DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 046 940 TE 002 206

AUTHOR	Ebbs, John D.
TITLE	Language Course for Teacher Training Program in Elementary Education.
INSTITUTION	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Tri-University Project in Elementary Education.
PUB DATE	7 May 68
NOTE	27p.; Vol. 4
AVAILABLE FROM	Nebraska Curriculum Development Center, Andrews Hall, Univ. of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska 68508 ($0.50). Make checks payable to University of Nebraska
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Descriptive Linguistics, Dialects, *Elementary School Teachers, English, *Language Arts, *Language Instruction, Language Research, Linguistics, Phonology, Psycholinguistics, Teacher Education, *Teacher Education Curriculum, Traditional Grammar, Transformation Generative Grammar

ABSTRACT

After briefly reviewing the present state of linguistic research, this project concluded that both recent developments in research and increasing educational demands upon all children indicate a need for increased attention to the language education of elementary teachers, especially a broader orientation in language training. Following a discussion of the uses and limitations of traditional grammar in language education, the report suggests a course of study for teachers which would cover aspects of traditional grammar, transformational grammar, structural phonology, methods of linguistic description, psycholinguistics, and dialects. Additional materials include a partially annotated list of references and a list of sources which could be used as textbooks for the components of the language course. (DD)

LANGUAGE COURSE FOR TEACHER TRAINING PROGRAM

IN

ELEMINTARY EDUCATION

By

John D. Ebbs

Tri-University Project

in

Elementary Education

The University of Nebraska

Lincoln, Nebraska

May 7, 1968

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LANGUAGE COURSE FOR TEACHER TRAINING PROGRAM

IN

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION

INTRODUCTION

The basic content of a language course for teacher training programs in elementary education is dictated by important linguistic developments of the past in relation to almost certain needs of the future. It would be a mistake to denounce any single linguistic research activity of our own generation, for each has contributed in a special way to what we now know about language. It is true that some of these activities have pursued rather barren, unproductive avenues, failing to assert a total relevance to the mainstream of such research. Yet, these endeavors have helped to give other currents of research more certainty, more productivity, more extension into the real needs of our time. It is the intent of this brief introduction to look briefly at the work of linguists of the immediate past, and by so doing attempt to project the need for a type of training in language which will equip elementary teachers to meet adequately the demands of the future.

Present State of Linguistic Research

Although clearly anticipated by Edward Sapir's brilliant exposition in his Language (1921),[1] the real movement toward modern linguistic research began in 1933 with the appearance of Leonard Bloomfield's monumental work, Language (the identicalness of title should not escape us).[2] Bloomfield was a man of his own time, and as such he incorporated the finer spirit of the linguistic movement of his immediate past, that of historical linguistics.[3] However, of more importance here, he himself looked to the future and in so doing provided the means for a new and more productive movement--a movement which remains the cornerstone of linguistic research today--the movement we call descriptive linguistics. And to this movement Bloomfield contributed two essentials: an

---

1 This important work is readily accessible in paperback form (A Harvest Book. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1966).

2 New York: Henry Holt and Company.

3 We owe to historical linguistics, for example, the work on and discoveries concerning the place of English in the Indo-European family of languages.

innovative way of looking at language[4] and a new, precise terminology, one sufficient for a truly adequate description.

More than latently imbedded in Bloomfieldian linguistics was the dynamic potential for extension, and the very terminology which he introduced (along with the inherent concepts surrounding this terminology) determined the next important linguistic movement, that of structural linguistics. Bloomfield had perceived of language as a structure or as a system of structures, and such terms as phoneme, morpheme, and immediate constituent allowed a structural description of the three broad areas of language--phonology, morphology, and syntax. The first of these areas was treated by George L. Trager and Henry Lee Smith, Jr., in their An Outline of English Structure in 1951.[5] The latter two areas were treated by Charles C. Fries in his The Structure of English in 1952.[6] Together, these works present a valuable representation of the structural movement.

Except in the area of phonology, however, the structural movement as a true force in linguistic research was short lived. The reasons, I think, are clear. It is true that methods of structural linguistics provided the means for a description of language; however, traditional methods, predating by centuries the work of Bloomfield, had also provided the means for a description of language, and, in some respects, in a more comprehensive manner. Both traditional and structural methods, however, could not describe all elements of language, and, of great importance, could not, at least adequately, get at the system underlying language. The need for a different, more complete approach to language description became apparent.

This different approach is the present approach, an approach which grew out of the structural movement but which goes beyond the structural. Called the transformational movement, it has come into being and has had a rather rapid

---

[4] Of course, the reference here is to the descriptive way as opposed to the prescriptive way of traditional grammar. James Sledd has stated it nicely: "New descriptive concepts and techniques were elaborated . . . and the principle was established that every language must be described as it is, not as if it were Latin and not as some grammarian might think it ought to be." (A Short Introduction to English Grammar. Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1959, p. 4) And a few years before, Charles C. Fries had made the same point in his own way: "The point of view in this discussion is descriptive, not normative or legislative. The reader will find here, not how certain teachers or textbook writers or 'authorities' think native speakers of English ought to use the language, but how certain native speakers actually do use it in natural, practical conversations carrying on various activities of a community." (The Structure of English. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1952, p. 3)

[5] Studies in Linguistics, Occasional Papers No. 3. Norman, Oklahoma: Battenberg Press.

[6] Op. cit.

development largely through the work of Noam Chomsky.[7] It has the power to describe all elements of language, it has the power to work toward a real knowledge of the system underlying language, it has the power to relate more closely to psychology and related sciences in attempts to understand, more than superficially, what language really is.

At the present time, however, the transformational movement is in its infancy. It has not gone far enough to provide materials which meet completely the demands of a realistic language program for elementary teachers. As we shall see in the next section of this introduction, the needs are great for a more intensive program in language training for elementary teachers, and to meet these needs adequately--if not completely--we must select those materials and methods from the total body of linguistic research which will best help to train these teachers in language.[8]

Need for Broader Orientation in Language Training

Recent developments in linguistic research, plus increasing educational demands upon all children, make imperative a reassessment of the nature of language training elementary teachers have received in the past in light of the almost certain demands of the future. Too often, in the past, the language training the elementary teacher has received has been, at best, superficial

---

7 It can be said with certainty that the transformational movement began with Noam Chomsky's Syntactic Structures (The Hague: Mouton, 1957).

8 This brief sketch of linguistic movements may be further clarified through the citing of definitions of the sentence to be found in publications representing the traditional approach and the descriptive, structural, and transformational movements. (1) Traditional: "A sentence is an expression of a thought or feeling by means of a word or words used in such form and manner as to convey the meaning intended. . . . In a normal sentence both subject and predicate are present, but sometimes the one or the other or both may be absent and yet the sentence may be a complete expression of thought." (George O. Curme, Syntax. New York: D. C. Heath and Company, 1931, p. 1); "A sentence is a (relatively) complete and independent unit of communication. . . ." (Otto Jespersen, Essentials of English Grammar. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1933, p. 106). (2) Descriptive: ". . . each sentence is an independent linguistic form, not included by virtue of any grammatical construction in any larger form." (Bloomfield, op. cit., p. 170). (3) Structural: Charles C. Fries (op. cit., p. 21) accepts Bloomfield's definition of the sentence; "A complete sentence will always end in one of the terminals /↘/ and /↗/ (never /→/), and it may or may not contain occurrences of /↗/ or /→/ within itself; but it will also contain, in every case except that of the imperative, at least one independent combination of complete subject with complete predicate, expanded or unexpanded." (Sledd, op. cit., p. 173). (4) Transformational: "We also noted that any attempt to define the notion of 'sentence' in English is bound to be futile, since the only possible definition that would be complete would actually be a grammar of English." (Owen Thomas, Transformational Grammar and the Teacher of English. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1965, p. 44).

and lacking in any real sense of purpose and direction. With a background only of training provided by freshman-sophomore required composition courses--in many quarters, thought to be sufficient--the elementary teacher has been entrusted with the training and development of language proficiencies of children. When we consider that this language background has been solely in the tradition of prescriptive training--in which, in the main, everything has been either correct or incorrect--we need not wonder at the predominant sense of futility which has characterized language training in the elementary classroom.

Linguistic research has shown conclusively that by the age of six years children have already acquired profound proficiencies in language.[9] A six-year-old child, typically, has at his command a rich vocabulary, an intuitive recognition of how to make and to understand sentences, and, perhaps most important, an intense curiosity about all aspects of language. These language proficiencies will vary, strikingly in some cases, from child to child in a substantially similar socio-economic environment, and vary, profoundly in most cases, from children in one socio-economic climate to those in another. Yet, the goals of language training in elementary school are the same for all children--to equip each child, as a bare minimum, with those formal language proficiencies which will enable him to profit from further training in secondary school and become a useful, productive citizen in a democracy, and, as a desirable maximum, to enable each child to employ such proficiencies in a continual process of self-satisfying, self-rewarding efforts toward the increase of his intellectual and moral capacities.

To provide for children the type of training in language envisaged above, the elementary teacher must have more than a body of rules or admonitions which present very strict paradigms of right's and wrong's. She must have training which will enable her to take children where they are in language proficiency and build onto and enrich what they already possess.[10] Such training will necessitate a basic orientation in language which does not rely solely upon the prescriptive; such training will make imperative a working familiarity with the methods of linguistic description; such training will make desirable an understanding of the creative processes of language and the positive side of linguistic variety. Such training requires intensive practicum work with children using the tools of linguistic description. Such training, in short, will make inevitable an awareness that language growth is limitless and, in almost every respect, is of an individual nature.

The description of a language course for elementary teachers which follows, it is felt, points the way toward the type of language training the future will demand of them. A ridigity of the components of the language course is not intended. Whereby these components have been placed in an order which seems sequential, there is no reason why the order may not be changed. In fact, it can be argued that rigid programs of training produce rigid teachers, a type which has been in evidence too long. It is for a more flexible teacher that this course in language has been prepared.

---

9 See Owen Thomas, op. cit., p. 6; John Dixon, Growth through English. Reading, England: National Association for the Teaching of English, 1967, pp. 15-16.

10 See Herbert J. Muller, The Uses of English. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1967, p. 62.

TRADITIONAL GRAMMAR: ITS USES AND ITS LIMITATIONS

When asked recently about the place of traditional scholarly grammar in the language training program for elementary teachers, Noam Chomsky was quick to say that these teachers should receive a sound grasp of traditional grammar. He went on to explain that traditional grammar was the place where all other work had begun but that it had severe limitations. Traditional grammar, he thought, did not always ask the right questions.[11] It will be the purposes of this section to place training in traditional grammar in the language course for elementary teachers through discussions of its uses and its limitations and to suggest the specific nature of such training.

Its Uses

The importance of Chomsky's assertion that traditional grammar is the place where all other work had begun should not be overlooked or minimized. Every linguist mentioned thus far in this paper, no matter what linguistic movement he represents, received first of all an exact knowledge of traditional grammar. He looked at language--both spoken and written--with a viewpoint which had at its base a traditional orientation. Accordingly, he incorporated into his view of language much of the framework of traditional grammar.

An attempt will be made here to show that a basic understanding of the morphology and syntax of traditional grammar will be of great use to the elementary teacher. Overriding these areas and pervasive throughout all linguistic research, however, is the terminology of language. An understanding of the terminology of traditional grammar is essential since it, in the main, has been retained in the work of the linguistic movements of the immediate past and of the present. The author of one of the most widely used works of the structural movement has written:

> . . . the present Introduction preserves as much of the schoolroom tradition as its author thought possible. . . . With some modifications, the familiar subject-predicate definition of the sentence is retained, along with the classifications of sentences into simple, compound, complex, and compound-complex and into statements, questions, commands, and exclamations. The first classification presupposes distinctions, which are duly stated, between independent and dependent clauses and between clauses and phrases. Most of the familiar constructions, including three kinds of objects, are also distinguished, and wherever possible the familiar names are used. Nouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs are here nouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs . . . the present tense is called the present tense, not the non-past; and neologisms like resultative phase, inchoative aspect, and negative status are avoided.[12]

---

[11] This information was obtained during a personal conference with Professor Chomsky at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts, on March 14, 1968.

[12] James Sledd, A Short Introduction to English Grammar, op. cit., p. 10

And other quotations could be supplied to validate the point further.

The sentence as the basic unit of the English language has been accepted by all linguists, regardless of the linguistic movements to which they belong, and the description of the sentence to be found in traditional grammar still retains immense value and wide application.[13] The elementary teacher will talk and write in sentences; likewise, the children in her classes will communicate by means of sentences. Further, these children will take steps toward higher, more involved schemata of communication in direct proportion to their understanding of the sentence and its central position in speaking and writing, and here, traditional grammar, which has much to say about the sentence, can be of great use to the elementary teacher.

As the child progresses through the elementary grades, more demands--from classroom instructional materials, from teachers, from peers, from life itself--are made upon him to acquire more precision as well as more variety in his language performance. Such performance makes active employment of modification, subordination, and coordination; such performance makes greater use of varied word orders; such performance begins to pay more attention to the concept of the right word in the right form in the right place. Traditional grammar has treated extensively all of these performance areas, and the elementary teacher may discover wide uses of traditional grammar in her attempts to aid her pupils as they progress toward this more demanding performance in language.

There are, finally, the proprieties of language usage which appear everywhere in print, which abound in typical schoolroom language, and which--we need to be reminded--constitute a large segment of the national characterization of ideal educational training. The shall-will distinction, the who-whom rules, the use of the subjunctive were at the proper time, the than-from usage--these"proprieties" are but a few of those that still remain among us, and are all treated definitively in traditional scholarly grammars--though not in the so-called traditional grammars used in the schools. The main purpose in traditional school grammar has not been to describe these proprieties; instead, it has been to prescribe them, and a prescriptive approach is not being advocated here. Yet, because these particular usages still persist, the elementary teacher should have a familiarity with them. This familiarity will be of use to her in her recognition of the superficiality of demanding such usages--particularly without regard to their context. Although it is not envisioned here that the elementary teacher will ever come to the place where she will openly condemn anyone who observes the traditional proprieties, it is hoped that she will never arrive at a position in which she will rigorously demand them. Other more essential proprieties, such as spelling and punctuation, may place some demands upon her instructional time.

---

[13] For example, the descriptive, structural, and transformational linguistic movements have retained the subject-predicate concept of a sentence to be found in traditional grammar.

Its Limitations

The basic limitations of traditional grammar are clear: it is a grammar which attempts to describe the English language in terms of the rules of Latin grammar, and in this descriptive process it presents a corpus of grammatical dogmas which serve to lock English into the Latin mold. When we consider that classical Latin was more than honored as the ideal language during the eighteenth century--the time when traditional grammar as we know it became formalized--then it is no mistake to condemn traditional grammar for its characterization of an English the late eighteenth century thought it ought to be, not as it really is.[14]

Inherent in the limitations described is another, and perhaps one equally serious: the failure of traditional grammar to provide the means for describing or generating any creativity in the use of English. Perhaps more than any other single force, the non-creative emphasis of traditional grammar has been responsible for blocking or destroying in children during the formative years of school their innate creative capacity in language.

In addition, there was not built into traditional grammar the means to take account of the changes that have occurred and are occurring in the English language. Because it is a living language, English has been subjected to all of the processes of change which come about precisely because a language is alive. The English language constantly is being influenced by the processes of simplification, or regularization of form and structure, of loss and gain of vocabulary, of a weakening of a structure here and a strengthening there.[15]

Suggested Training in Traditional Grammar for Elementary Teachers

The outline that follows indicates the areas of traditional scholarly grammar in which elementary teachers should receive training. The emphasis here quite clearly is upon those areas which, in conjunction with the other components which help to make up the total language course, will prove of widest application to the elementary teacher in her efforts to involve her pupils in an active language program.

I. The sentence.
   A. Its parts.
   B. Its kinds.
   C. Its function as a unit.

---

14 See also the statements by Sledd and Fries in footnote 4 above.

15 A case in point is the split infinitive, which in traditional grammar has been regarded a flagrant error. The present writer's eighth grade teacher (almost thirty years ago) would fail a composition containing one split infinitive. Today, however, it is recognized that there is strength in this particular construction and at times it is highly desirable. Yet, the traditional rule is remembered and children (and high school and college students) are still prevented from using the split infinitive.

II. Methods of sentence expansion.
   A. Subordination.
   B. Coordination.
   C. Modification.

III. English word order.

IV. Parts of speech.

V. Inflections of parts of speech.

VI. Agreement.
   A. Subject and verb.
   B. Pronoun and antecedent.

VII. Active and passive voice.

VIII. Phonetics and letter systems as described by traditional grammarians.

IX. Punctuation systems as described by traditional grammarians.

(Cf. Bibliography section below for books which might usefully be used in training elementary teachers in traditional grammar).

TRANSFORMATIONAL GRAMMAR AND CREATIVITY

The transformationalists, in their attempts to set down a descriptive system which will ultimately provide for all aspects of language, place great emphasis upon two concepts: linguistic competence and linguistic performance. The linguistic competence of a child includes the entirety of his knowledge of the system of language, such knowledge, the transformationalist affirms, being enormous even at the age of six years. Linguistic performance, on the other hand, signifies the actual use the child can make of this knowledge at any particular stage in his development. The strikingly significant disparity between the apparently great amount of linguistic knowledge and the rather limited use to which such knowledge is put becomes a central focus of transformational grammar, which, although yet to emerge as a complete system, may contribute greatly to our understanding of how we may stimulate an enlarged and more productive linguistic performance in children.

The transformational linguistic movement has at its center a unique insight which gives it the theoretical power of accounting for all of the sentences in the language. Through rather dramatic insights, the transformationalists have been able to demonstrate convincingly that the number of basic English sentence structures is finite,[16] and that all other sentences, no

[16] These basic sentence structures, generally, are called kernel sentences.

matter how simple or complex, are transformations of these basic sentence structures. Since the sentence is the basic unit of the English language, a means is hereby provided for observing children engage in exciting extensions (transformations) of the basic sentence structures they know and use and perhaps even for bringing them so to engage in extending their performative repertory.

More complex--and to the transformationalist, more inconclusive--are transformational theories concerning the deep structure of language. The spoken or written utterance represents the surface structure of a sentence. Underlying each such utterance is a deep structure--the underlying set of semantic relations expressed in the sentence--which is represented in the surface structure. Just how far the elementary teacher will have need to go into deep structure theories to illumine her instruction of children, no one at this point in the development of transformational grammar can be certain. However, transformational linguists are generally clear, and are almost unanimous, in their belief that the teacher herself should acquire a knowledge of deep structure to aid her in her understanding of the creativity implicit in the process of sentence production and the options available. In addition, advances by the transformationalists in an understanding of the true features of the primary parts of speech will add to the elementary teacher's total understanding of word functions and relationships.

The suggested nature of specific training in transformational grammar for elementary teachers is as follows:

I. The basic sentence structure.
   A. Its parts.
   B. Its capacity for extension.

II. Deep structure and surface structure: kernel sentences.

III. Transformations.
   A. The transformation process.
   B. Types of transformations.
      1. Question transformation.
      2. Negative transformation.
      3. Contraction transformation.
      4. Passive transformation.
      5. Cleft transformation.
      6. Relative clause transformation.
      7. Relative pronoun deletion transformation.
      8. Relative "Be" deletion transformation.
      9. Adjective transformation.
      10. Complementizer transformation.
      11. "It" deletion transformation.
      12. Extraposition transformation.
      13. Complementizer deletion transformation.
      14. Identical NP deletion transformation.
      15. Indefinite NP deletion transformation.
      16. Article transformation.
      17. Plural ending transformation.
      18. Accusative transformation.

19. Pronominalization transformation.
20. "Be" introduction transformation.

IV. Linguistic competence and linguistic performance: Implications of transformational grammar for evoking performance in the child.

STRUCTURAL PHONOLOGY

The first language a child learns is the spoken language, and, as has been stated before, he learns it rather well. However, after the child enters school, the emphasis begins to be placed upon a second language, the language which he sees upon the printed page and which he will be expected to learn to read and the language which he will learn to write. Soon, almost certainly by the time of the intermediate grades, the entire emphasis is upon the written language, and this emphasis continues throughout secondary school and on into college. As a result, the chances are great that the child here referred to will learn well what there is to know about the written language--a language which, in reality, he will use sparingly--but know relatively little about the spoken language--the language which, throughout his life, will remain the mainstay of his existence.

As has been demonstrated in the preceding paragraph--and can be authentically documented by looking at the history of man himself--the spoken language is historically prior and prior in the life of the child, and the written language appears to him as a representation of the spoken language. It is true that multitudes of teachers and tons of materials have attempted to reverse the process, and have succeeded only in hindering true progress in either language. Perhaps more than any other school practice, the still much too prevalent admonition--"You must say it as you would write it"[17]--has done more to kill the innate, spontaneous love of oral language that is to be found in every child. The language program envisioned in this paper advocates that an elementary teacher take a child where he is in language performance and build onto and enrich such performance. And here the reference is to the whole child, his performance in oral language constituting the bulk of the raw material with which she has to work.

However, in order to accomplish this important feat, the teacher herself must know a great deal about spoken language--the sounds of English, how these sounds are produced, the human vocal apparatus, for example--and gain a proficiency in her ability to record and analyze the spoken language of children. At the same time, these children should be learning the things they can about oral language. It goes without saying that, in clinical cases, a child who

---

17 The kindred admonition--"You must write it as you would say it"--although seemingly logical, tends to produce confusion in the child in his conception of what writing really is. Both instructional warnings fail to recognize that the spoken language and written language are, in a final analysis, distinct and separate.

knows what is involved in the production of a long a will be in a better position (and feel more confident) to produce this sound.

The most serviceable system which has been devised to describe adequately the phonology of English grew out of the structural linguistic movement. Using descriptive terms such as the "phoneme" and "allophone," using the descriptive nicety afforded the student of language by the conceptions associated with these terms, and using equally precise terms to cover the important speech features of 'stress', 'pitch', and 'juncture', the structural system has made possible rather significant research findings in language development in children as well as rigorous studies of dialect on a nation-wide basis.

The training in structural phonology for elementary teachers suggested here is in no way intended to be complete training. However, it should be sufficient to allow a teacher to make a confident beginning in giving all elements of the spoken language a proper emphasis and meeting the needs of each of her pupils on an individual basis. It is believed that once a beginning has been made, the teacher's involvement in phonological activities will help her, through further self-study, to keep abreast of the actual needs of such activities.

The nature of the suggested training follows.

I. The vocal organs and the production of speech sounds.

II. Important speech features.
   A. Stress.
   B. Pitch.
   C. Juncture.

III. English consonants.

IV. Short vowels.

V. Long vowels.

VI. Diphthongs.

VII. Phonological transcription.

VIII. Phonemic-graphemic relationships and their implications for reading and spelling training.

THE METHODS OF LINGUISTIC DESCRIPTION

Seldom, to my knowledge, is the term scientist applied to the linguist. Philologist, grammarian (historical, traditional, structural, transformational), language specialist, language theorist, yes; but generally not scientist. Yet, his methods are those of science and of the scientist: he seeks to discover and describe the truths of his subject--language. And thus we shall begin with perhaps the most central of the methods of linguistic description: objectivity. It is truth that the linguist is after, and he knows it, and what he finds is subject to the reasoned criticism of all other linguists. And he knows this too. Thus, a description of an American dialect, or a description of the language of a South American jungle tribe must incorporate no subjective colorings; it must represent the dialect or language, in so far as the linguist is able, as it really is. This key method, which places unusually strong demands upon the exercise of objective procedure and analysis, has direct implications for the elementary teacher in the language program for children.

A second important method of linguistic description concerns the data or the manner of collecting data for analysis and description. Extreme care is taken to isolate such data in a way that supports fully the purpose of the investigation. This procedure insures the employment of systematic and meaningful techniques throughout the investigation, since it brings to the investigation from the beginning the means for a more revealing analysis and description. This method, too, has direct implications for the elementary teacher.

An additional method practically demands that descriptive findings, before being put into print, be submitted to those other linguists who, because of specialized training, will be able to test the authenticity of the findings. It is extremely difficult to come upon a work of linguistic description which does not include prefatory acknowledgments to other linguists for special aid. Such procedure also contributes to a non-duplication of investigative efforts. The significance of this method becomes more than clear when we consider the need for investigations in an area as important as language to have as many tests, evaluations, and reevaluations as possible. And, as we shall see later, the elementary teacher has need for a knowledge of this method.

A final method springs, at least in part, from the creative nature of language acquisition and production. This method gives to the descriptive linguist licence to go beyond the known or established theory by means of the exercise of creative insight. The work of a linguist at any particular time is and must be a culmination of all work that has preceded, and since he is fully knowledgeable of this previous work, the linguist will be prompted to form new hypotheses--to exercise creative insight--in attempts to refine and go beyond all previous work. It is no mistake to consider the important developments in linguistic research during the past forty years to be the result of the full play of creative, in some cases, brilliant, insight.

It is time that we realize fully that in various ways the elementary teacher, in her dealings with language in the classroom, is engaged in the

work of the linguist. Of great importance, then, she must know and incorporate into her language work the methods he employs. Whereby there is a great need for her to remain almost entirely subjective in her personal dealings with her pupils, a need of equal or perhaps even greater importance is apparent for her to be objective in her analyzation of their needs in language. In addition, there is no reason to presume that her collection of data for analysis should lack any of the care and method of the linguist. The imperativeness of her understanding the need for the isolation of data which fully support investigative purpose is, I think, clear. Further, the recognition of the need for help and reassurance from colleagues and/or specialists as she attempts to make language performance more meaningful to her pupils should be impressed upon elementary teachers. Finally, it is hoped that methodical work in language over a period of time will produce in elementary teachers the potential for meaningful insights.

In summation and conclusion, it can be said that typical elementary teachers during the process of their own language training will arrive intuitively at an understanding of the methods of linguistic description discussed above. However, since it is possible that for some this understanding will not be complete, specific training in these methods is recommended.

PSYCHOLINGUISTICS

The need for the entry of psychology into the work of linguistics was argued for as early as 1929 by Edward Sapir:

> It is peculiarly important that linguists, who are often accused, and accused justly, of failure to look beyond the patterns of their subject matter, should become aware of what their science may mean for the interpretation of human conduct in general. Whether they like it or not, they must become increasingly concerned with the many anthropological, sociological, and psychological problems which invade the field of linguistics.[18]

Along with others of the so-called hyphenated disciplines, such as sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics fulfills the plea inherent in Sapir's argument and does so, most likely, in ways he may have envisioned.

Although still too young as a science (or sub-science or sub-sub-science) to have produced a corpus of research to indicate with precision its true province of investigation, psycholinguistics already has asserted an importance in the area of language acquisition.[19] In one place we find psycholinguistics defined as follows:

---

[18] "The Status of Linguistics as a Science," Language, V (1929), 214.

[19] During a personal conference with Noam Chomsky on March 14, 1968, I

> The rather new discipline coming to be known as psycholinguistics . . . . is concerned in the broadest sense with relations between messages and the characteristics of human individuals who select and interpret them. In a narrower sense, psycholinguistics studies those processes whereby the intentions of speakers are transformed into signals in the culturally accepted code and whereby these signals are transformed into the interpretations of hearers. In other words, psycholinguistics deals directly with the processes of encoding and decoding as they relate states of messages to states of communicators.[20]

More to the point of language acquisition is Chomsky's statement, which points up the need for psychological research:

> How an untutored child can so quickly attain full mastery of a language poses a challenging problem for learning theorists. With diligence, of course, an intelligent adult can use a traditional grammar and a dictionary to develop some degree of mastery of a new language; but a young child gains perfect mastery with incomparably greater ease and without any explicit instruction. Careful instruction and precise programming of reinforcement contingencies do not seem necessary. Mere exposure for a remarkably short time is apparently all that is required for a normal child to develop the competence of a native speaker.[21]

Such research has been begun by psycholinguists, among whom one of the more distinguished young scholars is David McNeill. In a recent paper he too points out the need for more attention to the language acquisition process of children. He says:

> Superficial acquaintance with young children reveals one of the problems with which a theory of language acquisition must be concerned. At the age of eighteen months or so, children begin to form simple two- and three-word sentences. At four, they are able to produce sentences of almost every conceivable syntactic type. In approximately thirty months, therefore, language is acquired, at least that part of it having to do with syntax.[22]

---

asked him this question: "Do you consider psycholinguistics to be important in your work now and in the future?" His answer was an immediate "Very!"

20 Charles E. Osgood and Thomas A. Sebeok (eds.), Psycholinguistics. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1965, p. 4.

21 Noam Chomsky and G. A. Miller, "Introduction to the Formal Analysis of Natural Languages," in Handbook of Mathematical Psychology, eds. R. Luco, R. Bush, and E. Galenter. New York: Wiley, 1963, pp. 275-76.

22 David McNeill, "The Creation of Language by Children," in Psycholinguistic Papers, eds. J. Lyons and R. J. Wales. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1966, p. 99.

And this same paper shows the research McNeill has done, research in support of the hypothesis that children are born with an innate, biologically-based capacity for language acquisition.

Other quotations could be furnished to show that one of the important provinces of research psycholinguistics has entered is language acquisition. And it is through such research that this new discipline can be if immeasurable help to elementary teachers. On the one hand, it will help to reinforce the all-too-easily forgotten fact, indisputable now, that children, by the time they reach school, have acquired an amazing knowledge of the way the language works. They bring to school an excitingly rich language base onto which teachers may build. On the other hand, psycholinguistics will show elementary teachers vividly that the children in their classes are not finished with their language acquisition. Their cognitive development will not be complete until the age of twelve, but they will be in the process of acquiring vocabulary, style, and dialect (each acquiring his own idiolect) for still some time, in the case of some, perhaps, for the remainder of their lives.

Thus, it is here suggested that during their training elementary teachers should become knowledgeable of the underlying forces which made necessary the emergence of psycholinguistics and the goals which psycholinguists have established for their research. Further, an adequate number of papers outlining psycholinguistic research in language acquisition should be assigned to the teachers for close study and for discussion. It is hoped that these teachers, because of interest developed during their training and because of their recognition of the value of psycholinguistic research, will then continue such study and discussion after they have assumed their in-service positions. It is also hoped that such findings from psycholinguistic research which seem pertinent to their attempts to build onto and enrich the language foundations of their pupils will be incorporated into their instructional practices.

DIALECTS AND LINGUISTIC VARIETY

It has been stressed throughout this paper that there is need that the elementary teacher take her pupils where they are in language performance and build onto and enrich such performance. This philosophy of instruction is nowhere more important than in the matter of dialects. This importance has been stated rather strongly only recently:

> A major hurdle for young children with a strong local or social dialect is learning to accommodate to the standard English in which all their books are written. And we now begin to see this as only one of a whole set of language switches that a pupil must gradually learn to make as he copes with new situations and takes on new social roles. The language of home, he learns, differs in significant ways from the language of the classroom; the language of the classroom differs from that of a school assembly; stories differ from talk; textbooks about a new subject may

> appear to have invented a new language. It can all be very puzzling.[23]

Perhaps the word puzzling, as used above, is too soft a term. Frustrating or even excruciating might more nearly describe the feelings of a child who suddenly is made aware that there is something different about his language, and different in the sense of its being wrong or unacceptable. It is time that users of the standard dialect, or what is commonly called the "prestige dialect," become more aware themselves of the paradox that must confront all children who possess a non-standard dialect, such a paradox as is presented clearly in the following statement:

> If he uses the grammatical encoding "I seen him when he done it," we will place him at a relatively low educational and social level--even though (and this is an interesting point) the message comes through just as clearly as if he had said "I saw him when he did it."[24]

It is a mistake--all too commonly made--to think that dialect means only a strangeness in the way words are pronounced, such as "thoity-thoid," spoken by a person from Brooklyn. In addition to the phonological differences, differences in the areas of syntax, morphology, and lexicon may also characterize a dialect. Thus dialect delimits a child's idiolect--his total linguistic performance--and, if it is non-standard, places restraints upon the language which, thus far, he has had so much pleasure in learning, exploring, testing, and expanding. The implications for the training of elementary teachers are numerous and are profound.

To a degree never before anticipated in our nation, the need for giving the elementary teacher an ability to deal with matters of dialect will increasingly be in evidence. Just what method or methods should be used is at the present time not perfectly apparent, and the need for a large corpus of well-designed research is clearly needed in this area. However, what is apparent is that the elementary teacher of the future must be equipped with more specialized training than she is at present. Certainly she should have a good deal of practice in taping, analyzing, describing, and representing her understanding of the grammatical structures and lexicon of a dialect other than her own. This point has been made rather forcefully:

> A very specially trained type of teacher is needed. We cannot assume that teachers trained in traditional methods in language arts are adequately equipped for the new classrooms which the current demands for equal educational opportunities have foisted upon us. We know that proficiency in English and in the methods of teaching it to native speakers does not mean proficiency in

---

23 John Dixon, Growth through English. Reading, England: National Association for the Teaching of English, 1967, p. 16.

24 William G. Moulton, A Linguistic Guide to Language Learning. New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 1966, p. 41.

> teaching it to non-native speakers. . . . What we urgently need today are teachers capable of giving second language instruction in their own classrooms.[25]

It is not clear at this time that the main thrust of training in the areas of dialect should be confined to using the techniques of second language instruction. What is clear, however, is that some type of training should be conceived and offered.

Before any attempt is made here to indicate the type of training that seems best suited for the needs of our times, we should first attempt to isolate the desired end-results of such training. First, it should make teachers aware that a so-called non-standard dialect of English is still English, and in many cases it may present a more true picture of real, deep-rooted American English than does the standard dialect. In addition, there is extreme power over language where the usage is that which has been naturally acquired. Both points represent positive sides of non-standard dialects. Second, it should train teachers to work gradually toward endowing the child with the system of standard oral usage. The absolute harm that can come from the overzealous teacher who instills feelings of disapproval from the beginning has been pointed out rather vividly:

> The child has vocabulary; he has experiences; he has grammar; and he has his culture. Surely these are worth valuing and preserving. Surely these are worth valuing and preserving. Surely these are worth using as a lever to broader, deeper, and richer goals. But more important, perhaps, than the school using what the child brings may be the effect upon the child's self-image of the school's use of what he brings. Dignity and self-respect accompany acceptance of him as he is. Proud of his heritage, he can begin to raise his sights so that his goal will always be just beyond his grasp. On the other hand, if everything he knows is wrong and everything he does is bad, he is apt to close his shell like an oyster and silently drift away to stand against the world of the school rather than with and of it.[26]

Third, and perhaps most important, it should equip teachers with more than just superficial skills in the analysis of dialect and usage. If a child has a dialect which the school decides that it wishes to supplement with other dialects, it is imperative that the teacher's analysis of such features be accurate and defensible. As has been shown above, a great deal is at stake when one attempts to criticize, no matter how constructively, a child's use of the natural language.

---

25 Beryl Loftman Bailey, "Some Basic Assumptions in the Teaching of Standard English to Speakers of Social Dialects," an address made at the Annual Convention of the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, San Antonio, Texas, March, 1968 (mimeographed copy, p. 2).

26 Herbert J. Muller, The Uses of English, op. cit., p. 62.

It is felt that the language course which has been suggested in this paper has the power to equip elementary teachers sufficiently to understand and respond in a creative way with many of the dialects which may confront them. Sound foundations in the phonological, syntactical, and morphological aspects of the English language, plus a knowledge of the scientific approach to language--the approach of modern students of linguistics--will contribute greatly to their ability to make language instruction pleasurable and profitable for all pupils.

And, finally, as such instruction becomes the rule, not the exception, it can be envisioned that a new status can be given to linguistic variety, a characteristic of our nation from the very beginning and one which has contributed so greatly not only to literature but also to man's aspirations here. It would indeed be a mockery of the very purpose of language--i.e. to represent our variety--to impose, in the strictest sense, one language upon all, when we know that the constant changes make it impossible to show precisely what this one language would be like and when we are certain that man's need for variety and individuality is more important than his need for linguistic conformity.

A METHOD OF LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION

The language course which has been suggested here for the training of elementary teachers is based upon the strong belief that changes in language instruction in our schools are not only needed but are imperative. It is further believed that to effect change in instructional methods, we must first effect change in instructional methods, we must first effect change in the training our teachers receive.

In support of these beliefs, the components of the suggested language course have been chosen in an attempt to provide a more specialized type of training. The end has not been to imply that elementary teachers need to become specialists; rather, it has been to indicate the type of training which will enable these teachers to meet more adequately the needs of their pupils.

It is felt that the type of training suggested will lead elementary teachers to a method of language instruction which places great emphasis upon the individual needs of pupils. Various areas of training have been included to prepare teachers to analyze with confidence the language needs of their pupils. Training has also been specified to help teachers to move, again with confidence, from the analysis stage to the crucially important phases of language building and enriching.

The signs are unmistakably clear that all levels of education in the future will make increasing demands upon teachers for a competence of instruction. At no level will such demands be greater than at the elementary level, for it is here that the educational process really begins. The suggested language course will contribute significantly to instructional competence.

A CURRICULUM POSTSCRIPT

The language course which has been suggested in this paper contains the following components:

1. Traditional grammar
2. Transformational grammar
3. Structural phonology
4. Methods of linguistic description
5. Psycholinguistics
6. Dialects

The curriculum implementation of such a course may vary greatly from institution to institution. Some may wish to establish a training program which fits the components into the total undergraduate curriculum of prospective elementary teachers. Others may wish to establish a year-long language course, giving emphasis to all components with special emphasis reserved for those components in which prospective teachers have had no previous training. Still others may wish to consider the course in terms of one and one-half years, with formal training delegated to a year-long language course and intensive application during the student teaching phase. In any case each course should include extensive practicum work in the description of tapes and videotapes of the language, language acquisition, and language behavior of children in Early Childhood Centers and in schools and using the tools for describing the child's language of the six areas listed above. On the basis of such analytic work, a teacher capable of elaborating the rudiments of a language policy for the schools and a teacher capable of herself making a relevant curriculum in such areas as oracy, spelling, and certain aspects of reading, might be trained. It is felt that a course of only one semester's duration, unless it focuses upon no more than one or two components, can accomplish only the superficial type of training that has characterized much of the training in the past.

SOURCES AND REFERENCES

The purpose of this concluding section is to suggest sources which may be used as textbooks for the components of the language course and give a small number of references which may be used to provide background and/or supplement the suggested sources. In the case of references, only those which seem particularly relevant have been given.

Sources

General

Rudolph C. Troike. An Introduction to Linguistics for Teachers of English (forthcoming: late 1968 or early 1969).--With the exception of psycholinguistics, all of the components of the suggested language course are given full, elementary coverage in this text. In addition, the history of the language is skillfully introduced. The selection and the coverage of topics are unusually full in this well-written text.

Dwight Bolinger. Aspects of Language. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1968.--Much briefer than the title above, this book is also very well written and designed to give students an introduction to a very wide range of topics and points of view in the modern study of language. Topics are not covered as fully as in Troike, nor is there as much information about the English language.

Traditional Grammar

Margaret M. Bryant. A Functional English Grammar. Boston: Raytheon Education Co., 1959.--This is a competent presentation in text-book form.

Otto Jespersen. Essentials of English Grammar. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1933 (reprinted by the University of Alabama Press, 1964).--This is perhaps the most readable, short discussion of English grammar from the scholarly traditional point of view. Jespersen's individuality as a serious student of language is clearly marked in this book; this should be a strong asset for the language course, for the scholarly tradition, no less than more recent views, was characterized by diverse points of view among the leading students of language.

Transformational Grammar

Roderick A. Jacobs and Peter S. Rosenbaum. English Transformational Grammar. Walton, Mass.: Blaisdell, 1968.--This is the only possible text that can be recommended at this time. A number of books on transformational grammar are in preparation: their usefulness for this purpose is not yet clear. Each of the previously published presentations are currently less than fully satisfactory: the problems range from simple inadequacy through, and including,

the problem of being, in various measures, out of date. On the other hand, this book is up to date, clear, and pedagogically attractive in its approach to the presentation of transformational views of English grammar.

Structural Phonology

Fortunately, good materials for developing this component are readily accessible. Several textbooks for teaching phonetics and several for teaching English phonology are available. In addition, discussions that are adequate, or very nearly so, for the purposes of this training appear as individual sections in several of the general introductions to linguistics and to the grammar of English. (The phonological sections of Troike's Introduction listed above represent an adequate recommendation.) Further comments will be made below in the listing of reference materials.

Psycholinguistics

Charles E. Osgood and Thomas A. Sebeok (eds.). Psycholinguistics. Bloomington: University of Indiana Press, 1965.--This is probably the most comprehensive and useful of a limited number of works on the subject of psycholinguistics. Included is "A Survey of Psycholinguistic Research, 1954-1964" by A. Richard Diebold, Jr.

Dialects

Carroll E. Reed. Dialects of American English. Cleveland: World Publishing Co., 1967.--This title should fill the need of a special text for the study of dialect. It should be heavily supplemented by material from the list of references, including recorded samples of various dialects.

References

General

H. A. Gleason, Jr. Linguistics and English Grammar. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965.--This work provides a unique and uniquely valuable discussion of language for teachers in the schools and will serve as a rich general reference for instructors. Some valuable collateral reading in this volume could be assigned to students.

Janet A. Emig, James T. Fleming, and Helen M. Popp. Language and Learning, special issue of the Harvard Educational Review, spring, 1964 (printed in revised and expanded form, New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1966).--Contained in this title are several provocative articles that will remain of value for several years.

H. A. Gleason, Jr. An Introduction to Descriptive Linguistics, revised edition. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961.

Charles F. Hockett. A Course in Modern Linguistics. New York: Macmillan, 1958.--This and the immediately preceding work by Gleason are excellent introductory texts in general linguistics.

George L. Trager. Language and Languages. Chicago: Chandler, 1968.--This forthcoming book will contain a valuable discussion of writing as well as a wide range of general topics pertinent to the language course.

Traditional Grammar

The following major reference grammars of the language should be fully available to students. The course should identify and discuss these grammars and should require some research in them by the individual students.

George O. Curme. Parts of Speech and Accidence. Boston: Raytheon Education Co., 1935.

George O. Curme. Syntax. Boston: Raytheon Education Co., 1931.

Otto Jespersen. A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles, 7 vols. Copenhagen: Einer Munksgaard, 1909-1949; reprinted, London: Allen and Unwin, 1954.

Etsko Kruisinga. A Handbook of Present-Day English, fifth edition, 3 vols. Groningen: P. Noordhoff, 1931.

Henrik Poutsma. A Grammar of Late Modern English. Groningen: P. Noordhoff, Part 1, second edition, 1928-1929; Part 2, 1926.

In addition, the following short work is a useful reference:

R. W. Zandvoort. A Handbook of English Grammar, third edition. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1966.

Many scholars have found the following useful as a convenient source of example sentences for discussion and for analysis from other points of view:

Ralph B. Long. The Sentence and Its Parts: A Grammar of Contemporary English. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Some attention might well be given to:

Henry Sweet. A New English Grammar, Logical and Historical, 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1891-1898.

Transformational Grammar:

In the spirit of the comments under this heading in the preceding section, no recommendations beyond the single title already listed can be made. The major works of Noam Chomsky and some closely related studies represent the full bibliography for this topic. Little, if any, of this material should be read by students in this stage of their training.

Structural Phonology

George L. Trager and Henry Lee Smith, Jr. An Outline of English Structure (Studies in Linguistics. Occasional Papers, No. 3), 1951; reprinted, Washington, D. C.: American Council of Learned Societies, 1963. --This is the basic reference for the approach recommended.

Archibald A. Hill. Introduction to Linguistic Structures: From Sound to Sentence in English. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1958.--This is probably the best single sketch of English grammar in the structural tradition. Particularly recommended here is the presentation of phonotactics and the treatment of the phonological system as a system.

W. Nelson Francis. The Structure of American English. New York: Ronald Press, 1958.--There is contained here an excellent presentation of the phonetic details of the Trager-Smith analysis.

The introductory linguistic texts by Gleason, Hockett, and Trager also contain useful discussions of phonology. The Trager-Smith analysis should be compared with and supplemented by

Hans Kurath. A Phonology and Prosody of Modern English. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1964.

and the phonological sections of the dialect materials.

Psycholinguistics

No work beyond the source given above will be listed. It is felt that the bibliographical materials in this source are sufficient for reference purposes.

Dialects

The following publications closely related to the Linguistic Atlas survey of American English are indispensable resources for the study of this component:

Hans Kurath, Marcus L. Hansen, Julia Bloch, and Bernard Bloch. Handbook of the Linguistic Geography of New England. Providence: Brown University Press, 1939; reprinted, American Society of Learned Societies.

Hans Kurath. A Word Geography of the United States. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1949.

E. Bagby Atwood. A Survey of Verb Forms in the Eastern United States. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1953.

Hans Kurath and Raven I. McDavid, Jr. The Pronunciation of English in the Atlantic States. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1961.

It would be valuable, though not essential, to have easy access to

Hans Kurath (director and editor) and others. Linguistic Atlas of New England, 3 vols. in 6. Providence: Brown University Press, 1939-1943.

The best short summary is a chapter written by the following:

Raven I. McDavid, Jr. "The Dialects of American English," Chapter 9 of Francis, The Structure of American English (cited above).

Although this listing of references has been restricted to books, one article is of enough special significance to be included as a resource for instructors of this language course:

E. Bagby Atwood. "The Methods of American Dialectology," Zeitschrift Für Mundartsforchung (1963), Vol. XXX, No. 1, 1-29.

Illustrative of suitable recorded dialect samples are the following:

John T. Muri and Raven I. McDavid, Jr. Americans Speaking (recording with pamphlet). Champaign, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1967.

Evelyn Gott and Raven I. McDavid, Jr. Our Changing Language (recording). New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965.

Regretably, no recommendations can be made in the very important area of social dialect. Only brief, fragmentary treatments have appeared. For the immediate future, teachers in the schools will have to rely on a general understanding of the nature of language and competence as observers of language to establish pertinent facts in their own geographical, socio-economic context.