1-1-2011

Learning Through Standard English: Cognitive Implications for Post-Pidgin/-Creole Speakers

Ian Malcolm
Edith Cowan University

COVER SHEET

Learning Through Standard English:

Cognitive Implications for Post-Pidgin/-Creole Speakers

Ian G. Malcolm
Emeritus Professor
Edith Cowan University
2 Bradford Street
MOUNT LAWLEY
Western Australia 6019

I.Malcolm@ecu.edu.au

(Running head title: Learning Through Standard English)

Abstract

Despite their (albeit limited) access to Standard Australian English through education, Australian Indigenous communities have maintained their own dialect (Aboriginal English) for intra-group communication and are increasingly using it as a medium of cultural expression in the wider community.

Most linguists agree that the most significant early ancestor of Aboriginal English is New South Wales Pidgin, which developed in the first decades after the European occupation of Australia in 1788. Influence of present or past Aboriginal languages can be traced in Aboriginal English both directly and by way of NSW Pidgin and other contact varieties.

Recent work in Western Australia has proposed conceptual continuities with Aboriginal culture which underlie contemporary Aboriginal English grammar and discourse. What has not been done hitherto is to relate the conceptual continuities to patternings in the pidgin and creole antecedents of Aboriginal English.

This paper[1] highlights conceptual continuities across Australian pidgins, creoles[2] and Aboriginal English and suggests implications for school learning by medium of standard Australian English.

Non-Standard Dialect Speakers Learning Through Standard English

All over the English-speaking world, and even beyond it, in state-sponsored education systems, learning is offered to people by medium of standard English, with, for the most part, little regard for the learners' home language or dialect (See, e.g., Edwards 2004; Nero 2006). Thus, even initial literacy, for large numbers of citizens, is offered in a language or dialect which is foreign to them, presenting them with an initial educational hurdle which they may never effectively negotiate. All over the world, non-standard dialect speaking minorities fall behind their standard English speaking peers in school achievement but the discriminatory nature of their language and literacy education is rarely questioned. Applied linguists have been remarkably ineffectual in disseminating among parents and within the controlling bodies of school education the knowledge that all natively-spoken dialects are comparable in linguistic sophistication (See, e.g. Wolfram and Christian 1989:61) and that non-standard dialects, pidgins and creoles have been shown by empirical research to function effectively as media of education for those who speak them (See, e.g. Siegel 1997).

In this paper I want to provide a fresh look at the relationship between one non-standard variety, Australian Aboriginal English and the pidgin/creole antecedents from which it sprang, and with which it co-exists, and to see what this means for the way in which Indigenous Australians approach experience and knowledge. The data on which I draw will be research sources on Aboriginal English and Kriol, especially in Western Australia and the Northern Territory, but I think there will be much that will be applicable to other areas.

Why Do Indigenous Australians Speak English the Way They Do?

The answer to this question is usually assumed rather than thoughtfully explored in the context of education (See, e.g., Sharifian 2008). It would seem (from the way in which English language and literacy are taught and tested with respect to Indigenous people) that Australia assumes that Indigenous Australians speak English the way they do (See, e.g., Tables 2-8, below) because they do not know any better. They speak a form of English that they should gratefully relinquish once they have the benefits of education in standard English.

Yet, if standard English is so obviously superior, and if Indigenous Australians have been exposed to it (to a greater or lesser extent) for two hundred years, why have they not adopted it? It would seem that they must have stronger reasons for maintaining their own variety of English.

I want to suggest two reasons why Indigenous Australians speak the way they do:

1. because of the socio-historical factors leading to the introduction in Aboriginal speech communities of English variant features not preferred in the mainstream (this is the linguistic reason);
2. because of the conceptual factors involved in the Indigenous nativization of English by successive generations of Indigenous speakers (this is the cognitive reason).

In other words, Aboriginal English is, on the one hand, the outcome of sociolinguistic processes associated with language contact, and on the other hand it is the collective achievement of the Australian Indigenous consciousness.

The sociolinguistic processes leading to Aboriginal English have been detailed elsewhere (e.g. Malcolm 2000), so my treatment here will be brief. The contacts between Indigenous people and the Europeans who occupied Australia from 1788 did not lead to widespread second language acquisition by Indigenous people, largely because of the lack of integration between the European and Indigenous communities. Cross-cultural communication of an intermittent nature led to the development of a jargon, or a number of jargons, incorporating features from the Indigenous languages of the Sydney area and from the various forms of English current in the settler community. As Troy (1994) has documented, two contact varieties began to stabilize: one among the settler population and one among the Indigenous population. In time, as the need for a lingua franca among Indigenous groups grew, the latter variety came to be adopted more widely by Indigenous speakers and developed into New South Wales Pidgin. This drew heavily on English for its vocabulary but greatly simplified the grammar of English, as well as the pronunciation, under the influence of Indigenous substrate languages. While the contact variety enabled matters related to the settler culture to be talked about, it had a heavy semantic underpinning from Indigenous sources. This Pidgin became influential and widespread in the colonial community and, as more and more parts of Australia came to be directly or indirectly involved with the occupying forces, the Pidgin spread. In time, in some places, especially in the North, the Pidgin took over the functions of a first language for some Indigenous people and creolized (See, e.g., Harris 2007). Elsewhere, it formed the basis of the English which came to be spoken by Indigenous people in occupational and community settings. The contact varieties gave way to English in many parts of the country by processes of depidginization and decreolization. English, as it came to

be spoken by Indigenous people, would bear the marks of the distinctive contact experience of its speakers, as well as the linguistic signs of its *developmental* processes towards pidgin and creole and its *restructuring* processes back towards mainstream English (Mühlhäusler 1979).

More than this, English as spoken by Indigenous people was to represent what was selected out from the linguistic "raw material" to which Indigenous people were exposed to enable Indigenous conceptualizations to be given expression in an English-based variety. What I call "Indigenous nativization" of English occurred as a result of English being re-formed to make it more amenable to the expression of meanings generated by communities of Indigenous speakers. The intention of this paper is to explore the possible conceptual rationale for the linguistic selections and modifications made.

A Framework for Relating Linguistic Form to Cognition

If Aboriginal English is English nativized to express meanings which have been found pertinent within Aboriginal communities, we need to move beyond traditional linguistic description in describing it. We need a means of studying the linguistic variants which differentiate Aboriginal use of English from that of the mainstream so that we may be able to interpret them not only according to an alternative linguistic paradigm but according to an alternative way of structuring experience. The framework which is proposed here is that which is put forward by Gary Palmer (1996) in his theory of *cultural linguistics*. Palmer takes the view, which is shared by cognitive linguistics, that language is fundamentally a matter of "mental representation" (1996:29) and, as such, is continuous with human experience more

broadly, which is understood and responded to on the basis of mental imagery. Palmer argues that "we can examine linguistic varieties and norms of interaction as governed by sociolinguistic schemas" (1996:36). This implies that the sociolinguistic schemas which generate or fit one linguistic variety will be different from those which fit another. On this basis, we can assume that the linguistic variants which have been developed and maintained in Aboriginal English in contradistinction to mainstream Australian English are cognitively non-random. They are part of a larger conceptual whole which will be expressed in many other aspects of the life of Aboriginal people. Hymes (1996:139) demonstrated such "implicit cultural patterning" or "rhetoric of experience" with respect to oral discourse forms: Palmer implies that it applies to variants at all levels of language.

Integration versus Abstraction

Dixon (1980:23) in his volume *The Languages of Australia*, expresses support for a depiction of the Aboriginal world view by the anthropologist Mervyn Meggitt as one "that regarded man, society and nature as interlocking and interacting elements in a larger, functionally integrated totality." While recognizing the danger of stereotyping both Aboriginal and Western cultures with generalizations about world view, it is possible as a part of cross-dialectal study to use linguistic evidence to determine the extent to which the respective speech communities have moulded English to favour the expression of alternative orientations to experience. I want to suggest that, if we were to sum up the distinctiveness of the Indigenous world view, as expressed in its language and culture, in the context of a European culture, it is seen in the difference between a tendency towards integration (on the part of the Indigenous society) and a tendency towards abstraction (on the part of the European society). Wherever

mainstream English speakers use language to abstract elements from experience, Aboriginal English speakers modify the language to re-integrate them. This applies to the concepts of existence and time, of function, as opposed to substance, of attribution and analysis as opposed to wholeness and the concept of the non-spiritual as opposed to the spiritual. These alternative tendencies are shown in Table 1. In the in remainder of this paper an attempt will be made to provide evidence for the claim being made here.

INTEGRATION		ABSTRACTION
1. experience	>	existence
2. experience	>	time
3. substance	>	function
4. entity	>	attribute
5. entity	>	component
6. spirituality+temporality	>	temporality

Table 1: A representation of cultural/conceptual predispositions of Indigenous Australians as encoded in their language. Where English tends towards abstraction, Aboriginal English shows a counter-tendency towards integration.

In order to show the conceptual consistency of the changes which English has undergone through its nativization by Indigenous communities, I have selected 40 features of Aboriginal English grammar and lexico-semantics which have been reported in the literature. Out of the unknown, but considerable, number of variants to which Aboriginal speakers of English have been exposed, they have selected out, or created, these to be a part of their communal repertoire, and it can be argued that, in the majority of cases these selections have been supportive of an integrative rather

than an abstractive approach to experience. Following Mühlhäusler's terminology (2001:135), and recognizing the continuity between Aboriginal English, pidgin/creole and Aboriginal languages, we could see these features as parts of the collective cultural "memory" of the Aboriginal society. We shall look at each of the six expressions of integration in turn.

In suggesting the linguistic principles involved in the development of the Aboriginal English forms, the terminology used will assume the existence of the two continua referred to by Mühlhäusler (1979) and Romaine (1988) (and others): a developmental continuum whereby English, in contact with the Aboriginal vernaculars, is initially simplified, becoming part of a mixed jargon and eventually stabilizing into a pidgin before (in some settings) expanding into an independent system (creole); and a restructuring continuum whereby the pidgin or the creole, comes increasingly under the influence of English again. At all stages where the English system is being changed, I would argue, Aboriginal conceptualization is operating in these processes, whether directly (by way of the vernaculars) or indirectly (by way of the pidgin or creole which has developed under vernacular influence).

1.   Focus on experience rather than existence

Table 2 (below) shows twelve features of Aboriginal English which can be seen as showing a preference for the expression of more experiential or action-oriented conceptualizations of life rather than more reflection-oriented or existential conceptualizations. The table (like those that follow it) provides for each of the features a description, one or more examples from the literature on Aboriginal English, one or more corresponding examples from the literature on Australian pidgins and creoles (where relevant) and an identification of the linguistic principle

which can be observed in the processes leading to the Aboriginal English feature. (It
should be noted that references in the table to the literature are made in abbreviated
form. These abbreviations accompany the references in the reference list).

Table 2: Experience > Existence

No	Feature	Example	Source	Linguistic principle
1.	Formation of continuous aspect without 'be' (except where past tense is salient)	***they doin*** *real well* (Metal99:48) But: ***we was walkin*** *back* (see 24 below)	Pidgin/creole: *Olabat gaman* 'they come' *Olabat bin gaman* 'they came' (Sandefur 79:132)	Simplific-ation
2.	Non-use of copula 'be' to relate a subject to its complement	*they too small* (EKM82:93) *they devil dolls* (Tape 036 Kal)	Pidgin/creole: *Im bigbala* 'He is big' (Sandefur 79:166-7)	Simplific-ation
3.	Formation of existential clauses without verb	*Too many cynics in that job* (M97:69)	Pidgin/creole *Nobody iya* 'There's nobody here' (Kimberley Language Resource Centre 1996:136)	Simplific-ation. Ellipsis.
4.	Formation of existential clauses with 'get'	***E got*** *some sand there* (EKM 82:104) *Yes* ***got*** *that fresh water there* (Tape Gn1/2) ***They go***t *a big under-ground swimming pool* (Tape 036 Kal)	Creole: *I garram wan big eligeita la riba* 'There is a big alligator in the river' (Hudson 81:95)	Restructur-ing: extension of associative clause structure (H81:75-77; 95)
5.	Formation of passive without auxiliary	*They just told they can move back home* (MK97:61)	Aboriginal languages (Hudson & Richards 78:101)	Simplific-ation
6.	Formation of passive with 'get'	*One* ***got taken*** *off the market* (MK97:69) *I think it* ***got killed*** (Tape Gn1/2)	Creole *We bin git bog la riba* (Hudson 1981:108)	Creolization
7.	Numeral 'one' in place of indefinite article	They saw **one** man (KM79:422)	Creole: *Ai bin luk wanbala boniboni* 'I saw a colt' (Sandefur 79:79)	Restructuring ; maximum use of limited lexicon
8.	Lexical	*bashful way*	Creole (Sandefur 79:149	Creolization;

	compounds blending an attribute with 'way'	(M94:292) *full way* (Metal 02:50) *long way* (EKM82:84) *north way* (M02a:13) *proper way* (KK93:46) *quick way* (M94:292) *wobbly way* (Metal 02:50) *ngulu way* (M94:292)	*longwei*) *Det gardiya bin siyim langwei* 'that white man saw him from a long way off' (Kimberley Language Research Centre 1996:50).	derivation of adverb from adjective
9.	Blending of a nominal and prepositional element	*dinner out* (Metal99:45) *camping out* (KK83:82)	Aboriginal English grammaticalization	Restructuring
10.	Semantic shift: decontextualized → culturally contextualized	*sit down* 'camp' (KK93:22) *language* 'Aboriginal language' (M01:231) *country* 'traditional land' (KK93:46) *camp* 'sleep over' (KK93:39-40)	Creole *jidan* 'dwell, be' (Sandefur 1979:184) *kantri* 'one's people's country' (Koch & Koch 43:46) This shift in 'sit down' is also found in Melanesian PE (possibly from NSW PE) (Simpson 1996)	Semantic narrowing; simplification
11.	Semantic shift: kin terms expressing classificatory & reciprocal relationships	*grannies* 'grandchildren and/or grandparents' *mummy* 'mother or baby' (M01:229) *cousin brother* 'cousin with status of brother' (A96:74)	Aboriginal languages and creole *anti* 'father's sisters and other females in her subsection'; *angkul* 'mother's brothers and other males in his subsection'; *kasin-bratha* 'cross-cousin – mother's brother's son, father's sister's son and other males in the same subsection'; *kasin-sista* 'cross-cousin – mother's brother's daughter, father's sister's daughter and other females in the same subsection' (Hudson 1981:146)	Semantic broadening; restructuring.
12.	Derivation of gerunds from certain nouns	*schooling* 'going to school' (Leslie Davey, 2000) *shelling* 'collecting shells'; *cheeking* 'giving cheek' (Metal 99:45).	Aboriginal English grammaticalization	Restructuring; analogy

One of the main means which the English language provides of enabling experience to be looked at in terms of existence is the system of auxiliaries and copulas, heavily dependent on the verb to 'be'. Features 1-6 in Table 2 show where Aboriginal English has found ways of avoiding the verb to be. Hence, in the present continuous, *they doin real well* rather than 'they **are** doing well'; in the expression of subject complements, the zero copula forms *they too small* and *they devil dolls*; in the creation of existential clauses the avoidance of 'there is', either by having no subject and verb, as in *Too many cynics in that job*, or by using the verb 'get' instead of the verb 'be', as in *E got some sand there*; and in the formation of the passive a similar pattern of auxiliary avoidance, as in *They just told they can move back home*, or the substitution of 'get' for 'be', as in *One got taken off the market.* These options were brought into English by the simplification process which was part of the history of pidginization which led to Aboriginal English, and Aboriginal speakers have retained them.

Another feature derived from pidgin is the use of *one* for the definite article (feature 7). The definite article is not obligatory in Aboriginal English. We shall suggest a reason for this when we discuss feature 17. The use of *one man* instead of 'a man' obliges a focus on an instance and represents, I would suggest, an experiential rather than a generic or abstracted focus.

Features 8-12 show reflections of the experiential as opposed to existential emphasis in Aboriginal English lexis. Feature 8 is a pervasive trend, carried over from creole, to compound attributes with *way*, as in *bashful way, north way (she jumped north-way dere), quick way (e just got up quick way)*, etc., which has the effect of providing a head for the otherwise abstracted attribute, which concretizes it and relates it to

action. Often, though not always, the *–way* can be seen as adverbializing what it is attached to. Something similar is seen in feature 12, where a nominal expression like 'school' or 'shell' or 'cheek' is turned into a gerund in Aboriginal English, thus, treating it as a way of action rather than a concept abstracted from experience.

In features 9-11 we see different ways in which Aboriginal speakers have taken over concepts of English and nativized them, so that they have an Aboriginal-experience-specific meaning rather than a generic meaning. Thus, the concepts *dinner out* and *camping out* (which may also be used adjectivally, as in *a campin out spot*) instantiate culturally salient experiences of Aboriginal people. Similarly, *language* 'Aboriginal language'*, camp* 'sleep over'*, country* 'traditional lands' and *sit down* 'camp' are indexed to Aboriginal social settings. In the case of kin terms, *grannies*, *cousin-brothers* and even *mummy* do not denote the same referents as in Australian English, being part of a classificatory kin schema with implied patterns of reciprocal use which do not apply to other English users. In cases such as these, the meanings which Aboriginal people employ and respond to are experience-based, rather than abstracted and generalized. They are evidence of the "ecological embeddedness" of the English used by Aboriginal people (Mühlhäusler 2001:133).

2. Focus on experience rather than time

The English system provides for time to be abstracted from the experience of which it is a part. This is done both in the verb morphology (e.g. stay/stayed) and in the way in which the lexicon allows for segmented units of time, such as hours, days and years to reified and talked about in isolation. Aboriginal English operates differently. Some evidence of this is seen in Table 3 (below).

Table 3   Experience > Time

No.	Feature	Example	Source	Linguistic principle
13.	Lack of obligatory marking of past tense	*Mummy got wild and she* **burn** *it up* (EKM82:91)	Pidgin/creole: *Longtaim wen ai bin lidil, ai siyim sneik ai gedam ston, en ai tjakam langa det sneik.* 'A long time ago, when I was a child, if I saw a snake, I used to get a stone and throw it at the snake.' (Hudson 81:29).	Simplification; reduced redundancy
14.	Reduced use of auxiliary 'have' to form perfect aspect	**You never done** *any further study since* (MK97:68) **They got** *a big driveway* (Tape 036 Kal)	Non-standard varieties of English (Wolfram & Christian 1989:38)	Simplification (though also restructuring): analogy of perfect with simple past
15.	Lexical compounds blending an attribute or happening with 'time'	*all time* (KM79:428) *dark time* (KM79:428) *late time* (KM 79:428) *long time* (EKM82:84) *olden time* (KK93:113) *one time* (Metal 02:50)*morning time* (KK93:127) *dinner time* (KK93:100) *afternoon time* (KK93:99) *night time* (KK93:127) *supper time* (C95:56)	Creole *dinadaim* 'noon' (Sandefur 79:168) *sabadaim* 'tea time' (Sandefur 79:155) *longtaim* 'a long time ago' *somokodaim* 'ten o'clock' (Sandefur 79:153,4)	Creolization; nominalization of time points/ periods as events

For speakers of Aboriginal English, the time of an event can be marked in the verb

and thereafter assumed, rather than marked afresh every time a verb occurs (Feature

13). This is a simplification feature taken over from pidgin/creole and retained, and it

fits a view of life in which, in the light of the *dreaming*, there is a spiral integration of

past, present and future time rather than a linear progression which sees these categories as largely independent of one another (See Malcolm et al 1999:28).

Just as Aboriginal English speakers dispense with the auxiliary 'be', they do the same with the auxiliary 'have', thereby following the pattern of many non-standard English dialects (Wolfram and Christian 1989:38) to employ past participles in the same way as past tense verbs. This means that Aboriginal English does not show the concern of standard English to use perfect aspect, whereby a point of time, either past or present, is used to give a perspective to an action (Feature 14). Again, there seems to be a less segmented and more integrated view of time.

Rather than treating time in the abstract, Aboriginal English ties it to experience through a system of lexical compounding. Feature 15 on Table 3 shows something of the range of terms which may be followed by *time*. In some cases where this is done, the abstract attribute such as 'dark' or 'late' or 'long' is given a head to enable it to be concretized in experience. In other cases, the 'time' compounds show how in Aboriginal experience, events like 'dinner', 'supper', or 'morning' may be turned into experiential time markers.

3. Focus on substance rather than function

Dixon (1980:102) has pointed out that in many Aboriginal languages "a single lexeme [may be used] to refer to both some cultural object and also to the natural source from which it is obtained." There is some reflection of this in the Kriol term *sengran*, which refers to the ground (*gran*) in terms of the sand (*sen*) of which it is composed. In Aboriginal English (as shown in Table 4) a small set of lexemes function this way.

15

Table 4   Substance > Function

No	Feature	Example	Source	Linguistic principle
16.	Semantic shift: identification of object by its material of composition	*calico* 'tent' (A96) *bamboo* 'didgeridoo' (A96) *video-cassette* 'movie (recorded on video)' (Metal 02:64)	Creole *sengran* 'sand' (Sharpe and Sandefur 1977:60) Also Aboriginal language: "use of a single lexeme to refer to both some cultural object and also to the natural source from which it is obtained" (Dixon 1980:102.	Semantic transfer

As shown above, a didgeridoo can be called a *bamboo* and a tent a *calico.* A more recent usage is the reference to a movie recorded on video cassette as a *video-cassette.* Somewhat similar is the tendency in Aboriginal English to identify an animal with the meat it provides (Arthur 1996:7). Thus, for example, the term *kangaroo* evokes a "hunting and eating" schema among Aboriginal speakers, whereas it is not identified with food by non-Aboriginal English speakers (Malcolm et al 1999:36).

These usages may be interpreted as consistent with the Aboriginal avoidance of abstraction (in this case, abstraction of use or function) and the preference for the term which refers to the material composition of the object concerned.

4. Focus on the entity rather than the attribute

Features 17-22 are concerned with the ways in which Aboriginal English deals with attributive expressions. It will be seen that the speakers of Aboriginal English are not comfortable with the isolation of attributes from the entity to which they belong and find ways of avoiding the English structures which would do this.

Table 5 Entity > Attribute

No	Feature	Example	Source	Linguistic

.				principle
17.	Lack of obligatory articles before nouns	*We all went **to funeral*** (KM79:422)	Aboriginal languages (Dixon 1980:272) → creole	Pidginization
18.	Postclausal modification or 'afterthought'	*We get five sheeps **fat one***. (KM79:423)	Creole *tray-im langa natha-wan wota o:: lilbit shela-wan* 'tried a different route where the water was shallower' (Hudson 1981:194)	Creolization
19.	Embedded observation	*I saw him was running behind me* (M02b:7)	Creole *Mela bin see-im imyu bin breikat* 'We saw an emu started to run' (Hudson 81:181)	Creolization
20.	Lexical compounds blending an attribute with 'one'	*close-up one* (KM79:423) *juicy one* (M79:102) *nice one* (KK93:58) *smoky one* (KM79:423) *white one* (KM79:422)	Creole *jet waitwan rok* (Sandefur 79:170) *blekwan* (Sandefur 79:107) *greiwan* (Sandefur 79:107) *longwan* (Sandefur 79:104) *kukwan* 'ripe' (Sandefur 79:104)	Creolization; restructuring. Common to NSWPE and Melanesian PE (Simpson 1996) (not used attributively in Aboriginal English)
21.	Lexical compounds blending an attribute or personal pronoun with 'fella'	*blackfella* (M82:127) *oldfella* (KK93:18) *somefella* (KK93:120) *Yamatji fella* (Tape CM) *whitefella* (KM79:427) *themfella (s)* (MK97:70) *youfella (s)*	Creole *im hotbala* 'it is hot' (Sandefur 79:174) *bigbala* (Sandefur 79:166) *drongbala* 'strong' (Sharpe & Sandefur 77:59) *gudbala* (Sandefur 79:123) *fobala lilwan dog* 'four little dogs' (Sandefur 79:105) *yundubala* 'you(r) two' (Sandefur 79:88)	Creolization; restructuring (in Aboriginal English, the –fella suffix is limited to pronouns and persons)
22.	Lexical compounds blending an attribute with 'head'	*man head* *woman head* (M02a:13) 'a precocious boy or girl'	Aboriginal English neologism	Metonymy

Like Kriol, as we mentioned in discussing Feature 7, Aboriginal English reduces the

obligation to precede nouns with articles. A noun does not have to be qualified as

definite or indefinite, so that it is acceptable to make utterances like *We all went to funeral* (Feature 17). The funeral, as an entity, seems to be the focus, rather than its attributes of definiteness or indefiniteness.

In the case of Features 20-21, we can see the way in which Aboriginal English, following a strong tendency in Kriol, creates compounds which anchor attributes to an entity. Thus, attributions like juicy, smoky, white, etc are turned into entities, *juicy one, smoky one, white one,* and by a similar process, personal attributes have *fella* attached, as in *blackfella, oldfella, whitefella* and so on. And this morphological process is applied also to the pronoun system where, even in areas where creoles have possibly never been spoken, there are remnants of the creole pronominal system in *themfella(s)* and *youfella(s).* Within Aboriginal English (as distinct from creole), this kind of compounding continues (Feature 22) with such neologisms as *man head* and *woman head*, which are current at least in the Nyungar community (south-west Australia) as references to children who are characterized as mature or precocious.

There are also more subtle influences on the syntax, as seen in Features 18 and 19, both of which are clear carry-overs from creole. The kind of post-clausal modification shown in *We get five sheeps fat one* shows a tendency to give priority to the entity which is being referred to and to defer the listing of any more than one attribute to the end of the clause. The desire to give separate attention to the entity and to the attributes is also seen in structures like *I saw him was running behind me*. This is a blend of 'I saw him' and 'He was running behind me', but it does not use the standard English method of embedding. In calling this "embedded observation", I emphasize the fact that the structure only occurs when the first verb depicts the observation from

the point of view of the person who made it, then the second verb is concerned with

the nature of the observation. It is a syntactically different way of achieving the same

kind of effect as that of post-clausal modification. The reason for the more separate

reporting of the observer and the observation may be found, as I would see it, in the

enduring influence of patterns of behaviour developed by past generations who have

survived on their hunting and gathering skills where not only the source of the

observation but its nature, need to be specified in detail.

5. Focus on the entity rather than its components

Standard English continually reinforces through its morphology the idea of the

segmentation of one member (marked in the noun, pronoun or verb as "singular")

from the larger group of which it could be seen to be a component part (marked as

"plural"). This goes against the Aboriginal emphasis on the integrity of the whole, and

hence Aboriginal English, in line with creole and many non-standard Englishes,

significantly alters the operation of this dualism as shown in Table 6.

Table 6   Entity > Component

No	Feature	Example	Source	Linguistic principle
23.	Lack of differentiation of 3rd person singular in simple present tense	*My sister **reckon I** was born in Narrogin* (KM79:425)	Pidgin/creole and/or interlanguage (Mühlhäusler and Rose 1996:209) Also non-standard varieties of English (Hughes & Trudgill 1979:16-17).	Simplification or Regularization
24.	Lack of concord of singular/plural subject with verb	*They **was** comin to Wagin* (MK97:68)	Non-standard varieties of English (Hughes & Trudgill 79: 56)	Regularization
25.	Lack of obligatory plural marking on noun	*How many **year** he got to go?* (MK97:70)	Aboriginal languages → creole (Sandefur 1979:78) Also occurs after numerals in non-standard varieties of English (Hughes & Trudgill	Pidginization, reduced redundancy (parsimony)

			79:19)	
26.	Distinction between singular and plural second person	*you* singular *youse* plural (M2000:139)	Irish English (Harris 93:146)	Regularization
27.	Distinction between dual and plural second person	*youtwofella* (K2000:41) *youfella* (pl) (M79:121) *mother-gether* 'mother and child' ; *brother-gether* 'elder brother & younger brother or sister' , etc. (K2000:44)	Creole: *yundupala* 'you two' *yupala* 'you' (pl) (Hudson 81:45) and (in the case of –*gether*) Kaytyetye language.	Creolization
28.	Distinction between inclusive and exclusive pronouns	*me'n'you* inclusive dual *we* exclusive dual (K2000:41)	Creole: *minyu* 'we two' *mindupala* 'I and another (not you' *mela* 'we but not you' (H81:45)	Creolization; restructuring
29.	Extension of use of adverbial particle 'up'	*share things up; pet someone up; rear someone up* (M02a:16) *borrow up* (KK93:64) *roast up* (Michelle Webb, interviewed on SBS television)	Creole (adverbial suffix) (Sandefur 79:118) Verbal suffix (Hudson 1981:38) *widimap lon* 'weed the lawn' (Kimberley Language Research Centre 1996:72)	Creolization; restructuring by analogy with AusE forms like "eat up"
30.	Serial verbs	*the wind blow me knock me over* (KM79:414)	Creole *Da bot I kam anka ya* 'The boat came and anchored here.' (Shnukal 88:81)	Pidginization
31.	Invariant question tags	*they fight, unna?* (Tape Mu 1/2) *we would play basketball unna...* (Metal99:57)	Creole (Sharpe & Sandefur 77:57) Aboriginal language, Walmatjari (Hudson & Richards 78:93) Possible influence from non-standard varieties of English.	Simplification. Also transfer from Aboriginal language.
32.	Lexical compounds blending two nouns of which	*bush tucker* (KK93:87) *cattle snake* 'snake with	Creole *dilib* 'tea' ; *bujiged* 'cat' (Sharpe & Sandefur 1977:54)	Creolization; modification by juxtaposition

	the first is the attribute or classifier	markings like cattle' (M02a:13) *eye glass* (EKM82:98) *finger ring* (EKM82:98) *firesmoke* (M02a:13) *foot track* (EKM82:98) *nannygoat* (KK93:89)	*aiglaj* 'spectacles' (Hudson 1981:153).	(c.f. possessive *yu gabarra* 'your head' (S79:89).
		waterflood (KK93:64) *cattle cow* (A68) *paper wrapping* (EKM82:98)	Aboriginal language: generic classifiers may accompany nouns (Dixon 1980:272)	Transfer
33.	Semantic shift: excess → extent	*A brainiest kid* 'a very brainy kid' (EKM82:88) *him bin waiting a bit too long* 'he was waiting a long time' (KK93:39)	Creole: *Imin gijim bigiswan bijibiji* 'He caught a very big fish' (S79:102) *Bob Morrow…det dugud tu mi* 'Bob Morrow was really good to me' (Kimberley Language Resource Centre 1996:137) Similar shift in other post-colonial Englishes (e.g. Sranan) and Pacific languages, e.g. *tumas*, from Tok Pisin (Arthur 96:220)	Intensification

The reduction of the singularity/plurality divide is seen in the regularization of the present tense verb paradigm (Feature 23), as in *My sister reckon I was born in Narrogin*, where the grammatical distinction between third person singular subjects (which require *–s*) and any other subject is eliminated. Similarly, (Feature 24) the past tense of the verb 'to be', where it occurs, is regularized, as in *They was comin to Wagin,* so that there is no distinction between a singular form 'was' and a plural form 'were'. Effectively, the singular is no longer given special treatment.

In parallel with this is the treatment of noun plurals. Aboriginal languages and creole do not inflect the noun for plural. In Aboriginal English the strict requirement to mark the singular/plural distinction in noun morphology is relaxed, allowing for such structures as *How many year he got to go?* Again, the salience of the singular-plural division is downplayed in Aboriginal English. The kind of redundant plural marking which standard English requires is avoided.

What is most important of all in Aboriginal society is that the individual is seen as integral to the social group. It is not surprising, then, that the system of personal pronouns in standard English is modified in Aboriginal English to reduce the singular/plural dichotomy. This is shown in Features 26-28. Although Aboriginal English in most places (perhaps Central Australia is an exception: Koch 2000) does not preserve the complex pronoun systems of creole, which, in their turn, reflect counterparts in Aboriginal languages, Aboriginal English does modify the standard English system in small but significant ways. Feature 26 represents the addition of a plural alternative form of "you", *youse*, a variant probably borrowed into non-standard Australian English from Irish English. Feature 27 shows another way in which the singular/plural division is broken down in some Aboriginal English varieties: by introducing an intermediate number found in Aboriginal languages and creole: dual, expressed in forms like *youtwofella*. A further refinement is shown in Feature 28: the distinction between an inclusive form, such as *me'n'you* and the form *we*, which is used to exclude the listener. All of these changes favour the expression of meanings in which group membership is made more salient and the abstraction of the individual from the group less salient.

The use of the particle *up* after a verb (Feature 29) is more pervasive in Aboriginal English than in Australian English. In both dialects it often carries the sense of completeness. However in Aboriginal English there may also be a strong additional sense of group reference, especially in such expressions as *borrow up, share up* and *rear up*. The invariant question tag *unna,* and its many allomorphs (Feature 31), enables group feedback to be elicited quickly and easily, by contrast with the various analytically-derived tags in standard English (*isn't he, do you, could they...*etc.).

The reluctance to single out individual cases is further reflected in Feature 33. The superlative loses its sense of unique reference in Aboriginal English. More than one kid can be *brainiest*, because this simply means 'very brainy.' In parallel with this, expressions of excess, like *too much* are used to denote extent, i.e., 'very much'.

Feature 32 relates to lexical compounds. This feature of Aboriginal English which has its parallels in Aboriginal languages and creoles, brings together two nouns, of which the first is either an attribute or a classifier, as in *bush tucker, eye glass* 'spectacles', *finger ring, foot track.* The use of such terms often seems to relate an instance to a class, thus supporting the urge towards integration rather than abstraction. This is especially apparent in cases such as *waterflood, cattle cow* and *paper wrapping.*

6. Focus on the spiritual, not just the temporal

Finally, a set of commonly used terms are used by Aboriginal English speakers to refer to the spiritual and traditional cultural realm although they may also be able to be used to refer to the temporal entities they evoke for non-Aboriginal speakers. Some of these terms are shown in Table 7.

Table 7   Spiritual/temporal > Temporal

No	Feature	Example	Source	Linguistic principle
34.	Semantic shift: temporal → spiritual	*clever* 'spiritually powerful' (A96:21) *law* 'religious & cultural knowledge' (A96:39) *man* 'initiated man' (A96:46) *cut* 'circumcise' (A96:184) *dangerous* 'hazardous because of possible effect of spiritual powers' (A96) *smoke* 'put in smoke as cure or protection' (G. Collard)	Aboriginal languages; possibly direct translations (calques). Creole *jmokam* 'put into smoke as a cure or for protection' (Hudson 1981:152).	Semantic broadening

The use of vocabulary such as this summons up for the Aboriginal speaker schemas which are not accessed by people who do not share their cultural inheritance. The immanence of the sacred/cultural domain is, for many Aboriginal people a matter of reality which is difficult to convey to non-Aboriginal listeners, and often the meanings when some of this vocabulary is used are kept implicit, in the knowledge that those who share the culture will get the full meaning.

Other Cases

Although the integration/abstraction tension is, in my view, extremely pervasive and provides the main basis for the understanding of the conceptual distinctiveness of Aboriginal English, it does not explain everything. The cognitive significance of six of the forty features considered in this study, shown in Table 8 is still undetermined.

Table 8   Some Cases Not Yet Accounted For

No	Feature	Example	Source	Linguistic principle

35.	Demonstrat-ives in place of definite articles	*An **that** rain e bin fall down* (KM79:422)	Aboriginal languages (Hudson & Richards 1978:103) → creole *Det stik bin pein-im mi* 'The splinter is causing me pain' (Hudson 1981:56).	Stronger deictic reference
36.	Optional use of pre-verbal past tense marker	*I **bin** run* (KM79:415) *I **been** called up twice* (MK97:67)	Creole *Olabat bin gaman* 'They came/were coming' (Sandefur 79:128)	Creolization; restructuring
37.	Optional use of pre-verbal future tense marker	*We **gonna** make one down the river* (Tape ECM3) *An mela new teacher **gotta** come* (EKM82:91 (FX))	Creole *Olabat gona gaman* 'They will/want to/intend to/plan to come; *Olabat gada gaman* 'They want to/intend to come' (Sandefur 79:129)	Creolization; analogy with past marking.
38.	Pronoun apposition	*This old woman **he** started packing up* (KM79:422)	Creole (Sharpe & Sandefur 77:58) Also non-standard varieties of English (Hughes and Trudgill 1979:20)	Creolization; restructuring
39.	Reduplication (with respect to fauna)	*kiddie kiddie* 'little goats' (KK93:59) *bullocky bullocky* 'cattle' (KM79:425)	Creole *dakdak* 'duck(s)' (Sandefur 79:106) *papap* 'puppy'; *jukjuk* 'domestic fowl' (Hudson 81:153). Aboriginal language, Ngaanyatatjara, *piggypiggypula* 'two pigs' (Eagleson, Kaldor and Malcolm 1982:234-5)	Aboriginal language → creolization: reduplication
40.	Reanalysed possessive and reflexive pronouns	*Hees team came last in the race* (Mullewa Tape 1) *theirselves* (M2000:139)	Analogical change within Aboriginal English. Creole: Reflexive suffix –*jelp* (Hudson 81:121).	Restructuring, analogy

In some cases, (e.g. Features 36, 37) the features listed here may represent cases

where there is cognitive agreement between Aboriginal English speakers and

mainstream English speakers, and the different linguistic forms are simply structural

alternatives. In other cases there is structural, but not necessarily conceptual, influence

from creole (e.g. Feature 39) or non-standard Australian English (e.g. Feature 38). Feature 40 simply represents a regularization of pronominal forms on the basis of intra-lingual analogy. Feature 35 may be best accounted for on the basis of its discourse function, which, conceptually, has been described by Sharifian (2001) as *schema-based referencing*.

Notwithstanding these unresolved cases, I think the overall evidence is clear that Aboriginal English is a different linguistic system from Australian English at least partly because it is generated by a different conceptual system.

Cognitive Implications for Indigenous People of Learning Through Standard English

We began by considering the implications of the fact that most speakers of post-pidgin/-creole varieties of English, like Aboriginal English, have education delivered to them in standard English and are subjected to educational evaluation in standard English and I would like to return to that now. If what I have attempted to argue in this paper is correct, Aboriginal English encodes pervasive assumptions about reality and how it is rightly understood which conflict at many points with the corresponding assumptions which are supported by the standard English of the school system. What might be expected to happen when Indigenous learners are placed in learning situations where standard English is the only medium of communication?

Having come from a context where experience is approached as an integrated totality, where language serves the activity of living, rather than the analysis of its elements, where one's way of talking is indexed throughout its lexico-grammatical system to a

communal past history and shared cultural assumptions as well as to an ongoing social network, how will one survive if all this is not recognized?

Many Indigenous students go through the motions at school, partly understanding the language of instruction, but not fully committing themselves to it, since they know the real meanings of their life cannot be expressed in it. The mental representations of standard English have no prior framework to build on. Their capacity for coming to integrated learning about their life experience is not tapped, or given the opportunity for expression.

Craving something that relates to experience as they know it, Indigenous students are expected to adjust to talking in terms of abstracted existence and time. They are confronted with language which too quickly focuses on attributes and components, losing sight of the entities to which they belong. Even the language they think they know seems in the speech of others who do not share their dialect to have hidden meanings which they cannot appropriately respond to.

Aboriginal English is at the core of the conceptualization of those who speak it. It is inconceivable that it should be left out of consideration when Indigenous children are being initiated into schooling and literacy. To begin to do justice to the needs of children who come to school speaking Aboriginal English, I would suggest that education systems need to make five fundamental commitments:

1. to ensure that all teachers of Indigenous Australian children are aware of the conceptual predispositions of Aboriginal English speakers and how they are reflected in Aboriginal English;

2. to ensure that all teachers of Indigenous Australian children are aware of the conceptual and linguistic hurdles that standard English poses to Aboriginal English speakers;

3. to ensure that all teachers of Indigenous children are helped to develop teaching and learning approaches that exploit integrative rather than analytic approaches to experience (See further Malcolm 2002a, 2002b; Malcolm et al 1999);

4. to ensure that Indigenous children in all schools are free to use Aboriginal English, if they wish, as a tool for learning (See, e.g., Cahill 1999);

5. to ensure that bidialectal Indigenous children's language and learning are assessed in a way which takes due account of their two dialects and their conceptual implications.

Conclusion

This paper has attempted to demonstrate, by reference to widespread varieties of Australian Aboriginal English and associated creoles that, where Indigenous students use a distinctive variety of English, they are using not only a linguistic but a conceptual tool, which is a product of the Indigenous experience within the context of which it has evolved. Because of its relatively recent history of development by Indigenous language speakers by way of pidgin and creole varieties it is possible to trace the way in which this variety of English has emerged in a form which favours some ways of expressing experience over others for which other varieties of English, and, in particular, standard English, have developed. As such, Aboriginal English

may be compared with other post-pidgin/creole varieties which are conceptually adapted to the needs of their speakers in other parts of the world.

There is no intention here to minimise the educational impact of factors other than linguistic on the educational success of Indigenous students. Not all Indigenous students speak Aboriginal English (though, in communicating with one another, a majority do), and there are many social and psychological factors entailed in Indigenous students' school performance. However, the way in which the students' dialect is treated is one factor which is capable of immediate attention, and if reform in this area is possible it should be carried out without delay.

If standard English is treated not only as the end-point of language education but also as its unique medium, both teachers and Indigenous pupils will continue to suffer miscommunication and the educational goal will remain, for many students, unattainable. If, on the other hand, Aboriginal English and its associated conceptual framework are able to be accessed as a part of education towards standard English competency students will be more willing learners and their educational goals more generally achievable.

Notes:

1. This paper represents a development of material presented initially to the 28th Annual Conference of the Applied Linguistics Association of Australia, Southbank Campus, Griffith University, Brisbane, 12th-14th July 2003.
   The ideas expressed here have emerged in the course of ongoing research in teams of Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal researchers. The input of many Aboriginal informants and of my colleagues is gratefully acknowledged, although they have no responsibility for the interpretations presented here.

2. Australia has two main varieties of creole: Kriol, spoken mainly in the Northern Territory and Western Australia, and Torres Strait Creole, spoken in the Torres Strait Islands and parts of Cape York. Data on which this paper is based come mainly from Kriol.

References:

Alexander, D. H. (1968). *Woorabinda Aboriginal Australian English*. M.A. thesis. St Lucia: University of Queensland (A68)

Arthur, J. (1996). *Aboriginal English: A Cultural Study*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press. (A96)

Cahill, R. (1999). *Solid English*. East Perth: Education Department of Western Australia.

Capell, A. (1962). Some linguistic types in Australia [Handbook of Australian Languages, Part 2]. *Oceania Linguistic Monographs* 7. Sydney: University of Sydney.

Crugnale, J. (Ed.) (1995). *Footprints Across our Land: Short Stories by Senior Western Desert Women*. Broome: Magabala Books (C95)

Dixon, R.M.W. (1980). *The Languages of Australia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Eagleson, R. D., Kaldor, S. and Malcolm, I. G. 1982. *English and the Aboriginal Child*. Canberra: Curriculum Development Centre. (EKM82)

Edwards, V. (2004). *Multilingualism in the English-speaking world.* Oxford: Blackwell, (Chapter 6).

Haig, Y.G. (1997). Towards More User Friendly Education for Speakers of Aboriginal English (training materials) (typescript) (H97)

Harkins, J.. (1994). *Bridging Two Worlds: Aboriginal English and Cross-Cultural Understanding*. St Lucia: University of Queensland Press.

Harris, J. (1993). The grammar of Irish English. In J. Milroy and L. Milroy (Eds.) *Real English: the grammar of English dialects in the British Isles* (pp. 139-186). London: Longman.

Harris, J. (2007). Linguistic responses to contact: Pidgins and creoles. In G. Leitner and I. G. Malcolm (Eds.), *The habitat of Australia's Aboriginal languages: Past, present and future* (pp. 131-151). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Hudson, J, (1981). *Grammatical and Semantic Aspects of Fitzroy Valley Kriol*. M.A. thesis, University of Western Australia. (H81)

Hudson, J. and Richards, E. (1978). The Walmatjari: an introduction to the language and culture. *Work Papers of SIL-AAB Series B Volume 1*. Darwin: Summer Institute of Linguistics, Australian Aborigines Branch. (HR78)

Hughes, A. and Trudgill, P. (1979). *English Accents and Dialects: An Introduction to Social and Regional Varieties of British English*. London: Edward Arnold.

Hymes, D.. (1996). *Ethnography, Linguistics: Narrative Inequality: Towards an Understanding of Voice*. London: Taylor and Francis.

Kimberley Language Resource Centre. (1996). *Moola Bulla: In the Shadow of the Mountain*. Broome: Magabala Books. (KLRC96)

Koch, H. (2000). Central Australian Aboriginal English: in comparison with the morphosyntactic categories of Kaytetye. *Asian Englishes* 3, 2:32-58.

Koch, G. and Koch, H. (1993). *Kaytetye Country: An Aboriginal History of the Barrow Creek Area*. Alice Springs: Institute for Aboriginal Development. (KK93)

Malcolm, I. G. (1979). *Classroom Communication and the Aboriginal Child: A Sociolinguistic Investigation in Western Australian Classrooms*. PhD thesis, University of Western Australia. (M79)

Malcolm, I. G. (1982). Speech events of the Aboriginal classroom. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*. 36:115-134. (M82)

Malcolm, I. G. (2000). Aboriginal English: from contact variety to social dialect. In J. Siegel (Ed.) *Processes of Language Contact: Studies from Australia and the South Pacific*, 123-144. Montreal: Fides.

Malcolm, I. G. (2001). Two way English and the bicultural experience. In B. Moore (Ed.) *Who's Centric Now? The Present State of Post-Colonial Englishes*, 219-240. Melbourne: Oxford University Press. (M01)

Malcolm, I. G. (2002a) Aboriginal English: What You Gotta Know. *Literacy Learning in the Middle Years* 10 (1):9-27. (M02a)

Malcolm, I. G. (2002b) Aboriginal English: A case for the recognition of prior learning. Paper presented to the National Conference of the Australian Council of TESOL Associations and ESL Educators (SA). Glenelg, 10th-22nd January. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 469 390). (M02b)

Malcolm, I. G., Haig, Y., Königsberg, P., Rochecouste, J., Collard, G., Hill, A. and Cahill, R. (1999). *Two Way English*. East Perth: Education Department of W.A. (Metal99)

Malcolm, I. G., Königsberg, P., Collard, G., Hill, A., Grote, E., Sharifian, F., Kickett, A. and Sahanna, E. (2002) *Umob Deadly: Recognized and Unrecognized Literacy Skills of Aboriginal Youth*. Mount Lawley: Centre for Applied Language and Literacy Research and Institute for the Service Professions, Edith Cowan University. (Metal02)

Malcolm, I. G. and Koscielecki, M. M. (1997). *Aboriginality and English*. Mount Lawley: Centre for Applied Language Research, Edith Cowan University. (MK97)

Mühlhäusler, P. (1979). *Growth and Structure of the Lexicon of New Guinea Pidgin.* Pacific Linguistic Series C-52. Canberra: Australian National University.

Mühlhäusler, P. (2001). Ecolinguistics, linguistic diversity, ecological diversity. In L. Maffi (Ed.) *On Biocultural Diversity: Linking Language, Knowledge, and the Environment,* 133-144. Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Mühlhäusler, P. and Rose, D. (1996). The linguistic ecology of Anangu Pitjantjatjara communities. In Clayton, J. (Ed.) *Desert Schools Volume 2: Research Report*, 179-213. Canberra: Department of Employment, Education, Training and Youth Affairs.

Nero, S. J. (Ed.) (2006). *Dialects, Englishes, creoles and education.* Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Palmer, G. (1996). *Toward a Theory of Cultural Linguistics*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Romaine, S. (1988). *Pidgin and Creole Languages*. London: Longman.

Sandefur, J. R. (1979). An Australian Creole in the Northern Territory: a description of Ngukurr-Bamyili dialects (part 1). *Work Papers of SIL-AAB Series B, Volume 3*. Darwin: Summer Institute of Linguistics, Australian Aborigines Branch. (S79)

Sandefur, J. R. (1991). The problem of the transparency of Kriol. In I. G. Malcolm (Ed.) *Linguistics in the Service of Society: Essays to Honour Susan Kaldor*,115-129. Perth: Institute of Applied Language Studies, Edith Cowan University.

Sharifian, F. (2001). Schema-based processing in Australian speakers of Aboriginal English. *Journal of Language and Intercultural Communication*. 1(2),120-134.

Sharifian, F. (2008), Aboriginal English in the classroom: an asset or a liability? *Language Awareness*, 17(2), 131-138.

Sharpe, M. C. and Sandefur, J. (1977). A brief description of Roper Creole. In E. Brumby and E. Vaszolyi (Eds.) *Language Problems and Aboriginal Education*, 51-60. Mount Lawley: Aboriginal Teacher Education Program, Mount Lawley College of Advanced Education. (SS77)

Shnukal, A. (1988). *Broken: An Introduction to the Creole Language of Torres Strait*. Canberra: Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, Australian National University. (Shn88)

Siegel, J. (1997). Using a pidgin language in formal education: help or hindrance? *Applied Linguistics* 18 (1), 86-100.

Simpson, J. (1996). Early language contact varieties in South Australia. *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 16:169-207.

Troy, J. (1994). *Melaleuka: A history and description of New South Wales Pidgin.* Ph.D. thesis, Australian National University, Canberra.

Wolfram, W. and Christian, D. (1989). *Dialects and Education: Issues and Answers*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall Regents.