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Studies of Chicano English have been concentrated almost entirely in the southwestern United States, where a long-established Hispanic culture, the viable presence of the Spanish language, and closeness to the Mexican border appear to sustain a variety of English closely identified with Hispanic ancestry. But little is known about Chicano English in the American Midwest, which also maintains a large Hispanic population. Although among the 50 states Illinois and Michigan rank third and seventh, respectively, in the number of Hispanic residents, only two studies so far (Hartford 1975, 1978) have examined Chicano English in the Midwestern United States.

The Hispanic population in Sterling and Rock Falls, Illinois—twin cities separated by the Rock River—numbered about 3,000 in 1990, a little more than 10% of the twin cities' total population of about 26,000. This community is almost entirely of Mexican birth or ancestry and has a history going back to the end of World War I, when the local steel mill experienced a labor shortage and recruited Mexican workers. Because the mill wages were, until recently, relatively generous, the Mexican immigrants were able to achieve middle- or upper-working-class socioeconomic status. By 1970 the average wage for Mexican adult males was $7,510, very close to the overall city average of $8,043. Unemployment among Mexican male adults was at a low 1.4%. (Eventually, the mill was crippled by the economic instability of the late eighties, and poverty began to increase among the Mexican community, especially among new arrivals. The interviews conducted for this investigation were taped before the effects of these changes began to be felt.)

Until the 1960s, this community was somewhat isolated from the Anglo majority by de facto residential segregation and by taboos against dating and intermarriage across ethnic lines; interaction with the Anglos (more often referred to as "whites" by the subjects of this study) was probably less frequent among women than men, who formed interethnic friendships with other workers at the steel mill. Three of the four men in this study also were veterans of military service; two of them had been active in politics, and one is active in the Roman Catholic Church, which includes not only ethnic Mexicans but also Germans, Italians, and Irish. The generation that grew up in the past few decades did not experience as much isolation. Ethnic boundaries finally weakened, intermarriage became more common, and Mexican Americans began to buy homes outside their traditional neighborhoods.

The use of Spanish in this community seems to be in decline. During the 1950s, one local movie theater ran Spanish films one night a week. Although St. Mary's church still conducts one mass per week in Spanish, Spanish does not appear to be maintained by the children of immigrants. By 1990 census tables indicated that slightly less than half of the Mexican population spoke any Spanish, and only about one person in seven could be considered Spanish-dominant. Presumably this minority of Spanish-dominant speakers was among the immigrant group which made up 35% of this Hispanic community. According to the 1990 census, of the 2,155 Sterling residents of Mexican origin, 361 were born in Mexico and 410 were born out of state, mostly in Texas (similar figures for Rock Falls were not available).

A major issue in the debate over Chicano English involves the presence of Spanish: is Chicano English a "norm" (Wald 1984, 20)—a legitimate dialect which can exist independent of Spanish use—or is it simply "interference English," which will occur only in communities where Spanish is spoken, and only in the speech of bilingual, and especially Spanish-dominant, speakers? To answer this question, we need to examine the English of Hispanic communities where Spanish is not normally a first or dominant language. So far, this has not been done: "the majority of studies to date [1984] have chosen as their focus the English of Chicanos whose first language was Spanish" (Gonzalez 1984, 33). Because few studies of Chicano English have appeared during the decade since Gonzalez's article, his complaint is still valid (see Galindo 1993 for a more recent review of the literature).

Sterling/Rock Falls, however, is a good place to begin, since only about half its Hispanic population knows any Spanish and only about 15% of that population is likely to be Spanish-dominant.

This particular population invites the testing of several hypotheses. First, it might be assumed that if Chicano English is indeed simply "interference" English, as Sawyer (1957) and some other early scholars claimed, its presence would be less in evidence in this community, where Spanish language influence would not be comparable to that of the Southwest. A corollary to this hypothesis might be that English monolinguals in Sterling/Rock Falls speak an English variety no different from that of the Anglo majority. An additional hypothesis might be that, given this community's size, its dis-
tance from the Rio Grande, and its comparatively weaker Spanish presence, any variety of Chicano English which does emerge in Sterling/Rock Falls will differ from those found in the Southwest.

This paper examines evidence that the Anglo and Hispanic populations of Sterling/Rock Falls do, in fact, have different varieties of English. It identifies the Chicano English features that differentiate the Hispanics from the Anglos. An examination of the social characteristics of the sample population, moreover, will allow determination of whether the Chicano English found here is a viable English dialect or simply a temporary kind of interference English that will not appear in the speech of monolinguals.

Sample and Methodology

To sample the speech of this particular community, I examined the oral history interviews of 11 Mexican-American residents recorded in 1986 and 1987 (all were born in the community except Alex [Kansas City], Cecilia [central Illinois], Eva [Colorado Springs], and Margie [Texas]; all spent their youth in Sterling/Rock Falls). Interviews were conducted by a middle-class, female, Anglo resident of Sterling, whom I hired for the specific purpose of collecting oral histories (three of the interviews of young whites [see below] were conducted by students of mine; in all cases the same format was used). Each interview includes about 40 minutes of free conversation, prompted occasionally by questions from an interviewer concerning community history and the interviewee’s childhood. In addition to the interviews of Mexican-American residents, another 16 interviews were conducted in Sterling/Rock Falls with the white population for comparison. While the oral history interview format does not include the reading passages or minimal pairs that allow sociolinguistic analysis of style shifting, it provides a wealth of personal and community information which I supplemented by consulting published census returns for 1970, 1980, and 1990 (United States 1975, 1983, 1992, resp.). (I also have some personal knowledge of Sterling/Rock Falls, having lived there the first 18 years of my life.)

The eleven Hispanic people whose tapes I examined represent three generations whose birthdates span five decades. The oldest were Joe, born in 1920; Mike, 1922; and Cecilia, 1932. These three attended, but did not finish, high school. The next generation includes Margie, born in 1935 and who did complete high school, as did Hope, born in 1940; Alex, 1940; Isabel, 1944; and Eva, 1946. All of the men in these two generations were active or retired mill workers; the women were traditional housewives except for Eva, who had a career as a bilingual court reporter and another

as a bilingual educator. The younger generation—Sergio, born in 1966, Rachel, 1969, and Jenny, 1970—either finished high school or were still enrolled when interviewed.

For each of these people, I transcribed all features that scholars have identified as either Spanish interference, Chicano English, regionally constrained English (in this location, Northern or North Midland dialect), nonstandard, or vernacular English. Spanish interference and Chicano English features are discussed in Thompson (1975), Metcalf (1979), Wald (1984), and Penfield and Ornstein-Galicia (1985). McDavid (1968), Callary (1975), and Callary (1990), among others, describe Northern and North Midland features.

Subjective Reaction Test

One piece of evidence for the presence of a Chicano dialect was a subjective reaction test that asked Illinois residents to identify Hispanic speakers from among a sample of the Sterling/Rock Falls oral history tapes. In 1987 I prepared a set of tapes from the interview sample using the voices of four Hispanic and two Anglo women from the 30 to 50 age group; this selection isolates the ethnic variable by keeping sex and age constant. Only brief passages were used so as not to give any contextual clues about identity. Thirty-eight college students (all but one non-Hispanic and mostly natives or long-term residents of Illinois) in an upper-division English course at Western Illinois University responded to the tapes by marking "yes" or "no" to a question about the speaker’s Hispanic identity.

The test showed that most of these Illinois residents could distinguish between the speech of the Sterling/Rock Falls Anglos and Hispanics. Only 10% and 11% of the students identified the two Anglo women they heard as Hispanic. However, the four Hispanic women were correctly identified by a majority of the students (92%, 63%, 66%, and 89%). These figures not only demonstrate that the students found something different about the speech of the Hispanics, but also that some of the women apparently sounded "more Hispanic" than others. We will turn our attention to the differences between these speakers later in this paper, after examining the features which mark the Hispanic community.

Documented Chicano English Features

Features of Chicano English documented in previous studies are discussed with regard to their occurrence in the Sterling corpus and summarized in table 1 and 2.
Documented Chicano English Features Absent from the Sterling Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Use in Sterling Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial consonant cluster reduction /swipid/ “stupid” etc.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laxing of /iy/, /ey/, /uw/ before stops, fricatives</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Documented Chicano English Features Present in the Sterling Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Use in Sterling Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/hw/ becomes /w/ in U.S.</td>
<td>Common, but widespread in U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final /z/ devoicing</td>
<td>Only Hope (6%), Margie (16%), Alex (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tensing of /h/ in final -ing</td>
<td>Cecilia and Hope categorically; Isabel variably</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/N/ realized as /a/</td>
<td>Cecilia categorically; Isabel, Sergio variably</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vowel interchange in met and mat</td>
<td>See discussion (pages 78–79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final consonant cluster reduction without glottal allophone</td>
<td>Margie, Hope, Cecilia variably</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final clear /l/</td>
<td>Eva categorically; Margie and Hope variably</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully articulated intervocalic /l/</td>
<td>Cecilia in “quieter”; Margie in “interview”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/N/ and /N/ as stop</td>
<td>Alex variably</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic intonation</td>
<td>All men except Sergio; all women except Jenny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple negation</td>
<td>Joe, Mike, Cecilia categorically; Rachel variably</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic comparative</td>
<td>Mike</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chicano English features present in the Sterling Sample. The following features were used by the persons listed.

Devoicing of /z/ (e.g., bees = /bi,is/) Other studies (notably Thompson 1975) associate this with both Spanish “interference” and with Chicano English (see also Metcalf 1979, Penfield and Ornstein-Galicia 1985, and Galindo 1993). Thompson selects this devoicing feature because “it seemed to predict the presence of other features of Mexican-American ‘accent.’ [11] . . . could also be expected to occur more frequently in the conversations than the other features” (19–20). Thompson found that more than half the Mexicans in his survey used devoicing 10–15% of the time; “the others,” presumably about 40% of those surveyed, used devoicing 33–75% of the time. For Thompson a devoicing figure of 25% or better describes “Spanish-influenced English” (20). Because this threshold invites comparison, devoicing frequencies were calculated for all of the Sterling/Rock Falls sample. No informant in this sample approaches Thompson’s criterion of 25%. Only three informants had any devoicing: Margie, with 16%, Hope, 6%, and Alex, 15%. The rest of the informants had no instances of devoicing. In contrast, Thompson found that 43% of his sample spoke either Spanish Influenced English (SIE) or Spanish Influenced Regional English (SIRE), either case meaning devoicing frequencies of 25% or more.

Devoicing of /z/ appears to have played some role in the recognition of Hispanic speakers by other Illinoisians. Some students did not identify Cecilia and Eva as Hispanic (with recognition scores of 63% and 66%, respectively), but they were nearly unanimous about Hope (92%) and Margie (89%). Here final /s/ does seem to be important; Hope and Margie were the only women with any instances of devoicing, with 6% and 16%. The correlation between voiceless /z/ and correct identification supports Thompson’s use of this feature as the primary marker for “Chicano English.” Despite Thompson’s benchmark of 25% for SIE, the fact that these speakers were identified by close to nine-tenths of all students and the fact
that Cecilia and Eva, with no cases of devoicing, received much lower recognition scores, suggests that even low frequencies of devoicing are still perceived as Hispanic by the population in general.

The use of Spanish in this community has an ambiguous relationship to the appearance of voiceless /t/ in English. In Austin, Texas, Thompson reported, "speakers of SIE tend to use more Spanish in the home" and that "almost all the speakers of SIE usually speak Spanish at work" (21). With one exception, Eva, who works as a bilingual court reporter and bilingual education teacher, none of the Sterling/Rock Falls interviewees speak Spanish at work, and only one, Margie, continues to speak Spanish at home (with her husband, an Ecuadorian national). Perhaps significantly, Margie had the highest percentage of devoicing of anyone in the sample, while Hope, the other woman with devoicing, learned Spanish as her first language and used it at home with her children (until discouraged by a speech therapist!). Eva, however, who uses Spanish in her work, should be the most likely to exhibit devoicing, yet has none. Alex, who says he has forgotten his Spanish and took high-school language courses in an effort to reacquire it, should be less likely than Eva to have devoicing, yet has a score of 15%. Only the younger generation seems entirely predictable. Sergio, Rachel, and Jenny, all of whom claim that they do not know Spanish, have no devoicing.

Regardless of the relationship between Spanish and devoicing, it is clear that this sample differs greatly from Thompson's Austin sample in that devoicing appears in the speech of far fewer people, and those who have it use it much less frequently than Chicanos in Austin. And as we shall see below, this community is also unlike Austin in that devoicing does not predict the presence of other features.

Teasing of /l/ in Final-ing. Register (1977) finds this feature used consistently in the Chicanos of Tucson, Arizona. Cecilia and Hope had this feature categorically (Hope also in think), Isabel variably.

/l/ Realized as /l/, in nothing, love, etc. Cecilia had this feature categorically, Isabel and Sergio variably; Margie had one instance of "love" pronounced with an "open a" instead of /l/.

Interchange of the Vowels in met and mat. Penfield and Ornstein-Galicia observe that the contrast between these vowels is not maintained, so that, for example, bet and bat can be confused (45). Accounting for this feature in our sample is complicated by two factors. First, while Cecilia's yes was transcribed as /yes/, Hope pronounced the same word as /yis/. Second, /æ/-raising, a sociolinguistic variable associated with the Northern Cities Vowel Shift (Labov 1994), is also present in this community (see below). It is difficult to know how to count this feature since hearing hack as heek could result from either the Northern Cities shift or from Spanish interference/Chicano English. Three of the Hispanic sample, Eva, Hope, and Jenny, had Northern Cities shift scores approaching those of the white population. I will examine that phenomenon separately.

Consonant Cluster Reduction. As noted above, southwestern varieties of Chicano English have consonant cluster reductions which do not occur in Sterling/Rock Falls. However, a few examples occurred which are somewhat different from the Anglo community. Many vernacular varieties of English reduce consonant clusters, especially -st, -nt, and -ld before consonants.

However, many accounts fail to observe that before nonstop consonants, final /t/ or /ð/ is not actually dropped, but is replaced with a glottal allophone. Final /t/ in the sequence didn't have or didn't realize is actually glottal closure for the preceding nasal. Margie, Hope, and Cecilia all have consonant cluster reduction in which this glottal allophone is not present.

/l/. In most varieties of American English, /l/ has two allophones, an initial alveolar lateral which is sounded with dorsovelar coarticulation or coloring, and a final dorsovelar lateral. Spanish has only a single alveolar allophone of /l/, which lacks any velarization. Eva has this "clear /l/" categorically (it is in fact the only segmental phoneme which marks her speech as Hispanic); Margie and Hope have it variably.

Intervocalic /l/. In most dialects of American English, /l/ has an alveolar flap allophone in intervocalic position. Spanish lacks this flap allophone and instead has a fully articulated alveolar or dental stop in this position. Cecilia has Spanish /l/ in "quieter" while Margie has it in "interview."

/ð/ and /Ø/ as Stops (e.g., "them" as /dem/). Alex's 40-minute interview had three instances of this variant, which occurs not only in Chicano English (Penfield and Ornstein-Galicia 1985), but in other English vernaculars, e.g., in Chicago (Hernandez 1993), New York (Labov 1966), and Duluth, Minnesota (Linn 1990).

Prosody. Penfield (1984) describes several intonation patterns which set Chicano and Anglo Engishes apart. This Illinois sample has no examples of the one-pitch final contrast, which has perhaps become a stereotype of Chicano English because it sounds "unfinished" (Penfield 1984, 56). However, at least two other patterns began to emerge that were unlike those in the speech of Sterling/Rock Falls whites.

Eva's speech has what Chicano English researchers have called the "rising glide to highlight" (Penfield and Ornstein-Galicia 1985, 48–49),
where rising glides are used as “highlighters or emphasers of specific words”:

2 I think what 3 hap2ens in Sterling/Rock Falls. . .

The same sentence ends in what Penfield and Ornstein-Galicia call a “rise-fall glide in sentence-final contour” (50):

2 is there’s so much inter 3 mar2iage.

In Cecilia’s speech, I observed what Penfield and Ornstein-Galicia call “a tendency to begin pre-contours with a pitch above normal voice—at level 3” (49). I heard this in several of Cecilia’s sentences, as in:

3 He went 2 back to 3 Mex2ic.

These intonation patterns appeared in the majority of the sample: in the speech of three of four men (it was most noticeable in the oldest, both born in 1920; it did not appear in the youngest, born in 1966) and in all but one (that one being one of the youngest) of the women.

Penfield and Ornstein-Galicia also mention the reduction of /hw/ to /w/, but this is a widespread phenomenon among many non-Hispanic English speakers in the United States, especially in Illinois, so in Sterling/Rock Falls it would not distinguish the Hispanic speaker.

GENERAL VERNACULAR ENGLISH FEATURES
PRESENT IN THE STERLING HISPANIC SAMPLE

SYNTAX: MULTIPLE NEGATION. Penfield and Ornstein-Galicia mention multiple negation as a common feature of Chicanos English; it probably originates in Spanish, which has no prescriptive taboo against multiple negation. Double negation does occur, of course, in nonstandard varieties of English, so its appearance as a Chicanos dialect marker here must remain questionable. Joe, Mike, and Cecilia use multiple negation categorically; Rachel has it variably (only one example occurred during her interview). It is possible that the men either acquired this feature from, or had it reinforced by, the working-class vernacular used by whites in the steel mill. Mike has an instance of triple negation:

He don’t hardly hang around with Italians no more.

“DIFFERENT USE OF THE COMPARATIVE” (Penfield and Ornstein-Galicia 1984, 52). Cecilia used the expression “more quieter.” This usage does occur in some dialects of English, notably those deriving from Appalachia (Murray 1990a). Mike uses the expression “for six or seven months, she hasta be there more.” This last usage seems more likely to originate in Spanish.

TO AS LOCATIVE. This is not a feature of Chicanos English, but of Northern United States vernacular (McDavid 1963). Mike used this locative once.

MISCELLANEOUS VERNACULAR FORMS. Both Mike and Joe used ain’t. All of the subjects but Eva had at least one example of the present participle -ing ending in /n/; while this appears in some of Penfield and Ornstein-Galicia’s transcriptions, it also occurs in most other varieties of English. Mike and Joe both had the non-Hispanic vernacular form “hunerd” for hundred. Joe’s can’t as [keynt] occurs in some Southern and Middle Atlantic varieties of English and also in some varieties of Black English (Joe worked part-time in a jazz band with Black musicians for 30 years). Regularization of strong verb forms occurs in the speech of Mike, Joe, Cecilia, Margie, and Hope (one instance only).

/æ/ Raising. This part of the Northern Cities vowel shift occurs in small cities around Northern Illinois. (It is less frequent among rural populations.) I include it here because it is a frequently noted sociolinguistic variable in Illinois (Callary 1975). I determined /æ/ indices for each speaker in the same way as Callary: a score of 50 = zero raising (i.e., [æ] with no shift sign) and a score of 10 = the optimum raising found outside of Chicago (i.e., mid-front lax e as the first part of a diphthong). For my discussion, then, the higher the /æ/ number, the lower the actual vowels. Three white males, born in 1917, 1936, and 1948, have respective “short a” /æ/ scores of 50, 35, and 36. Joe, Mike, and Alex, born in 1920, 1922, and 1940, have respective /æ/ scores of 49, 47, and 42. This difference becomes more striking among the women. The five middle-aged Hispanic women, whose birth dates are 1932 (Cecilia), 1935 (Margie), 1940 (Hope), 1944 (Isabel), and 1946 (Eva), have /æ/ scores of 42, 49, 37, 49, 32, respectively, for an average /æ/ score of 42. Three white women, born in 1930, 1935, and 1947, have scores of 37, 35, and 30, for an average of 34. So for this part of the population born before 1950, the Hispanic group appears to lag behind the white population in “short a” raising, though it has begun to participate. This difference is not apparent among the younger group, probably

---

**Table 3**

Non-Hispanic Vernacular Features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Use in Sterling Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Locative “to”</td>
<td>Mike categorically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ain’t</td>
<td>Mike and Joe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Hunerd” hundred</td>
<td>All Hispanic informants but Eva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/æ/ raising</td>
<td>Mike and Joe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>See discussion (page 81)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
because the sound change is no longer advancing among whites or Hispanics—Sergio, Rachel and Jenny have scores of 50, 46, and 37—while two white females, born in 1966, have scores of 46 each; one white male, born in 1966 also, has 38.

**Conclusions**

We can conclude from this study that the English spoken in the Sterling/Rock Falls Mexican community is markedly different from the white vernacular and is recognized as different by white college students living in the area. However, it is also different from some varieties of Chicano English found in the Southwest by virtue of having fewer Hispanic features and therefore more closely resembling white norms. The question of whether or not this community has its own viable Chicano dialect, one with "continuity" (Wald 1984, 19), is harder to answer. While a variety of features mark the English of this community, a pattern emerges when who says what is considered. Variants observed in the men's speech are largely features which appear in non-Hispanic working-class dialects, but most of the segmental phoneme variants examined here are used only by women. Mike and Joe have none of these segmental phoneme variants; Alex has only two, and Sergio one. Cecilia, on the other hand, has five; Margie five; Hope four; Isabel two; and Eva one. The earlier observation that men, through the workplace, can and do have greater interaction with whites suggests that the most broadly marked version of Chicano English found here is restricted to the speech of women because women have fewer contacts with non-Hispanic varieties of English. It is perhaps significant that Eva, the one woman in the sample who works outside the home, has fewer Hispanic segmental phoneme features than anyone else.

And since younger women will inevitably spend more time outside the home, it would not seem likely that Chicano English in this community will continue to be marked by the features listed here. This is suggested as well by the fact that the number of Hispanic features appearing among the older women declines with age: Cecilia, born in 1932, is the oldest and has five; Margie, 1955, has five; Hope, 1940, has four; Isabel, 1944, has two; and Eva, the youngest of her generation, has one. This prediction seems to come true in the speech of the younger people. With the exception of one instance in Sergio's speech, this generation exhibits none of the segmental phonemes.

It is often observed that prosody is the most durable feature of Chicano English. This is true in Sterling/Rock Falls; with the exception of final /n/ in -ing constructions, the intonation patterns are the only feature shared by both men and women. Here again, however, the younger generation is different: two out of three do not have any trace of Chicano English intonation.

Several characteristics of this population suggest that, while some Sterling/Rock Falls Mexicans speak a variety of English which sets them apart from the whites, that variety is in fact a form of English marked by Spanish interference; it has not become established as a continuing dialect which will be adopted by monolinguals. The most dramatic evidence is that very few Chicano English features are found among the youngest generation; even the prosodic features are less frequent among them than among the older generation. Among the older generation, moreover, the strongest evidence for Chicano English appears among the women, who, unlike their daughters, have less opportunity than the men to encounter other non-Hispanic varieties. It is possible that the men have a Chicano dialect that they did not use with the white female interviewer. However, the men, especially the two older men, seem to have made no effort to speak what they would probably think of as "correct" English. Both Joe and Mike frequently used a number of nonstandard features in their speech, but, except for intonation and one syntactic feature, none of these could be exclusively associated with Chicano English.

Why has a viable Chicano dialect failed to emerge in this community? Clearly, the use of Spanish is a major variable. Spanish is used by less than half the population of the community; in the sample, Cecilia, Margie, Hope, Isabel, and Eva know Spanish, but only Margie still uses it at home. Rachel, Jenny, Sergio, and Alex explicitly do not speak Spanish; I have no information about Mike and Joe. In Austin, Texas, on the other hand, many of Thompson's subjects used Spanish not only at home but at work. Even in Gary, Indiana, where Hartford did find a Chicano dialect, Spanish is apparently used much more widely than it is in Sterling/Rock Falls, since Hartford reports that the mothers in her study had minimal use of English. It would seem from my study of the Sterling/Rock Falls community that Chicano English is unlikely to flourish here unless a new influx of Spanish speakers takes place.

**Notes**

Fieldwork for this project was funded by a grant from the Research Foundation of the National Council of Teachers of English. A sabbatical from Western Illinois University allowed me to complete analysis of the data.

1. The 1990 census is somewhat selective for the categories of information it publishes for different sized communities. For example, Sterling is included among the tables which give numbers of persons of "Hispanic origin," but Rock Falls is not.
I, therefore, estimated the Hispanic origin population for Rock Falls by examining the 1970 figures for both cities and projecting the proportions to the 1990 numbers. Throughout this paper, I have used approximate census numbers where such estimates had to be made. In all cases my estimates seem reasonable given my personal familiarity with the community.

2. Hartford (1978), of course, found that females in her study used fewer, rather than more, Hispanic features than did males. However, her subjects were adolescents, whereas the gender differences I have found were among people who would be about the age of the parents of the adolescents in Hartford’s paper. Because Hartford reports that the mothers in her survey used “minimal English” (59), I would expect to find somewhat the same gender gap among the parents in her survey as is reported here.

Other differences between my sample and Hartford’s may emerge since mine is clearly in greater contact with the Anglo community. In fact, the grown children of several of my subjects have attended college or military service and left the community entirely.
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