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LIST OF SYMBOLS

The following symbols are used in the discussion of the examples taken from the 10 texts analyzed in this study. They are listed here alphabetically with definitions for convenient reference.

abstr. Abstract noun.
adj. Adjective.
adv. Adverb.
caps Capital letters.
concrete Concrete noun.
EDD Employment Development Department of the United States.
ESL English as a second language.
goof An error bilingual students tend to make in learning standard written English, for which no blame is implied. Adapted from the definition on page 1 of The Gooficon by Marina K. Burt and Carol Kiparsky (1972).

j j sound as in jewel.
L₁ Spanish, other language (sometimes mother tongue) of the bilinguals being studied.
L₂ English, language in which the texts for error analysis are written.
L's Languages.
lit. Literally.
NP Noun phrase.
pl. Plural in number.
sg. Singular in number.
skipant Foreign word used in the middle of an English sentence.
SLA Second language acquisition.
SV0 Typology or word order of languages like English with a dominant subject--verb--object sentence order.

VSO Typology or word order of languages like Spanish with a dominant verb--subject--object sentence order.

Weighty Having considerable length (number of syllables) or grammatical complexity (number of modifiers, etc.).

Y structure Sentence structures where a single idea simple subject branches into two aspects in a compounded predicate. Here subject idea is usually more nearly equivalent to one branch than to the other.

§ Voiced th sound as in though.

/ / Indicates the sound represented by the phonetic symbol inside.

{ } Indicates the letters inside represent a class of sounds associated with the given spelling.
ABSTRACT

AN ERROR ANALYSIS OF THE HISPANIC BILINGUAL ACROLECT

WITH REMEDIAL SUGGESTIONS

by

Hope Franklin O'Neill

Master of Arts in Special Major

Based on the view that a major source of English language writing difficulty is the influence of the student's own language or dialect, this study explores in detail the influence of Spanish language forms and stylistics on the written sentence structure of Hispanic bilinguals at the college level. Eight major categories of error are established based on a complete error analysis of 10 in-class writing samples. The body of the paper illustrates these categories and their subcategories by presenting representative examples from the texts together with analyses of the interference phenomena involved and resultant remedial suggestions. The conclusion affirms the relevance of such contrastive study to teaching, presents some general precepts of bilingual remediation, and suggests an area for further research.
Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

As Mina Shaughnessy pointed out in her article "Diving In: An Introduction to Basic Writing" (1976), one of the sources of writing problems for major groups of college students is "the influence of the student's own language or dialect" (p. 66) and not until we better understand the nature of that influence and its effects can we begin to do an adequate job of helping these students to improve their writing. Hispanics are the fastest growing bilingual group in the United States. Accordingly, the purpose of this study is to explore in detail the influence of Spanish language forms and stylistics on the written sentence structure of Hispanic bilinguals.

The study combines an error analysis of 10 in-class college-level writing samples of Spanish/English bilinguals with resultant suggestions as to remedial approaches for each significant category of error. As a first priority, major categories and subcategories are established as well as an order of treatment based on a sentence by sentence analysis for the selected papers. After introductory discussion defining population and various approaches to error typologizing, we present the categories and their ordering. We then justify and illustrate this hierarchy by giving representative examples of error categories and subcategories chosen from the texts. In each case an analysis of the interference phenomena involved is offered together with evidence for the importance of the category based on H. V. George's criteria of
frequency, comprehensibility, and acceptability (George, 1973).
Remedial suggestions follow addressed to the precise source of error.
Chapter II

TEXTS AND ERROR TYPOLOGY

A. Population Sample

The sample was obtained from Professor Rodolfo F. Acuña, Professor of Chicano Studies at California State University, Northridge (CSUN). A set of hour exams for a freshman Chicano Culture class was xeroxed thus providing a body of spontaneous written production for analysis. Only papers bearing Hispanic surnames were considered, and of these, the 10 containing the largest proportion of errors were chosen for evaluation. The members of the group investigated share the common features of being bilingual in Spanish and English and in their early years of college. There are 4 females and 6 males. Ages may vary widely since a number of mature students return to gain professional credentials at CSUN and it is not certain that all are born in the U.S. or even Mexico since there are students from all over Latin America in the various programs. However, the writing indicates that they have all been here long enough, whether immigrants or not, to use English with considerable fluency. Using the criteria specified in "The Relationship of Pidginization, Creolization and Decreolization to Second Language Acquisition" by John Schumann (1978), I would class the usage as belonging toacrolect (or in some cases mesolect) stages of decreolization. For some, as I have indicated, it may in fact be an acrolang (a second language acquisition stage) rather than a final step in moving from creole to native forms. However, this same article states
(p. 378) that "...at the mesolang and acrolang stages...the SLA continuum parallels decreolization," so that whatever remedial suggestions eventually emerge stand to be applicable to both.

B. Error Typology

Errors were distinguished from mistakes or lapses (letter trades, words dropped in haste, and so on) which were ignored. Various criteria were available for the descriptions of error. I began by following the schemata of Katri Meriö in "The Psycholinguistic Analysis and Measurement of Interference Errors" (1978) marking one group "native" or monolingual error and separating as interference errors "...all those errors which are not made by a monolingual" (p. 27). This distinction was easy to make based on thirteen years' experience with monolinguals, bilinguals, and ESL students and serves to usefully embrace both transfer and learner error. However, I came to realize that, in addition, I could not ignore certain perfectly "native-seeming" errors which seem to be encountered more frequently in the writing of bilingual Hispanics.

A good example is the class of errors involved in using—or rather failing to use—the semi-colon (;). In 8 of 10 papers I found not one semi-colon was used although I found many balanced-construction sentences which would seem to require one. Instead there were either two separate sentences (acceptable), a comma (,) in place of the semi-colon (dubious), or a run-on (unacceptable). It is true that monolinguals err in just these ways, but they also err by using semi-colons in the wrong places. An additional factor of significance—at least for those who have written in Spanish—is that Spanish scarcely uses the semi-colon even in scholarly writing, as I verified by scanning
comparative texts. Professor Carmelo Gariano of CSUN confirms that while formal rules exist in the official writings of the Spanish Academy (see Appendix A, p. 55), they are mostly ignored in Latin America [except for rule 1.8.5.c (Ibid.)] and, in practice, an "anarchy of usage" reigns. It is also clear from these official rules that Spanish tolerates commas where English demands semi-colons and vice versa and this asymmetry readily accounts for the patterns of confusion and avoidance. You could call errors like this interference errors masquerading as monolingual errors; but whatever you call them, it is clear they should be treated in remedial materials for bilinguals.

Meriõ subdivides interference areas into three sub-classes: direct, indirect, and distant error, meaning (respectively) transfers, errors such as hyper-correction in L₂ linked to aspects or forms of L₁, and errors in L₂ involving invented forms wholly unrelated to L₁ but unlike any monolinguals produce. These classes are useful in prodding analytic thinking as to error source and I use them to color some of my analytical explanations here (where L₂ equals English and L₁ equals Spanish). However, they cut confusingly across conventional groupings of syntax, phonology, and semantics and also obscure the category of style in relation to Spanish VSO. Since I feel this latter goes to the heart of the Spanish versus English "feel" of much bilingual prose, I do not follow Meriõ's distinctions for my major category divisions.

More useful is to employ the kind of divisions which are used in the classical contrastive study of The Grammatical Structure of English and Spanish by Stockwell, Bowen, and Martin (1965) and it will be seen that my arrangement is not unlike theirs in proceeding (after specialized groupings) from syntax (noun and verb groupings) to word order and
style (what they call simple and complex transformations) to lexical overlaps. However, since I deal with spelling and phonology (a separate book for them), and some punctuation, too, and since my aim is to go beyond contrasting structure to homing in on the actual interference spots where the bilingual writer's feel for Spanish interferes with his/her feel for English locally and more globally, my grouping also cuts across some of their distinctions and there is far from perfect parallelism. Thus, two problems relating to words referring to nationality, one orthographic, one morphemic, are grouped together. Style factors, which [in keeping with the approaches of Ruth Aronson Berman (1978)] I link to a commonality in the way VSO Spanish handles extended modification, emphasis and idea order, merge relativizations and of-phrases under the umbrella of post-modification; and lexical overlaps involving asymmetric meaning and morphology intersection become another area claiming detailed attention. Finally, precisely because many lapses occur less frequently or do not interfere with meaning in a major way and yet occur often enough so that teachers, anticipatorily, and students, a posteriori, should be alerted, I have a catch-all category for small-scale leftovers.
Chapter III

HIERARCHY OF ERRORS

Table 1 (p. 8) displays an ordered list of major error categories together with a key example for each. As indicated earlier, the remainder of the paper justifies this hierarchy by giving representative examples of these error categories and their sub-categories, chosen from the student papers, together with remedial suggestions. The discussion presents analyses of the interference (and other) phenomena and treats order of importance in terms of George's combined criteria (George, 1973).
Table 1

HIERARCHY OF ERROR FOR BILINGUAL WRITING
(COLLEGE LEVEL)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Key Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Nominalization of Adjectives</td>
<td>The Toltecs combined and held onto a past cultural but...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Agreement and Idea Equation with be</td>
<td>Corn, beans and squash were the principal resource...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Capitalization Wobble and Words of Nationality</td>
<td>The Indians; the valley of Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Verb Forms</td>
<td>Warriors did not appeared...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The film explain why...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Aztecs had slaves, but the children of the slave are free. (etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Phonological Influence on Spelling</td>
<td>&quot;strick&quot; for &quot;strict&quot;; &quot;artis&quot; for &quot;artist&quot;; &quot;former&quot; for &quot;farmer&quot;; &quot;interchange their&quot; (silent d) for &quot;interchanged their&quot; (etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. VSO and Other Style Factors (Extended post-modification)</td>
<td>The artist of his paintings gave meanings that are understandable to you as a looker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Asymmetric Lexical Overlap</td>
<td>With the soon fall of Toltec influence... (pronto = adj. &amp; adv.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Teotihuacan people interchanged their knowledge... (intercambiar = both exchange &amp; interchange) (etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Other Small-scale Goofs such as misuse of:</td>
<td>led of great chief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prepositions</td>
<td>the Chicano and its struggle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pronouns</td>
<td>The sugar was a symbol of the Indians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>articles</td>
<td>They traded corn like if it was money.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>idiom transfer</td>
<td>Includes: missing semi-colons (;) and run-ons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>punctuation</td>
<td>fragments, arbitrary caps, missing apostrophes (')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>missing commas (,)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>missing skipant underlining</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter IV

JUSTIFICATION OF THE HIERARCHY

A. Nominalization of Adjectives

The first category refers to a very fundamental process of Spanish which is merely a special case restricted to very narrow categories in English, namely the process whereby in Spanish, principally adjectives—but also other parts of speech such as possessive pronouns and verbs—are allowed to stand with the article as nouns in their own right: _el viejo_ (literally the old) for the old man, _lo más importante_ for the most important [thing] with referent determined by the context and nothing, in fact, appearing in the brackets. Stockwell et al. (p. 103) refer to "...the past and present vigor of the process of nominalization as a source of constructions, usage, and even lexical items in Spanish..." in contrast to its much more limited occurrence in English. What they do not mention, however, because it is not relevant to their English-to-Spanish focus, is the alarming effect of mimicking such a pattern in English in places where it is not supposed to go. Purists carp at the grating effect of the newly permissible

(1) He works for the military instead of military service

but what about

(2) The Toltecs combined and held onto a past cultural but...

(paper F)?

"Cultural...what?" we want to say. Cultural tradition is what we
expect (although, in fact, meaning-redundant since past already provides the clues). Turning it around, to one used to inferring tradition-heritage-wisdom in such contexts, there is nothing missing at all. The problem is enhanced by the kind of L₁/L₂ interaction Zobl (1980) describes in his article "Developmental and Transfer Errors..." where he notes that when an L₁ structure conforms more closely to general acquisition regularities than the L₂ structure, transfer errors are promoted which may retard subsequent restructuring (p. 469). As noted, L₁ Spanish nominalizes across a broad spectrum while L₂ English frequently permits nominalization for a group of people in the plural (the bad, the rich) but generally prohibits such a process in the singular (except for abstract qualities) because we can't say the rich for the rich man, not having the unambiguous options of singular and plural concordance that Spanish (el rico, los ricos) does. Although my main focus is on bilingual phenomena rather than SLA, I conjecture that here too, the more generalized use is transferred unconsciously. Indeed I have often noted an utter unawareness in the bilingual user matched by a baffled incomprehension in the monolingual receiver; and that—coupled to occurrence on 7 of 10 papers—is why I feel this feature needs urgent remedial attention.

I recommend having students begin by comparing the discussions of adjective nominalization in the Spanish and English sections of a good bilingual dictionary like Simon and Schuster's International Dictionary (1973). Then they should analyze comparative Spanish and English texts (orally, if necessary) for examples of permissible noun omission in Spanish NP's versus obligatory inclusion in the corresponding English translation. It may be enough to focus on applying the general rule
that English NP's require a noun with each adjective, in proofing, although discussions of adjectives used as nominals and relevant exercises are available in ESL books like the Grammar & Drillbook by Willard D. Sheeler (1978, pp. 141 and 161) to clarify the small areas of permissible English nominalization.

B. Agreement and Idea Equation with be

The second category involves uncertainty about idea equivalence and subject-verb agreement with the verb to be. In bilingual English, it occurs in such sentences as

(3) Corn, beans, and squash were the principal resource (paper D). (sg.)

This is an example of L1 interference involving be and idea equivalence, for here singular noun follows a clearly plural subject and sets up singular/plural and abstract/concrete conflicts in English, yet the usage follows Spanish custom in that a sentence like

(4) Todos los animales tienen cabeza means All animals have heads (pl.) (sg.)

(Ramsey, 1956, p. 36)

and the singular entity in the complement is equated with each of the plural items in the subject with no sense of number conflict. By contrast, I have found that while monolingual students have subject-verb agreement difficulty both with verbs in general and with be in particular, for them it is more apt to involve verb agreement with a "false subject" based on presence or absence of an s sound in the word adjacent to and preceding the verb, as in

(5) Corn, beans, and squash was... or There is many aspects to the situation.
For the bilingual writer, sentences like

(6) The first society were the hunters (paper B)
    (sg./abstr.)  (be-pl.)  (pl./concrete)

also occur and while there is temptation to count this as a monolingual
error involving false equation of non-countable (or abstract) and
countable (or concrete) items and unawareness of the option

(7) The first society was [that of] the hunters,
    (sg.)  (be-sg.)  (sg.)

the tell-tale L₁ feature in (6) is the agreement of be with the noun
following. A more typically L₂ or monolingual error is illustrated by

(8) The first period was the Olmecs for The first period
    (sg.)  (be-sg.)  (pl.)  (sg.)
    was [that of] the Olmecs (paper D).
    (be-sg.)  (sg.)

However, all such errors occur more frequently in bilingual writing;
there were examples in 6 of the 10 papers, including 3 examples of
agreement wobble following an abstraction as in the sentences

(9) The first society were the hunter (paper C)
    (sg.)  (be-pl.)  (sg.)

and

There art were very abstract (paper H).
    (sg.)  (be-pl.)  (adj.)

This appears to be an important category of error. Analysis of correct
usage in English texts would seem to be a good remedial approach.

C. Capitalization Wobble and Words of Nationality

The third category of error involves problems with words of
nationality. The main area of difficulty is one of punctuation and the problem is that there is neither completely opposite usage nor complete identity between Spanish and English capitalization practices. The same non-parity occurs for the morphological changes from adjective to noun.

The situation is this: names of nations and all words derived from them are capitalized in English, e.g., England, the English, English customs, English—a strange language. In Spanish, only the place names are capitalized—as in España, but los españoles, las costumbres españoles, el español—idioma raro [although in place names which contain an adjective (el mar Rojo—lit. the sea red) the adjective is regularly capitalized; and sometimes the noun, too (el Mar Rojo—see Ramsey, p. 18)]. There is no one pattern of malformation here. Rather one sees considerable wobble and hypercorrection in both languages so that Mexico, which should appear with a capital either way, appears as mexico (papers B, E, and G) and Mesoamerican and mesoamerican can appear on the same page (paper F). Other transfer examples are the indians (paper B), meso American (paper A), and vera Cruz (paper C). In some cases the wobble appears to extend to related contexts [proper names: both Mexcoatl and mexcoatl (paper F)]. And in 7 papers there were random capitalizations throughout the paper, parallel ing a common monolingual English user's spelling problem which suggests the writer has consciously or unconsciously generalized and decided that capitalization is so arbitrary there are no rules which he or she can discern to follow. The fact that the subject of these essays involved Spanish proper names may have accentuated the problems of interference but I have found many such instances over the years in
bilingual papers on other subjects so that the main factor in the confusion seems to center on the asymmetry of the overlap and the minimal character of the distinction. As remediation I recommend clarification of the difference between proper and common nouns and exposure to clear statements of the nationality rules in both Spanish and English (available in most grammars for the respective languages) followed by English capitalization and editing exercises emphasizing the capitalization of all words of nationality and no common nouns. Using English: Your Second Language (Danielson and Hayden, 1973) has an excellent summary and drill in the section on capitalization, pp. 254-6.

Regarding adjectives of nationality, wobble occurs narrowly where the morphological ending-changes from noun of country to other forms are most similar. Thus, in both languages the name of the country and the adjective of nationality generally have different endings (France, French; Francia, francés) but where noun and adjective forms differ this much in each language and also from L₁ to L₂ there are no problems. However, sometimes the -a to -an change occurs almost identically in both languages (Mesoamerica, Mesoamerican; Mesoamérica, mesoamericano) and in such a case, in a curious L₁/L₂ criss-cross, we may find the noun of country or language used by the student as an adjective of nationality. Examples are the phrases Mesoamerica societies (paper D) and the Maya calendar (paper B). We also find frequent apparent nominalizations such as

(10) The Mayan were... for The Mayans were... or The Mayan people were...

(paper C)
and, similarly,

(11) The Aztec were the last people... for The Aztecs were or
The Aztec people were... (paper B)

where people could be the missing noun. Here the fact that English
follows the standard Spanish use of nominalized adjectives made plural
for the name of the related people [maya (adj.), los mayas (noun);
Mayan (adj.), the Mayans (noun)] conflicts with the evidence of the
many cases like Dutch, the Dutch [people]; English, the English;
Chinese, the Chinese (for a representative list, see A Communicative
Grammar of English, Leech and Svartvik, 1975, p. 245). This second
pattern makes it look as if (contrary to Spanish) English nominalizes
an unaltered adjective form for the plural collective idea.¹ So the
seeming nominalization in (10) and (11) may, in fact, be a hypercorrec-
tion and generalization of the basic English rule as it appears to
Hispanics, another L₁/L₂ phenomenon. Either way, it may be enough to
sensitize the writer who commits this error to the near-universal need
for some kind of terminal sibilant (-s or -sh or -ch or -"z") for the
generic plural of nationality words in English. Editorial repair of
his/her own writing, applying this principle, should then follow.

D. Verb Forms

Category D is not so much a category peculiar to Spanish/English
bilinguals as one common to all who deal with an L₁ and an L₂ (or two

¹The class of sibilant endings, in fact, subsumes the addi-
tional plural -s, thereby losing the singular and plural indefinite
options of the -an(s) and -er(s) endings.
L's if you prefer). Verb systems are never identical and are, moreover, in European languages, elaborate and irregular. Hence we encounter invented forms or tense uses (Meriö's category of distant interference error, also sometimes called "learners' errors") which have nothing to do with L₁, yet are equally clearly non-monolingual. A clear instance is the complementary infinitive as the past participle (ed) form, as in struggling to expressed his feelings (paper C). This is a mesolect feature (Stauble, 1977) which appeared in 3 papers.

Two further examples are

(12) ...the Toltecs, who were lead to conquered Mexico by their chief...

(paper D)

and

(13) War did not appear until 750 A.D. Warriors did not appeared...

(paper B).

Here an interesting side aspect is that in each case, two clauses on the same subject are involved, and this pattern of verbal error occurring in the second or embedded clause of a more elaborate structure is fairly general. In these particular cases, Toltecs is itself in apposition to an NP of the main clause and the sequence War...Warriors represents an unrealized compounding of subjects with parallel structure, e.g.,

(14) War and warriors did not appear...

²The ordering from larger to smaller concept is also characteristic of Spanish (see section on "VSO and Other Style Features").
Other instances of improper verb form use mainly involve failure to maintain simple past narrative flow (using present instead) although past forms are generally used correctly in the main clause position, for example,

(15) The Aztecs had slaves, but it very interesting that the Aztecs slaves could own property, marry a free person and the children of the slave are free (paper C).

Main clause lapses also involved missing be-auxiliaries plus -ed or -ing [the prophecy fulfilled for was fulfilled (paper J); they working with art for were working with (paper E)] and missing third singular -s as in

(16) The film America Tropical explain why... (paper C).

8 of the 10 papers had past form goofs unrelated to phonology (see next category) and all had several verb form problems. While these problems do not interfere with meaning as badly as nominalization, they do affect acceptability especially in the academic milieu. Hence I rank tense and form control fourth in the hierarchy. I find the relation between control and structural complexity interesting. I picture a remedial approach using the kind of first clause/second clause comparison in editing which George (1972) describes in his section on remediation (pp. 72-80) as being effective for this class of error, while more traditional SLA approaches may be required for the other kinds of errors.

E. Phonological Influences on Spelling

The fifth category involves, primarily, spelling errors traceable
to phonological influence, that is, cases where English words have final consonant clusters impermissible in Spanish and where, therefore, the Spanish articulation of English sounds produces a dropped letter in the English spelling. The most obvious case is the familiar dropped {ed} or /d/ of the past morpheme in simple past tense and past participle constructions before /s/. Thus we find

(17) The Teotihuacan people interchange their knowledge between different colts...

(paper D)

in the midst of a simple past tense narrative which handles a /st/ realization of the tense correctly, i.e., in

(18) They produced arms for hunting...

(paper D).

This reflects the fact that /st/ occurs medially in Spanish (la historia) while the /j/d/ of (17)—interchanged—occurs neither medially nor finally. And the fact that in the spoken English of the bilingual community, final /t/ and /d/ become dentalized and non-aspirated as in Spanish accounts in part for additional examples like believe in for believed in (paper H) and also the phrase

(19) ...a highly develop irrigation system...

(paper D).

However, (19) is a case where, even in the pronunciation of English monolinguals, developed loses the /t/ in the difficult /pt/ combination; hence the bilingual spelling lapse, here, stems from the universally elided aural input and parallels a not uncommon monolingual spelling error. 8 of 10 papers included at least one final /t/ or /d/ lapse in the verbs and other papers included artis for artist (paper...
A), *strick* for *strict* (paper F) and *brough* for *brought* (paper E)—all of which I attribute to the same cause. The attack on this error should be two-pronged, clearly. On the phonological end, it would require practice in final sound aspiration, while at the morphological end, it necessitates explanation of the past tense and passive/adjec­tive function of the -ed morpheme combined with appropriate grammatical exercises. For the perfect and passive tenses, at least, a link of association can also be constructed to the equivalent Spanish forms since they also contain a d. Examples are

(20) han construido equivalent to they have constructed and fue construido equivalent to it was constructed.

**F. VSO and Other Style Factors**

The next category embodies local (modification) and global (major clause-disarrangement) aspects. The latter occur seldom but with serious consequences for comprehensibility, while the more common local occurrences mainly function to give Spanish flavor to the writing. I refer here to aspects of style, the normal "way-of-saying" of the bilingual which are completely comprehensible to monolingual speakers and yet not quite as they would say it. Ruth Aronson Berman in her very interesting unpublished manuscript "Contrastive Analysis Revisited: Obligatory, Systematic, and Incidental Differences Between Languages" (1978) singles out this kind of focus on "contrastive stylistics" or "the rhetorical devices typical of discourse in a given language" for special attention, calling it "the category of Nongenetic Systematic Differences" (p. 19) and identifying these as differences which "apply across the language as a whole...being typical features of
one of the languages in question but not the other" (Ibid.). She goes on to point out (p. 23) that in language pedagogy, properties such as these would seem crucial to the teaching process. Students need some sense of the picture as a whole, she states, especially at the more advanced level and stand to benefit from truly general generalizations which give a feel for what the secondary (and this writer would add for bilinguals—primary) language is all about and how, in fact, it works.

Broadly speaking, Spanish—a more nearly VSO language—uses extended post-modification devices such as of-phrases and relative clauses much more frequently than English—a primarily SVO language—which prefers compression into adjectival pre-modification form whenever possible. In Spanish there can be multiple strings of que (relative) or de (of) constructions and, additionally, reflecting even older Arabic influences, Spanish is at ease with and often demands a kind of duplication in either lexicon (where verb and object have the same root and even the same vowel sound) or with pronoun identification using to-phrases and indirect objects, both of which only seem repetitive in English. Thus as teachers we find ourselves saying "Why repeat?" in response to usages which appear obligatory to the bilingual. A popular Latino song of a few years back which spoke provocatively of wanting to motivar motivos is a good example. It means to induce motives but this kind of root repetition is not stylistically offensive or uncommon in Spanish as a phrase like to undertake an undertaking would be in English. And at a less colloquial level of diction are similarly duplicative phrases like vivir una vida (lit.
to live a life; English translation: to lead a life), cantar una canción (sing a song—but note the vowel shift in English), and so on.

In addition to preferring such extensions and echoings, Spanish reverses word order for modification (another VSO feature) so that not only do de and que phrases come after the noun, as in English, but most adjectives, as well, and this in turn gives rise to a reversal of preferred emphasis in a sequence [proceeding from stronger to less strong item basically because "in English and Spanish, the adjective most closely identified with the noun appears closest to it," (Stockwell et al., p. 93)]. The result is that Spanish una casa pequeña y bonita (lit. a house small and pretty) is properly rendered a pretty little house (Ibid.) but interference often produces such Spanish-ordered English strings as a little pretty house in bilingual utterance, with similar reversal in NP and—as we shall see—clause strings as well.

Finally, the additional features of gender agreement for nouns, pronouns, and adjectives make it possible to displace modifiers farther from their referents and still avoid ambiguity and all these contrastive stylistic features of Spanish may imprint themselves on the English of bilinguals.

1. Local problems: post-modification and redundancy

Thus English becomes uncomfortable with a phrase like militarism never conquered for unconquerable militarism (paper I) or with an extended string of relatives such as the following (ignoring for the moment some other errors):
With the soon fall of Toltec influence came another great era of nomadic people who came from the south the Chichimecs who were also warriors (paper F).

Here we find a string of three post-modifying phrases including two relative who-clauses ultimately dependent upon the same noun, people. The syntax improves remarkably if, in keeping with pre-modifying English compression, we turn the second who-clause into an adjective (warrior or warlike) forming the NP the warlike Chichimecs. It improves even more if we reverse the order of the remaining elements and insert appositive commas to produce

(22) ...nomadic people, the warlike Chichimecs, who came from the south.

Here, we are following English writing preferences for "end-focus" and "end-weight" (see excellent discussion in Leech and Svartvik, 1975, pp. 174-5 et seqq.). The key principle is that the so-called new, most important and/or more weighty parts of a sentence should be placed toward the end while information which is "older" relative to the discourse (and/or more concisely expressed) goes toward the beginning. In passing I note that the kind of sentence-combining exercises which focus on adjectival phrase and clause reduction would be of remedial use here, directed as an editorial device to the student's own writing.

A rather significant area of contrast is that between the of-phrase and the possessive because Spanish uses de + NP as its unique form of ownership attribution and also handles many other options of attribution in this way, while English uses possessives with apostrophes ('') for human ownership, prefers the of-phrase for things and
abstractions, and uses other prepositions altogether or simple adjectives, for other kinds of attribution. This gives rise to the transfer overextensions of the people of hard work for the hard-working people (paper A) and The seeds of nourishment for nourishing seeds (paper E). It also explains the hypercorrective Mexico's culture or the Barbarians [sic.] Period (paper D) for the more formally correct the culture of Mexico; the Period of the Barbarians. Additionally, the monolingual error of apostrophe omission for plural possession, here evident, occurs universally so that there was not one example of the correct plural possessive with (' in all 10 papers though singular possession was sometimes marked correctly with this feature. 4

An almost classic example of the foregoing features of extended modification together with meaning repetitions occurs in the sentence

(23) The Artis of his paintings gave meanings that are understandable to you as a looker (paper A—underlinings mine).

This reduces quite satisfactorily after a few "Why repeat? Why extend?" excisions, a preposition trade (see "Preposition goofs"), and a word order shift to

(24) The artist, through his paintings, gave you understandable (i.e., comprehensible) meanings.

Here a relative that-clause has collapsed to an adjective; and a duplicative phrase, as a looker, has been excised. Moreover, the sense in which understandable is used is reasonable as an example of semantic

4 More about this under "Small-scale Goofs—punctuation."
interference when we realize that Spanish comprensible means both understandsable and comprehensible (see discussion of "Asymmetrical Lexical Overlap").

Another form of repetition is redundancy of the te hablo a ti kind (lit. to you I'm talking to you). For example, we have

(25) Herbs were also added to their food to obtain extra sabor [sic] to their meals (paper D).

To English thinking the to their meals is so obvious it should not be said, but in accordance with the feel of Spanish it is not saying it that gives the reader an uncomfortable frisson!

Some of these kinds of errors occurred on all of the papers. In general what is needed here, I think, is to make the writer more at ease with his English options, to teach him or her to search editorially for English style economies and emphasis order, and to make him/her aware of the contrasting stylistic extension and compression in his two languages—which last can readily be done by comparing the length and phrasing of any two parallel Spanish and English texts such as are regularly provided in government notices like the driver's manual of the California Department of Motor Vehicles.

The matter of opposite emphasis in word order is well illustrated by the phrase piece [sic], prosperity and commercial transactions (paper J) and by the following:

(26) The Mayas are known best for Math, astronomy, cities, corn, calendar (paper B).

One can readily picture the monolingual versions as beginning with
calendar and transactions (the most specific and concrete) and ending with mathematics and peace (the most lofty and abstract) and it is true that, conversely, a tall, dark, and handsome gentleman will indeed be, in Spanish, un caballero guapo, moreno y alto (lit. handsome, dark, and tall). Here, making the student aware of the interference and its effect is perhaps best accomplished by using the device recommended by Dulay and Burt (1973) in The Gooficon in various similar situations, namely, reversing the ordering in a Spanish listing in accordance with English sequence to reproduce the same kind of shock to the expectations.

2. Global problems: Y structures and dislocations

Style factors appear to combine in more complex sentences involving Y structure (or branching) to produce global disarrangements of a disturbing kind. Thus we find the malformed sentence

(27) Their contribution to agriculture was of great importance not only as a survival source but also of human culture (paper D).

The multiple factors at work here make disentanglement difficult. We notice first a local problem in that the classic not only...but also structure governing parallel forms is used improperly. The phrase should probably read

(28) ...not only as a survival source but also as a source of human culture.

Additionally we note a possible adjectival hypercorrection since source of survival is a more usual arrangement and this suggests the following as a possible revision:
(29) ...as a source not only of human survival but also of human culture.

We see global dislocation in that the phrase contribution to appears in the wrong part of the sentence. The best revision in accordance with apparent intent is, then,

(30) Their agriculture was of great importance not only as a source of survival but also as a contribution to human culture.

I call this a Y structure because a single idea and simple subject (agriculture) branches into two aspects in a compounded predicate (survival, culture). The element indicating a part of a class (contribution to) hopped out of place, and such global leaps and consequently puzzling effects seem to occur where one idea is divided into two asymmetrical parts.

Paper F has what appears to be an even more dissociated thought in the sentence

(31) The Toltecs combined and held on to a past cultural but arrive with new people from the outside.

This sentence seems incomprehensible. However, from other papers in the same set and historical discussions in The Columbia Encyclopedia (1953) I deduce that three idea elements are involved: Olmec culture (the oldest), Teotihuacan culture (a descendant of Olmec culture marked by great architecture), and finally, Toltec culture. The latter developed when outside conquerors settled in the Teotihuacan region, ultimately conquering the Mayans, as well. Another sentence in paper F sheds further light for it reads
(32) With this great architectural elements were combined with Mayan influence and elements brought in by the Toltecs.

Here the insertion of the noun conquest after this (implied by the context) and adding the attributive of the Teotihuacans produces an unambiguous

(33) With this conquest, great architectural elements of the Teotihuacans were combined with Mayan influence and elements brought in by the Toltecs.

Now I could work backwards to see that the problem sentence must have meant something like

(34) The Toltecs arrived with new people from the outside but combined with, and held on to, a past cultural tradition.

Here the subject element is the Toltecs and the two predicate elements are the new people and the past cultural tradition. And again the subject element equates approximately with one branch (people) and is not exactly equivalent to the other (past... tradition). But this time, in a sort of reverse of the other dislocation, an element identifying the whole class (arrived... outside) was separated from the class (Toltecs) and placed second in (31) while the contributary element indicating part of the class appeared first. If we realize that the superficially contributory element is really a part incorporated after the arrival of the outsiders and hence "newer information" in the Leech and Svartvik sense (p, 175), we can recognize why English selects end-placement for it; and once again we find SVO and VSO ordering preferences in apparent conflict with one another.
A third example of a Y structure closely resembling (31) confirms this bilingual pattern of introducing the partial and new information element first in preference to the old information branch that is more nearly equivalent to the whole subject. It reads

(35) Now came the Toltecs. Semi barbarious people who combined cultural heritage of the classical world and new peoples from outside (paper J).

To facilitate analysis, we repair the fragment, replace the excised definite article with of-phrase (see "Article goofs" under "Small-scale Goofs") and correct the invented adjective to produce

(36) Now came the Toltecs, semi-barbarous people who combined the cultural heritage of the classical world and new peoples from outside.

The sentence now reads more smoothly but still has a logical flaw. In line with (34), the Toltecs are the "new peoples from outside"; what is combined is their semi-barbaric past and the cultural heritage of the classical world. Diagrammatically, instead of the writer's

(37) Toltecs = semi-barbarous people (combining) cultural heritage + new peoples from outside

we want

(38) Toltecs = new peoples (combining) semi-barbarous past + cultural heritage.
The corrected sentence reads

(39) Now came the Toltecs, new peoples from the outside who combined a semi-barbarous past with the cultural heritage of the classical world

and we see that to satisfy English SVO style and ordering conventions, first the whole class elements new peoples and semi-barbarous people must trade places (because the appositive new peoples must come directly after the referent to which it is virtually equivalent) and then the branches must trade orderings so that the branch describing attributes of the established subject (semi-barbarous past, now, instead of people) precedes the contributory addition (cultural heritage).

Conversely, the original sentences (31) and (35) suggest that for some bilinguals the VSO imperatives of Spanish stylistics exert a powerful influence toward a reversed English ordering of compounded predicate elements of this type, and the suggestion is confirmed in the following sentence

(40) There were two types of men, the Aztecs and Mayas were polyanthic Hunters and the seeg-gatthers [sic] who were decented from 7500 BC to 6000 BC (paper H).

The first step in analysis is to place the date phrase initially, following the preference of English historical writing (see, for example, Peru: A Cultural History by Dobyns and Doughty, 1976) as against the Spanish preference for the final position (see, as illustration, La civilización española by Diego Marín, 1969). This, together with
adding a *who* needed for parallel structure and other minor corrections yields

(41) From 7500 B.C. to 6000 B.C. there were two types of men, the Aztecs and Mayas, who were polyandrous hunters, and the seed-gatherers who were descended from them.

From another sentence in paper H we see that the writer knows (as we do) that the seed-gatherers came before the Aztecs. Thus once again the sense of placement in relation to chronology is reversed. Here English demands prior mention of the source group (the older information in the discourse sense) followed by mention of the derivative group (the newer more weighty information being added to it). Of course the matter is complicated by the use of relative pronoun joins (*who*, and a possible *from whom*) which are always tricky because different pronouns and prepositions can be appropriate in the two languages and Spanish has a tendency to vary the order of the joining elements (see Ramsey, p. 670). In particular the forms *el* or *la cual*, *el* or *la que*, etc., with their unambiguous gender and number references, permit greater displacement of clauses from antecedents without confusion. However we leave exploration of this feature until later (see "Small-scale Goofs--pronouns") and simply aver that the historical facts plus *Y* branching patterns of dislocation argue that a sentence like

(42) From 7500 B.C. to 6000 B.C. there were two types of men: the seed-gatherers, and the Aztecs and Mayas--polyandrous hunters who were descended from them

must have been intended.
We conclude that what we have in all these examples is simply a large-scale manifestation of the tug of war imposed by the contrary demands of post-modifying Spanish and pre-modifying English stylistics. Regardless of what the precise VSO ordering impulse is, that the sense of placement is very different—and much more flexible—in Spanish is confirmed by the whole discussion of the order of words in Ramsey (pp. 660-672). Here it is stressed that "A [Spanish] sentence...may be separated into sections according to meaning and the order of the sections changed according to taste" (p. 662) as long as obscurity does not result. Taste includes "the sound of words, the expression of emphasis, and the desire to avoid monotony of arrangement" (p. 660). More broadly we can say that, since 5 of the 10 papers contain some form of global dislocation, when such error is evidenced, practice in sentence combining involving compounding and ordering the compounded elements in accord with English style principles seems indicated.

G. Asymmetrical Lexical Overlap

1. Broader range of meaning in L₁

Category G, that of asymmetrical lexical overlap, represents an enormous area. Stockwell et al. offer an excellent survey of the kinds of problems which occur for an English speaker learning Spanish in their chapter entitled "Lexical Differences" (see pp. 265-281). Spanish/English bilinguals seem to have similar problems with asymmetric lexical overlap, that is, where seeming cognates in fact have distinct meaning in Spanish and English, or where genuine cognates have different ranges of meaning in the two languages. Thus, there was considerable use of English words in contexts permissible in Spanish but not in
English. A specific example where the range of meaning in Spanish is broader than that for the English cognate is the following:

(43) The Teotihuacan people interchange[d] their knowledge...

(paper D).

Here *interchange* immediately suggests a derivation from Spanish *intercambiar*. The mapping is like this

\[
(44) \text{intercambiar} \leftrightarrow \text{exchange} \quad \text{exchange} \neq \text{interchange}
\]

and we see that knowledge of the mutually exclusive split of English is not part of this student's lexicon. Rather s/he simply equates *intercambiar* with *interchange* and tries to make the latter serve a broader range of meaning than, in fact, it can in English.

In another example we have

(45) The Olmecs social classes were directed by the priests...

(paper C)

where

\[
(46) \text{dirigir} \leftrightarrow \text{lead} \quad \text{manage}
\]

is the mapping, and *led* would seem to be the intended sub-class meaning which was subsumed under the cognate *directed*. Similarly, in paper E because *pues* appears for *inasmuch as*, both being embraced in the meanings of Spanish *pues*. In 8 out of 10 papers this kind of "range for L₁ greater than range for L₂" error occurs.
2. Morphological asymmetry

Morphological asymmetry basically refers to cases where the range of grammatical use in L₁ (manifested, of course, by a certain set of morphemes) is not exactly equivalent to that of an English synonym and its paradigm. However, this aspect can be complicated by semantic subtleties and by the distant interference represented by an overgeneralization in L₂. Such a case occurs in a sentence treated earlier which contains the phrase

(47) ...paintings that are understandable to you as a looker

(underlinings mine--paper A).

Observer seems more natural in this context to a speaker of English. The problem is that in one way Spanish is just like English here. It provides two verbs, observar and mirar, to distinguish between informed (critical) and uninformed observance of a picture (English observe or study versus look). However, only one verb can be morphologically altered to provide a noun in common use for "the person who so observes." That is, Spanish provides

(48) observer
    (to observe, watch) and the
derivative noun
    el observador
    (the observer)

but would tend (as it often does faced with these alternatives) to paraphrase the rare and pedantic el mirante into el que mira (lit. he who looks). On the other hand, the addition of -er to the verb root is an extremely common form of noun generation in English (play--player; sing--singer, etc.). In the absence of an art-critical vocabulary in either L₁, then, and with the sense that verbs become nouns, if anything, more readily in English, it appears that the writer
grabbed for the English root parallel to non-professional observance in Spanish (look/mirar) and, at the same time, overgeneralized the -er verb-to-noun generation patterns of English in a rare case where it does not work. Thus, he reasoned logically but incorrectly

(49) look (verb); therefore looker (noun).

Morphological asymmetry causes interference with cognates, too. The phrase between different colts occurs (paper D) where between different cultures is obviously the intended meaning. Apart from the phonologically based misspelling, cults and culture though they both derive from Latin colere have now totally separated their meaning spheres in English, while Spanish retains closer ties to the Latin overlap. Thus

(50) culto = cult (noun) and culto-a = cultivated, cultured (adj.)

but by the convention of nominalization

(51) los cultos = the cultured people

(although la cultura = culture per se).

It is not possible to know if the criss-cross was wholly a matter of quasi-homophony and code-switching in English or of interference because of a meaning-morphology overlap in Spanish, but one suspects a complex L₁/L₂ interconnection.

An area of morphological non-symmetry which is of particular interest for Spanish/English bilinguals is that of passive and active voice because Spanish frequently favors a kind of passive with se, the
third person reflexive pronoun, where English does not. Thus the sentence

(52) This civilization was started around 800 B.C. (paper B)

would read better as

(53) This civilization started [or began] around 800 B.C.;

however two common words for this context in Spanish are:

(54) iniciarse = begin and fundarse = be founded.

Both exploit passive morphology in Spanish and it looks as if this pattern induced passive structure in English even though it doesn't work well for this particular great-grandson of an Old Norse word. Hypercorrective efforts to use an active verb when reflexive structure is appropriate to both Spanish and English also occur, for example, these people with similar cultures established in this region for established themselves (paper J). The corresponding Spanish verb is establecerse (infinitive plus reflexive).

Another example of morphological asymmetry appears in the phrase

(55) With the soon fall of Toltec influence... for With the swift fall of...etc. (paper F).

English soon may only be used as an adverb: if we want its adjective equivalent in this context, we must grab for swift. But Spanish more generally permits adjectives to serve as adverbs and, in particular, (applied to an event) we have the mapping
Here the Spanish double grammatical function caused the writer to use soon adjectivally. A reverse hypercorrective error occurs when the English adverb effectively is used in a sentence where the adjective effective is clearly more appropriate, e.g., in

57) The Aztecs had brain surgery and were very effectively at it

(paper H).

3. Asymmetry with cognate "synonyms"

The most elaborate linguistic criss-cross I encountered looks like this:

\[\text{only} \quad \text{be (is)} \quad \text{sometimes} \quad = \quad \text{exist} \]

\[\text{ser (es)} = \text{existir}\]

The two words are meaning synonyms in Spanish. Sometimes their cognates in English are also synonyms but there are contexts in which they are not interchangeable, each being usable for only one of the two possible meanings. Thus the sentence which reads

(59) The Aztec [people] were around 1400

(paper B)

really expresses the idea

(60) The Aztec people existed around 1400

or more simply, lived.
4. Broader range of meaning in L₂

I did not find any examples where the range of meaning in L₁ was smaller than that in L₂, in these papers, probably because in such cases the writer will still be using the English word for a cognate correctly, only over too narrow a range; consequently it will take a very subtle analysis of a student's avoidance patterns to verify that there are certain legitimate English uses of the word s/he never makes. Here is a related example, however. The word aplicación in Spanish means a sticking-together as in English application, but lacks the other English connotation of a paper requesting a job. Consequently, a recently arrived Hispanic will at first have no clue to the meaning of the English phrase job application, nor use it, since his own language supplies a completely different word—solicitud—for that concept. Yet I am told that, until recently (most embarrassingly) EDD offices staffed by non-bilinguals were still wrongly posting aplicaciones signs on their boxes of solicitudes, to the great confusion of the very clientele they were supposed to be helping!

5. Spelling-meaning confusion in L₂

A final area of confusion is distant interference in L₂ where a word in English is linked in the student's mind either with a seeming look-alike or with another word that starts out the same. Thus though was used for through in paper B and I believe contribute was confused with constitute in paper D.

This whole area of lexical incongruity is a fascinating one. Adapting two comments of Stockwell et al. (p. 276) to the bilingual setting one might say: Frequently a good bilingual student will formulate sentences in English which are grammatically impeccable but
which nevertheless lack "monolingual quality" precisely because the mold of thought is typically Spanish and the formulation violates English semantic rules. They add, "Only painstaking observation and imitation of...models can overcome this...[tendency]." Because some examples occurred on 9 of the 10 papers I do wish to mark the phenomena as deserving of attention. It seems that teachers of bilinguals, at the very least, would do well to emphasize careful lexical separation of cognates using what Rivers et al. (1976) call "extracts of living language where context clarifies nuance" as examples. In most cases such teaching should be a posteriori, however, to avoid the danger of planting interference by directing anticipatory drills at confusions which may not exist.

Clearly, to be in touch with two grammars, two lexicons, two ways of expressing ideas stylistically, is to be given an enriched sense of the possibilities of language. The problem for the English teacher is to make bilingual students consciously aware of the differing means and preferred options of their two linguistic cultures so that they can recognize the graceful, flowing, iterative and discoursive as more characteristic of Spanish writing and the terse, pruned, syllogistic, argumentative as more prevalent in English. In the same way, they will need to articulate for themselves the contrast between post- and pre-modification embedding, the use of more frequent and detailed references sentence by sentence (versus the dropping out of so-called redundancies), plus all the nuances of meaning overlaps and distinctions embodied in two related but non-identical lexicons. Then, in time, the bilinguals will be fully in control of their options, with a command both of a broader vocabulary and a more varied syntax than
their monolingual counterparts; and repeated ideas, prevalent passives, and frequent relative extensions will represent consciously chosen effects rather than features which have surfaced unconsciously as a kind of involuntary shadow-print of Spanish.

H. Small-scale Goofs

Our last category embraces a variety of small-scale goofs which, as a rule, do not interfere greatly with meaning nor occur across-the-board. Nevertheless, they are still worth noting, for every paper exhibits a varied cluster of them and when several occur in a given paper, the effect is to downgrade the overall impression of command of the language or clarity. It would take more papers to establish an unequivocal frequency of ordering of subcategories. Here, I separate punctuation, most important but also involving special complexities, and treat it last. Otherwise, I look for a clustering of error and/or a high effect of incomprehensibility, and arrive at the following tentative sequence of usage problems: preposition, pronoun, and article goofs and idiomatic phrase transfers.

1. Preposition goofs

To begin with, as in all language switches, use of the wrong preposition may cause many problems. It arises from asymmetries of meaning and use, and since the meaning-association for prepositions is especially arbitrary, it can be very hard to keep items straight.

Spanish

(61) en

\[\text{in, on, at, about}\]

(and more—see Stockwell, p. 207)
is a particular problem especially as it appears homophonic with in or on and there are many in/on trades in bilingual writing. An example is: everything depended in religion (paper H). Similarly de (roughly of) is a more all-purpose preposition in Spanish and embraces not only possessives but also Latin American use in place of por (by) with certain passives, so you get led of a great chief (paper F) for led by, and so on.

A noticeable area of preposition difficulty is in the formation of dates. Spanish frequently omits prepositions where English requires them or formulates the precise expressions differently, so that in 5 of the 10 papers there were such slips. In 3 of the other 5, there was total avoidance of use, while the remaining 2 papers used only one date each despite the fact that this was a historical essay! For example, in paper F we have The beginning of the 10th century for At... or In the beginning... (perhaps reflecting a two-word equivalent for al comienzo) and in paper B we get 200 B.C. for English in 200 B.C. and year 909 A.D. for English in the year 900 A.D., dropping the introductory preposition as Spanish does when it encloses the date in parentheses, as in (200 a.C.) or (siglo III a.C.) meaning in 200 B.C. or in the third century before Christ. Typical avoidance mechanisms involved organization by periods: The first period...The second...The third... (paper D) or by groups: The first society...Another group...

5 Professor Gariano provides the common examples querido de sus padres (lit. beloved of his parents) and conocido de todos (lit. known of all) and the note that, as often, this New World pattern reflects the perpetuation of a Spanish archaism. (See Academia Española, 1973, p. 378, section 3.5.2 for a full discussion.)

6 a.C. = antes de Cristo, i.e., before Christ.
Another group... (paper C). Additionally, paper H follows Spanish
preference in placing date phrases at the ends, rather than the begin­nings of sentences—all of which suggests that this particular area certainly deserves special comparative treatment.

2. Pronoun goofs

The most common pronoun error is to drop a mandatory English pro­noun subject, *it* or *they*, a transfer error from Spanish where the verb inflections make separate pronoun formulation in the third person largely unnecessary. Thus the sentence

(62) Now that wanted lands, people and power, they... (paper E)

should read

(63) Now that they wanted lands, people and power, they...

but in Spanish, *querían* by itself means *they wanted* by virtue of the third person plural *-n* ending. As originally written, sentence (31) lacks a similar *they* after the *but* (*but they arrived*) contributing strongly to the confusing effect, and there are several other examples. Here, exercises involving clause by clause proofing to spot or insert separate identifiable subjects would help.

In another kind of pronoun error, in one paper there was some kind of overgeneralization of the singular form *its* for most third person singular possessive use (with, additionally, *its* reduced to *it* here because of phonological complications with */ds/*). Thus, in paper C we get *it political aspect* for *its...* and The Chicano and *it struggle* where *it = his = the Chicano's*. This looks like interference from Spanish *su* for *his, hers, its* (interchangeably) though we also get he
and his used correctly in reference to the artist Siqueiros. Pronoun difficulty is also manifested in this paper (and several others) by simple omissions [but also in other groups where but also those in other groups is meant (paper G)] and by the avoidance mechanism of using noun repetition instead, as in

(64) He had painted a mural...There are people now working on the mural to restore the mural. (paper B).

The monolingual error of trading there for their: there crops (paper H) is quite common and also vice versa: Their are people working... (paper B), while, in an error common for monolinguals as well, this gets overused in the general reference sense as in

(65) They also brought Christianity and though this they keep the people in order (paper A)

where through this means would be clearer.

An example of the problem involving relative clause joining with a prepositional phrase referred to in the Y branching discussion of (41) is the following:

(66) The mural showed the constant strugle of chicanos which the people were upheld. (paper E).

How is this sentence to be understood? If we realize that sostener means uphold or support or sustain and choose the last meaning as more idiomatic in English, we can see that there is an excised preposition by, here--possibly a legitimately excised preposition in Spanish (see Ramsey, p. 669)--and the intended sentence must be
(67) The mural showed the constant struggle of Chicanos by which the people were sustained.

In a similar kind of error, it is not uncommon to find the join in which or in the which—even in that which—used as a Spanish en la que (equally, la en que) might be where about which is really meant, reflecting the non-parity of the joins, particularly of the prepositions on and in. Though less frequent than the substitution of which or that for who (following all-purpose que in Spanish), such combined preposition and relative pronoun goofs cause major confusion in advanced, college-level writing where complex sentences cannot be avoided. Detailed analysis of the Spanish origin of the error source and a comparison with contrasting English usage is unavoidable if remediation is to be accomplished.

3. Article goofs

The use of articles is similar but not identical in Spanish and English and this kind of asymmetrical overlap again causes some trouble because on the one hand, Spanish nouns in certain abstract, mass, or non-count uses (what Spanish calls la totalidad) always receive articles (la filosofía, la vida, los hombres if you mean men—in general) just where English drops them (philosophy, life, men); and on the other, count and non-count nouns are even less distinct in Spanish, slipping from count to non-count use with "no sharp line of demarcation" (Stockwell, p. 80 et seqq.). Thus we get

(68) The sugar was a symbol of the indians for Sugar was a typical crop of... (paper B).
Additionally, in the non-subject NP for singular nouns, Spanish drops the indefinite article unless either exactly one item is meant, or an emphatic sense intended like a real ______, a genuine ______. This leads to a sentence like

(69) In the beginning of the 10th century we see a rise of a new civilization (paper F)

where English calls for the definite article and the bilingual writer doesn't mean any old rise, but a genuine rise or the real emergence. Again, contrary to English, the verb to be in Spanish may be followed by a plural NP without the even when an identifying of-phrase is attached and this gives rise to typical "ESL" article goofs like

(70) They were great sculptors of Meso America... (paper J)

when

(71) They were the great sculptors of Meso America

is required. Finally, because Spanish lacks the a/an distinction (though it has others for euphony: o → u before o, etc.), we get a/an wobble and hypercorrection as in

(72) The gatherers mad corn to be An Culture (paper A).

ESL exercises abound for these common article problems.

4. Idiomatic phrase transfer

Direct idiomatic phrase transfer occurs in such formations as they had progress (paper D) for Spanish tuvieron éxito and similar forms, where made progress is the English idiom. Transfer occurs together
with asymmetry in verb aspect in the sentence

(73) Sigerios is living in Mexico now

(paper D).

Here English uses lives in the given context but Spanish conveys an additional intense emotional emphasis with esta viendo instead of vive (the present continuous in place of the simple present) and that same intensity is appropriate to the context of sentence (73). Again

(74) ...they traded corn like if it was money

(paper A) translates directly from the Spanish como si where como = like but como si joins clauses in the same places as English as if. Finally, illustrating the effect of what Stockwell et al. note (p. 92) about the asymmetry between distinctive Spanish all and every forms and their English equivalents, I note all three of the film (paper A) and in all films (paper F) for all three of the films and in all three films as well as

(75) The films that were shown expressed their own way of cultural living

(paper G)

for

(76) Each of the films that were shown expressed its own way..., etc.

This wobble relates to Spanish use of todas las tres for all three [films] (lit. all the three) but toda película if each and every film in the world is meant. Remedial reference to Spanish sources of interference on an item by item basis seems indicated, followed by drill in the English form.
5. Punctuation goofs

The last sub-category of small-scale goofs is punctuation and this includes overlaps with monolingual error such as the previously discussed features of semi-colon non-use, run-ons with resulting missing periods and caps, arbitrary fragments and capitalizations, missing apostrophes in plural possessives, and missing introductory commas. It also includes failure to underline Spanish words used in isolation in the middle of an English sentence. One may ask: if these are the problems of monolinguals, why treat them here? The answer is, first, that many seem to be reinforced by features of Spanish usage and, second and even more important, that coupled with the other errors of bilinguals they produce a much more confusing effect. Let me give an example which includes several error types to clarify my point.

Paper F begins

A

B

(77) The first in the evolution of Mesoamerica were the seed gathers or farmers who developed agriculture, they gathered in small villages with an organization no yet very democratic they had no indication of class difference.

a. Missing semi-colon and run-ons. I have numbered the punctuation errors in (77) and lettered the other goofs and we see that here three independent clauses have been run together, two with a comma (1) as separation and two with no marking at all (2). Since English does not tolerate such a three-clause string without terminal punctuation, we move to join two with a semi-colon (;) and separate the other two with a period (.) and capital letter. But which two? Apart from the missing noun people (A) and the missing er in gatherers (B) (misspelled
in 8 of 10 papers), we note some kind of meaning and syntax confusion in the phrase no yet very democratic. Turning for clarification to another paper—same assignment, same question, but non-Hispanic—we find the sentence

(78) The civilization of these villages was still quite democratic and there was no distinguishable class differences as of yet (paper Q)

and conclude that no yet very democratic must either mean still very democratic or not yet very undemocratic with the confusions stemming from the fact that Spanish no = both English no (adj.) and not (adv.) and that double negatives remain negative in most cases in Spanish (hence no + un + democratic must have felt undemocratic to the bilingual writer instead of the reverse). This also fits the sense of the next clause about absence of class differentiation. It now becomes clear that the first comma at (1) was a period + cap in its intended strength (They) while the second gap (2) is a join of related ideas, i.e., a semi-colon (;). The corrected form then reads

(79) The first people in the evolution of Mesoamerica were the seed gatherers or farmers who developed agriculture. They gathered in small villages with a still-democratic organization; they had no indication of class difference.

Clearly, it would have been easier to get at the semantics if the mechanics had been correct from the start, since the parity of the two independent clauses in the second sentence would immediately have been plain.
b. Arbitrary fragments and capitalizations. The arbitrary use of fragments and capitalizations (which goes together in 5 of 10 papers) is a similar kind of problem which occurs in the example

(80) The gratherers mad corn to be An Culture. Because they planted corn and they traded corn like if it was money (paper A).

Elimination of these errors already makes meaning more accessible by achieving a coherent flow as in

(81) The gratherers mad corn to be an culture because they planted corn and they traded corn like if it was money

although, of course, complete correction involves countering the pronoun avoidance, compounding the subordinate clauses, using a conditional contrary-to-fact and so on, yielding:

(82) The gatherers made corn a central cultural element because they planted it and then traded it as if it were money.

c. Missing apostrophes. Missing apostrophes (') for possessives are a problem monolinguals and bilinguals share since English is a language which, unlike Spanish, allows for an almost infinite number of noun compounds (meal ticket, school board, parish priest, etc.) and hence there is ample precedent for placing two nouns side by side with the first modifying the second. The parish priest and the parish's priest neither feel nor are very different; still less the Veterans Administration and the veterans' administration! In addition, as noted before, the fact that the possessive in Spanish has no possessive morphemes like 's; s' but rather appears with singular or plural nouns in
an of (de) phrase (las clases sociales de los Olmecas) apparently compounds the likelihood of confusing simple plural and plural possessive forms in English. Thus, we get the hypercorrective the Olmecs social classes (paper C) for the Olmecs' social classes rather than the more correct parallel to the Spanish form the social classes of the Olmecs; and, similarly, the Mixtecas capital city (paper I). The absence of the apostrophe reflects overgeneralization of the noun-compounding property of English while the failure to use an of-phrase reflects the kind of hypercorrection in which, once a syntactic usage in L₂ different from that in L₁ has been noted (here English John's hat for Spanish el sombrero de Juan, say), the "new" form is used broadly, even when it does not apply. Monolinguals overgeneralize the use of a pre-modifying possessive, too, but they virtually never drop both the apostrophe and the s in the singular as paper C did in the phrase Sequiero mural (for Sequiero's [sic] mural). The fact that 6 of the 10 papers had overt errors of omission and/or hypercorrection while the other 4 had total plural possessive avoidance suggests that, like the problems of the semi-colon, fragment and capital, this is an area deserving particular clarification. In all these cases I recommend sentence structure analysis plus carefully chosen exercises from the standard repertoire of grammar and ESL teachers in conjunction with editing, especially self-editing practice.

d. Missing commas. Missing commas (,) after introductory phrases or appositives also enhance existing obscurity as in the sentence examined before which begins
(83) With this great architectural elements were combined with Mayan influence... (paper F)

where the very first problem was to realize that there should be a comma after this or better yet, a restored nominalization deletion in the form of the noun conquest (With this conquest,...).

e. Non-underlined skipants. The last item worth mentioning is the convention of underlining foreign words used in an English text. An example of failure to follow this convention is

(84) We see here a group of pegules [sic]... (paper G)

which should evidently read pegujaleros (meaning small farmers). Most monolinguals omit the underlining at times, but such cross-lingual usage appears more frequently in bilingual papers (in 7 out of 10, here). As with commas, conventional editing drill is implied.
Chapter V

CONCLUSION

The major goals of advanced language teaching remain the same whether in a monolingual, second language, or bilingual context. Paraphrasing some words of Rivers et al. in their comprehensive manual *A practical guide to the teaching of Spanish* (1976, p. 304), we may cite as our goal in teaching English composition to bilinguals at the college level: to develop sensitivity to the meanings expressed in a stretch of English discourse and to the means for their realization. When interference is involved, I believe ultimate mastery must include contrasts with the corresponding Spanish forms in order to sort out the different linguistic mechanisms used by the two languages. The goal is college-level control of the syntactic and semantic systems of English; my conclusion from this study is that it cannot be accomplished in many cases without a comparative examination of their Spanish counterparts. And whether remediation is to be accomplished monolingually or not, certainly, for the teacher to understand the bilingual origins of many of the difficulties of his/her students, a contrastive approach such as that embodied here is a necessity.

Based on the 10 papers analyzed, the eight categories of bilingual error discussed here represent some major problems towards which teachers of writing to Hispanic bilinguals at the college level should turn their attention. Such teachers should not try to link English to Spanish all the time nor teach these difficulties as a general rule,
for the errors will not show up in every case, nor the same set for each writer, and there is no need to project confusion through inept pairing which may merely serve to create self-fulfilling prophecies of difficulty. Rather she or he should be quietly on the look-out for consistent patterns of error within the hierarchy (and beyond it). If one or another goof shows up for a particular student repeatedly, then remediation should be offered including insight as to error source, where helpful, and appropriate exercises. The most universal errors may be handled in class.

The teacher should also be on the look-out for the lack of facility that is masked by avoidance. The fact that avoidance patterns are indicated in at least 5 areas (semi-colon, apostrophe, and pronoun use; expressions for dates and semantic asymmetries—no doubt, the full exploitation of compound and complex structures, as well) reminds us how significant avoidance is as a factor in bilingual error and how astute Jacquelyn Schachter was in making the point that the overlooking of items of avoidance is the major "Error in Error Analysis" [article of the same name, (1974)]. I have tried to include awareness of this possibility throughout my analysis and I point to the need for unearthing other patterns of this type. It is a major area for further investigation in the writing of Hispanic bilinguals, in particular, and in the usage of bilinguals and second language learners, in general.
BIBLIOGRAPHY


Berman, R. A. (1978). Contrastive analysis revisited: obligatory, systematic, and incidental differences between languages. Tel Aviv University and UCB: Unpublished manuscript given to Prof. Fillmore, Department of Linguistics, University of California, Berkeley.


NOTE: The papers analyzed for this study are labelled A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, and J. They represent 10 papers by writers with Hispanic last names in the Chicano Culture class (Chicano Studies 100) of Professor Rodolfo F. Acuña of CSUN in the spring semester, 1980. The essays were written in class for an hour exam on February 28, 1980. The labels were determined by arranging these essays in alphabetical order by surname, then coding sequentially. Additionally, essay Q by a non-Hispanic is used as a reference.
APPENDIX A

Excerpt Showing Spanish Academy Rules
for the Use of the Semi-colon:

Ortografía

1.8.5 De los signos de puntuación.—a) Hay necesidad de signos de puntuación en la escritura, porque sin ellos podría resultar dudoso y oscuro el significado de las cláusulas...

c) Del punto y coma. 1.° Cuando los miembros de un período constan de más de una oración, por lo cual o por otra causa llevan ya alguna coma, se separarán con punto y coma unos y otros; por ejemplo: Vinieron los aquilones de noviembre, glaciales y recios; arrebataron sus hojas a los árboles, llevándolas, ya rodando por la tierra, ya volando entre nubes de grueso polvo; se guareció el rabadán en su cabaña, y el labrador en su alquería; la nieve, descendiendo espesa sobre el monte y el valle, borró los caminos, llenó los barrancos y cubrió con su triste blancura todos los matices del suelo, toda la variedad riquísima de la Naturaleza.

2.° En todo período de alguna extensión se pondrá punto y coma antes de las conjunciones adversativas mas, pero, aunque, etc.; verbigracia: Salieron los soldados a media noche y anduvieron nueve horas sin descansar; pero el fatal estado de los caminos malogró la empresa. Cuando la cláusula sea corta, bastará una simple coma antes de la conjunción; como en Vendrá, pero tarde; Lo hizo, aunque de mala gana.

3.° Siempre que a una oración sigue, precedida de conjunción, otra oración que, en orden a la idea que expresa, no tiene perfecto enlace con la anterior, hay que poner al fin de la primera punto y coma, según lo aclarará el ejemplo siguiente: Pero nada bastó para desalojar al enemigo, hasta que se abrevió el asalto por el camino que abrió la artillería; y se observó que uno solo, de tantos como fueron deshechos en este adoratorio, se rindió a la merced de los españoles (Solís, Historia de Nueva España, III, 7). Si después de la palabra artillería solo se pusiese coma, la oración y se observó, etc., vendría regida de la preposición hasta y cambiaría mucho el sentido.

Copy of portions of pp. 146-7 in Esbozo de una nueva gramática de la lengua española, Academia Española, 1973.