DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 256 175 FL 015 002

AUTHOR Kachru, Yamuna
TITLE Applied Linguistics and Foreign Language Teaching: A Non-Western Perspective.
PUB DATE [85]
NOTE 27p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Applied Linguistics; Classroom Techniques; *English (Second Language); Language Variation; Material Development; Research Needs; *Second Language Instruction; *Second Language Learning; Sociolinguistics; *Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

Serious basic research leading to adequate descriptions of English and other languages of wider communication around the world in their sociolinguistic contexts is needed. This must be accompanied by applied research in second language acquisition and innovative research in teaching methodology and curriculum and materials development. With the present state of knowledge regarding what makes language learning possible, it is more useful to encourage different methodologies, both familiar and new, rather than reject any as outdated. Different methods and classroom practices use different areas and pathways of the brain and result in greater success in learning. From a non-western perspective, these are the challenges that applied linguistics and foreign language pedagogy face today. (Author/MSE)

APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING; A NON-WESTERN PERSPECTIVE

Yamuna Kachru
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Introduction

The field of foreign and/or second language teaching is so vast that it may be useful, at the outset, to indicate the exact context of my discussion. First, I will not make any distinction between foreign and second language teaching: This distinction is not very clear-cut from the perspective of a majority of non-Western countries. I will return to this point later. Secondly, as the issues arise, I will refer to second language acquisition, second language learning, and second language teaching.[1] All three are related in the context of language education. Thirdly, I will confine myself to posing some questions for applied linguistics and language teaching. I am particularly concerned with the theoretical framework in second language acquisition research, and the methodology of second language teaching.

Second vs. Foreign Language

First, let me address the question of second vs. foreign language. It is true that historically speaking, for example, English and French are foreign languages in several parts of the world where they were introduced by the colonial powers. The countries where these two languages are used in

the present post-colonial era are referred to as Anglophone and Francophone, respectively. In these nations, English and French are no longer foreign languages, they are used intranationally for purposes such as administration, education, and legal services. Hence, they are the most prominent second languages in these countries. Nations where English has become a prominent second language are listed in 1 below:

1. Non-English mother tongue countries where English has official status:

Botswana	Nauru
Burma	Nigeria
Camroon	Pakistan
Ethiopia	Philippines
Fiji	Sierra Leone
Gambia	Singapore
Ghana	*South Africa
India	Sri Lanka
Israel	Sudan
Kenya	Swaziland
Lesotho	Tanzania
Liberia	Tonga
Malawi	Uganda
Malaysia	Western Samoa
Malta	Zambia
Mauritius	Zimbabwe
Namibia	

(Fishman, Cooper and Conrad 1977: 10,12)

(*The language situation is quite complex in South Africa, but is not relevant to our discussion)

What is true of English in the above countries is true of French in the Francophone countries of Africa. In the following countries of Africa, French is the medium of education and hence, of administration, etc.:

2. Former French colonies where French is the medium of education:

Algeria	Mali
Benin	Mauritania

Burundi	Morocco
Central African Republic	Niger
Chad	Rwands
Congo	Senegal
Djibouti	Togo
Gabon	Tunisia
Guinea	United Rep. of Cameroon
Ivory Coast	Upper Volta
Madagaskar	Zaire

(Bokamba 1985)

What is true of English and French in the countries listed in 1 and 2 above is true of Spanish and Portuguese in Latin America. Since I am most familiar with the Anglophone parts of the world, my subsequent discussion will focus on English in non-native contexts. I will particularly concentrate on English as a Second Language (ESL) as a representative case of second/foreign language teaching. This is perfectly justifiable on the grounds that a great deal of research in the area of Second Language Acquisition (SLA) is devoted to ESL all over the world.

SLA research: The state of the art

As regards the paradigms of research in the field of second language acquisition, this area has been approached from four major standpoints in the past three decades. The first approach took the position that one's first or native language either helps or hinders one in learning a subsequent language. Therefore, a careful comparison of the structures of the native and target languages is essential for effective language teaching. This approach, known as the CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS HYPOTHESIS, was advocated by such well-known linguists and langauge educators as Charles Fries and

Robert Lado (Fries 1945 and Lado 1957). A number of contrastive analyses of well-known languages appeared and it was taken for granted that materials based on them would lead to better success in language learning. Good examples of such contrastive analyses are the works published by the University of Chicago Press on Spanish - English (Stockwell and Bowen 1965 and Stockwell, Bowen and Martin 1965), German-English (Moulton 1962 and Kufner 1962) and Italian-English (Agard and Di Pietro 1965, 2 vols.). The bibliographies published by the Center for Appled Linguistics list several contrastive studies involving almost all major languages of the world (e.g., Gage 1961 and Hammer and Rice 1965).

Soon, however, disillusionment set in and experienced language teachers as well as researchers began to point out that contrastive analysis had limited predictive value. It was argued that simply on the basis of a comparison of the native and target languages, teachers will not be able to identify what causes most difficulty in learning the various sounds, words, and sentence patterns of a given target language. The errors that the learners make are not always what contrastive analysis predicts: It is not always the case that the errors made by the learners have their source in their native languages (e.g., Lee 1968, Duskova 1969). Researchers also pointed out that some of the errors learners make are similar to, or even identical with, the errors made by children learning the target language as their first language (e.g., Ravem 1968 and 1974).

Emphasis thereafter naturally shifted to the learner errors. Studies by Corder (1967 and 1971), Dulay and Burt (1974) and others pointed out that systematic errors provide clues to the progress that learners make in their learning task. Hence, ERROR ANALYSIS is more relevant as compared to contrastive analysis as the paradigm of research in second language learning (e.g., Dulay and Burt 1974).

The emphasis on learner-centered approaches soon resulted in a more comprehensive framework for studying second language learning or acquisition. The new approach incorporated the techniques of contrastive analysis and error analysis and became known as the INTERLANGUAGE HYPOTHESIS (Selinker 1972). This hypothesis stipulated that systematic learner errors provide clues to the process of learning. A periodic study of such errors, and a comparison of learner performance in the target language with the native and target language systems, will identify the successive stages of learning. At each stage, learners have an interlanguage system that is different from their native as well as the target language system that they are attempting to acquire. A learner progresses through several stages of interlanguage before acquiring competence in the target language. In a majority of cases of adult learners, native -like competence in the target language is difficult to achieve. Even at the most advanced stages of the interlanguage, adult learners have traces of fossilization of their native language, or of an interlanguage, feature in their target language system. The interlanguage hypothesis, incorporating the insights of

earlier approaches and concepts such as fossilization, is by now well-established.

The interlanguage hypothesis represents a general acceptance of the assumption that second language learning is similar to first language acquisition (Dulay and Burt 1976). This in turn has led to ivestigations of learner errors in terms of language universals. It is claimed that an explanation for errors in learner performance can be found if it could be established that it is the marked structures of the target language that cause learning problems (Eckman 1977). An example of this phenomenon is the following: Relative clause formation in English is marked in the sense that it involves, in addition to the use of appropriate relative pronouns, the fronting of the relative pronoun and hence a change in word order within the relative clause. For instance, in the sentence I would like to see the book which you recently bought, the relative pronoun which is understood as referring to the object of the verb buy, and yet the word order is not you bought which. As a consequence of the front shifting of the relative pronoun, the structure becomes complex and difficult to acquire from the point of view of a learner. As this hypothesis is attractive to researchers interested in linguistic universals, it has been adopted by a number of them.

Recent trends in SLA research

This emphasis on linguistic structure to explain language learning was not acceptable to all. A number of

researchers proceeded to demonstrate that language learning and teaching do not involve language structure only. Rather, successful language learning involves competence in communicating one's ideas, beliefs, needs, etc., in various types of linguistic interactions.

The activities of the Council of Europe dealing with the problem of teaching European languages to immigrant workers in Western Europe and Britain ultimately resulted in the development of a new approach labelled COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE TEACHING. According to this approach, what language teaching and learning have to deal with is the use of language in social interactions rather than a mere mastery of the skills of pronunciation, grammatical structures, vocabulary, etc. The main issue in teaching is how to equip the learners with the capability to use the target language appropriately in various social situations to achieve their communicative goals. This approach and related methodology were first proposed in Wilkins (1976) and later elaborated in Munby (1978). By now, the communicative approach to language teaching has gained wide acceptance on both sides of the Atlantic.[3] It should, however, be noted here that the underlying theoretical and methodological insights for these approaches were provided by linguists and sociolinguists such as J.R. Firth, Dell Hymes and M.A.K. Halliday.

SLA: A non-Western perspective

Approaching second language teaching and learning from a non-Western perspective opens up a whole new range of issues

not normally addressed in the approaches discussed above. The issues of literacy and language in education are inextricably tied in with the issue of language teaching and learning in those areas of the world where English, French, Portuguese, and Spanish are the media of education without necessarily being the native languages. In Ivory Coast, Kenya, Singapore and South Asia, to name just a few nations, it is not a question of teaching French or English as a second language, but a question of teaching literacy skills, mathematics, sciences, history, etc., through French or English. Thus, the whole issue of teaching a second language is linked with questions of language policy and planning (See ARAL 4, 1983 for a discussion of literacy in several regions of the world, and Rubin and Jernudd 1975 and Cobarrubias and Fishman 1983 for questions of language policy and planning in developed and developing countries).

It is worth noting that in a majority of the nations of the non-Western world (e.g., the ones listed in 1 and 2 above), it is not a question of 'bilingualism or not' (Skutnaab-Kangas 1984), as is clear from the data in 3 below:

3. Language profile of selected countries of the non-western world:

a. India: Number of mother tongues reported in the census: 1652. These belong to four language families: Indo-Aryan, Dravidian, Austro-Asiatic and Sino-Tibetan.
Official languages: Hindi and English.
Media of higher education: sixteen major languages and English.

Kenya: Four major languages: Swahili, Gikuyu and

Lubya (Bantu family) and Luo (Nilotic family).
Official languages: Swahili and English.
Medium of higher education: English.

Singapore: Three major ethnic groups: Chinese, Malay and Tamil.
Languages: several Chinese dialects, malay, Tamil.
Official languages: Mandarin, Malay Tamil, and English.
Medium of higher education: English.

It is clear from the above that a majority of the population in these countries is bi-/multilingual and has been for centuries. Thus, concerns of bi-/multilingualism are extremely relevant for research on second language acquisition from the point of view of these countries.

The case of non-native varieties of English

I would like to elaborate on these concerns with one example. The case in point is that of English around the world. In many of the countries where English is used either as an official language, as a language of higher education, or for international trade and commerce, diplomacy, etc., varieties of English have developed which are not identical with the native varieties used in Australia, Britain, Canada, New Zealand and the United States of America (See Bailey and Gorlach 1982, B. Kachru 1982, 1983, Platt, Weber and Ho 1984, Smith 1987, among others, for details regarding these varieties). In some of these varieties, there is a considerable body of creative literature. The perceptions of some of the users of these varieties is given in 3 below:

3.a. Most Singaporeans recognize the fact that they speak English differently from the so-called "native speakers" of English. ... They accept these differences but are quite content to speak English their "own" way as long as they can be understood by fellow-Singaporeans and foreigners.

(Richards and Tay 1981: 54)

b. I feel that the English language will be able to carry the weight of my African experience. But it will have to be a new English, still in communion with its ancestral home but altered to suit its new African surroundings.

(Achebe 1965: 30)

c. I am an Indian, very brown, born in
Malabar, I speak three languages, write in
Two, dream in one. Don't write in English, they said,
English is not your mother-tongue. Why not leave
Me alone, critics, friends, visiting cousins,
Everyone of you? Why not let me speak in
Any language I like? The language I speak
Becomes mine, its distortions, its queernesses,
All mine, mine alone. It is half English, half
Indian, funny perhaps, but it is honest,
It is as human as I am human, don't
You see? It voices my joys, my longings, my
Hopes, and it is useful to me as cawing
Is to crows or roaring to lions, it
Is human speech, the speech of the mind that is
Here and not there, amind that sees and hears and
Is aware. Not the deep, blind speech
of trees in storm or of monsoon clouds or of rain or the
Incoherent mutterings of the blazing
Funeral pyre. ...

(Das 1980: 38-39)

Some of the linguistic features that make these non-native varieties different from the native varieties of English are given in 4 below (See B. Kachru 1982, Platt, Weber and Ho 1984, Smith 1981, amomg others, for details):

4. Phonology

Different stress placement in words (the syllable preceding ' is stressed)

a. Filipino: laborato'ry, chara'cterized, circu'mstances

b. Singaporean: facu'lty, educa'ted, conte'xt, prefere'nce

c. Indian: de'velopment, chara'cter

d. Nigerian: su'ccess, recogni'ze, investiga'te

(Lowenberg 1984b)

Lexicon

a. Singaporean: Handicaps on our island republic get stares wherever they go. (Lowenberg 1984b)

b. Indian: What are the subjects you offered at B.A.? (Lowenberg 1984b)

c. Ghanian: He does not use a chewing stick to clean his teeth. (Lowenberg 1984b)

d. East African: He ove listened to the boy's conversation. (Hancock and Angogo 1982: 318)

Syntax

A. Countability of non-count nouns:

a. Filipino: He has many luggages. (Gonzales 1983)

b. Singaporean: Give me a chalk. (Lowenberg 1984b)

c. Nigerian: I lost all my furnitures and many valuable properties. (Bokamba 1982: 82)

d. Indian: There are historical as well as synchronic evidences which can support separating of aspiration from stops.

(IL 35:3, 1976: 230)

B. Resumptive pronouns:

a. Arab: the time I spent it in practice

b. Chinese: We put them in boxes we call them rice boxes. (Schachter 1976)

c. Nigerian: The politicians and their supporters, they don't often listen to advice. (Bamgbose 1982: 106)

C. Tenses:

a. Singaporean: Are you feeling lonely. bored or having no time to get friends? (SM July 7, 1984: 5)

b. Indian: You are all knowing, friends, what sweetness is in Miss Pushpa. (Ezekiel 1976)

Interlanguage or bilingual's creativity?

The above examples and similar data from non-native varieties of English give rise to several questions. The first question is whether the differences observable in the data are due to overgeneralization of target language features or transfer from the native languages. The difficulty is that this question is not easy to answer. To take one example, there is no consistent semantic basis for marking the count/ non-count distinction in English nouns, especially in the case of collective and abstract nouns. In such cases, learners simply follow the conventions of their own native languages (cf. examples in A above). Similarly, in the case of resumptive pronouns (cf. examples in B above), Schachter and Celce-Murcia (1980) argue that such structures in the performance of Chinese and Japanese learners are motivated by the topic-comment structure of their native languages. Hatch (1978b) claims the same about the use of articles (a, an and the) in the English of Spanish speakers. In Hatch 1978b, it has been pointed out that an analysis of total texts produced by Spanish speakers reveals the fact that these learners follow the Spanish convention of use of indefinite and definite articles in their English. This learner strategy leads to fewer errors in the use of the, but a greater number of errors in the use of a/an.

The following examples from various localized forms of English provide further support for the claim that learners follow the discourse conventions of their native languages which results in their using specific grammatical devices of English in a non-native fashion:[6]

Discourse

a. Indian:

> ... The position has belonged to such actresses who come to personify, at any given moment, the popular ideal of physical beauty ... (IT, September 30, 1983: 39)
>
> ... They are brought up in such an atmosphere where they are not encouraged to express themselves upon such subjects in front of others ... (HLI: 194-195)

The use of such as a correlative of who and where in the above examples reflects the conventions of use of cohesive ties (Halliday and Hasan 1976) in Indian languages such as Bengali, Hindi, Marathi, Punjabi and others.

This leads to a further question: if the features identified as unique to non-native varieties of English are motivated by discourse considerations, as has been demonstrated in studies such as Chishimba (1983), B. Kachru (1982, 1983, 1984), Y. Kachru (1982, 1983, 1984), Lowenberg (1984a), Magura (1984), among others, then how can they be considered instances of fossilization? How can we distinguish cases that exemplify discourse strategies from cases that provide evidence for fossilization? What theoretical justification, if any, is there for characterizing features of non-native varieties as fossilization and of the varieties themselves as interlanguages? Which

characteristics of the non-native varieties, as encountered in creative literature or mature writing (i.e., by journalists, critics, authors, etc.), are to be treated as illustrations of bilingual's creativity as opposed to fossilization, overgenralization, or ignorance of rule restrictions? These questions are serious; they can not be pushed under the rug. As has been stated above, most of the institutionalized non-native varieties are being used in their respective regions as media of higher education, administration, and for social interaction. To label them interlanguages denies vast populations of these countries a legitimate language for conducting their business.

Obviously, the question of a model of English for education and other purposes is crucial for the non-Western world (B. Kachru 1976 and 1982). As far as the users of the non-native varieties themselves are concerned, they are not in favor of a 'foreign' model, as is clear from the following tables:

5. a. Variety of English presently spoken by educated speakers:

		Singaporeans %	Indians %	Thais %
1.	British	40.5	27.4	6.5
2.	American	6.0	3.2	28.1
3.	Australian	0.6	0.0	0.0
4.	Unique	42.3	50.6	40.3
5.	Others	10.6	18.8	25.1

b. The variety that we should learn to speak:

		Singaporeans %	Indians %	Thais %
1.	British	38.3	28.5	49.1
2.	American	14.4	12.0	31.6
3.	Australian	0.6	0.3	0.3
4.	Own way	38.9	47.4	3.5
5.	Others	7.8	11.8	15.5

(Shaw 1981: 119-120)

(These results were obtained in a survey conducted among final year Bachelor degree students in Singapore, Hyderabad (India), and Bangkok (Thailand). There were 170 Singaporean, 342 Indian, and 313 Thai students.)

c. Indian graduate students' self-labeling of their English:

Identity marker	%
American English	2.58
British English	29.11
Indian English	55.64
'Mixture' of all these	2.99
I don't know	8.97
"Good" English	.27

(B. Kachru 1976: 232)

(Kachru 1976 presents the results of a survey carried out in India that involved 700 Bachelor and Master's degree students in English, and 196 members of faculty and 29 heads of departments of English.)

It is clear from the above data that unlike the countries where English is used only for international purposes (e.g., Thailand), the institutionalized variety users prefer to characterize their English as their "own" rather than to conform to some "native" English norm. The tables in 5 support the sentiments expressed by scholars and creative writers in 3 above.

Communicative needs and the uses of English

Looked at from the point of view of communicative needs of the users of the localized forms of English, it is clear that the adoption of these varieties as models for teaching and learning in their respective regions is entirely justifiable. The differences that these varieties exhibit serve specific socio-cultural needs such as satisfying certain conventions of linguistic interaction, whether through an oral or written mode. The following excerpt from an Iraqi news report demonstrates this dramatically:

6. In the name of God, the merciful, the compassionate.

> Great Iraqi people, sons of the glorious Arab nations, it has been known to us from the beginning that many parties local international, were and still are behind the eagerness of the backward and suspect Iranian regime to stir up the dispute with, and conduct aggression against and begin the war against Iraq.

(from B. Kachru 1982: 340)

The above are the opening paragraphs of an official statement about the destruction of the Iraqi Osirak nuclear reactor by the Israeli forces in June 1981. The point of the story - the attack by Israeli forces - is mentioned in one sentence after five such short paragraphs. Such elaborate build ups before coming to the point of a story is not unique to Iraqi Arabic. To quote Chishimba, "In the cultures of Africa, loquacity, ambiguity, redundancy, obscurity and other strategies of verbal discourse are markers of wisdom, age, knowledgeability , sex, and other socially relevant criteria." (Chishimba 1982: 246-247).

What is suggested is that the unique features of non-native varieties deserve to be treated as evidence for bilingual's creativity rather than as evidence for fossilization (a la Selinker 1972), ignorance of rule restrictions, deficiency, etc. In cases where such features occur in literary texts, we have less difficulty in accepting them as stylistic innovations (Nelson 1984a, 1984b). In case of expository prose or ordinary speech, however, there is an attitudinal factor that labels such innovations "un-English". Considering the range of variation in dialects within a native English -speaking country, and in varieties across different native English-speaking countries, it is not unreasonable to suggest that certain features of non-native varieties be accepted as legitimate variations. After all, the non-native variations in 7 below are no more severe than the native ones:

7. British: Have you had your holiday yet?
American: Did you have your vacation yet?
(Strevens 1977: 149)

British: different from, to
American: different than
(Strevens 1977: 150)

Singaporean: So you have to go turn by turn.
(Platt, Weber and Ho 1983: 48)

African: ...we are seven and a half million strong and quite a number of these can not get jobs to do, so we should cut down on bringing forth.
(Bokamba 1982: 88)

Indian: The concept of idiolect I do not know if people still talk about it.
(IL 35:3, 1974: 229)

This entails a new theoretical framework for research that starts with the assumption that people learn languages in order to fulfill certain communicative needs which may not coincide with the needs of the native speakers of the target language. Consequently, second language users develop their own strategies which result in differences at each level of the target language structure as well as conventions of its use. Second language acquisition research thus has to take into account the findings of research in bi-/ multilingualism.

Issues in methodology

As regards the question of methodology, several methods have been proposed, adopted for a short time, and discarded as the fashions change in second language pedagogy (Richards 1984).[7] Very little empirical evidence is available to support the claims of effectiveness for any particular method, and yet, a great deal of resource is invested in following 'the trend' in ESL classrooms. In the eighties, there is a definite shift from the audio-lingual method to the communicative approach in the classroom, but, unfortunately, neither approach, as currently conceptualized, takes any notice of the situation in non-Western countries. The following is typical of many of the countries listed in 1 and 2 above:

8. Teaching English in Gambia:

a. General teacher information:

Gender	Qualifications	Qualifications by gender
67% male	27% qualified	28% men qualified
33% female	73% unqualified	25% women qualified

b. Bi-/multilingualism:

Average teacher speaks 2.8 languages, one of which is English.

34% bilingual, 48% trilingual, 15% speak four languages, 3% speak five languages.

c. Patterns of language use: English used for banking; in linguistic interaction with the head teacher and other teachers; in teaching mathematics, sciences, social studies; in praising children for their performance; occasionally in interacting with the parents of the children; occasionally in interacting with one's spouse, children and friends.

(Bowcock 1984)

There is an urgent need for research in the area of suitable methodology for language teaching in crowded, sparsely equipped classrooms as compared to the type of classrooms we are familiar with. Recently, a group of English teachers and teacher trainers from selected non-Western countries visited a number of TESL programs at U.S. universities. Their typical concerns were as follows:

9. Pakistan: (college-level teaching)

Two of her biggest problems are large classes (100-200 students) and lack of sophisticated resources. She would like to learn as much as she can about strategies for teaching large classes and where to find (or how to make) inexpensive visual aids.

Sudan: (high school teacher training)

60-80 students are often in one class; what can be learned on this trip to help teach in this environment?

One can always take the position that these are

impossible situations and ignore the whole question. As applied linguists, teacher trainers, teachers, and educators, however, I hope we accept the challenge instead.

Conclusion

In conclusion, we need serious, basic research that will lead us to adequate descriptions of English and other languages of wider communication around the world in their varied sociolinguistic contexts. This has to be accompanied by applied research in second language acquisition, and innovative research in teaching methodology and curriculum and materials development. At the present state of our knowledge regarding what makes second language learning possible, it is more useful to encourage different methodologies, both tried and familiar methods as well as new ones, rather than to throw out any as being out-dated. As suggested in Diller (1981), different methods and classroom practices utilize different areas and different pathways of the brain and result in better success in learning. From a non-Western perspective, these are the challenges that applied linguistics and foreign language pedagogy face today.

NOTES

1. Theoretically speaking, a distinction is made between second language learning and second language acquisition. Second language learning is said to be a conscious process that involves instruction whereas second language acquisition is characterized as a natural, unconscious process. Learning and acquisition are both learner-centered as opposed to teaching, which is teacher-centered and does not take into account factors related to learners such as age, attitude, motivation, the difference between input (provided in the classroom) vs. intake (internalized by the learner), etc. There is, however, some doubt as to whether the distinction between learning and acquisition is so clear-cut (Diller 1981).

2. See Sridhar 1980 for an insightful discussion of contrastive analysis, error analysis and interlanguage.

3. This is clear from recent publications meant for language teachers (and teacher trainers), e.g., Widdowson 1978, Brumfit and Johnson 1979, Finnochiaro and Brumfit 1983, and Savignon 1983.

4. 'Bilingualism or not' is the main title of Skutnaab-Kangas 1984 which contains a detailed discussion of the problem of minority education in Europe. The need for guest workers or immigrant laborers in the industrialized nations of Europe has created a situation where it is becoming increasingly obvious that the immigrant workers and, more importantly, their children have to have access to bilingual education if these nations are to avoid a great deal of social and political unrest.

5. I do not mean to suggest that <u>all attested differences</u> between native and non-native varieties are motivated by discourse considerations. Obviously, non-native varieties, too, just like the native varieties, have a range of dialect variation (e.g., basilect, mesolect and acrolect in Singapore discussed in Lowenberg 1984). Also, in any body of attested data, it is likely that there will be a number of 'mistakes', whether the data is from a native or a non-native variety. What I am concerned with here is the variation that is due to discourse considerations. Most such innovations in non-native varieties result from restricting or extending the domains of specific devices of English, e.g., in the example in 4 under <u>discourse</u>, Indian English extends the function of <u>such</u> to a correlative of the relative pronouns <u>who</u> and <u>where</u>. It is worth remembering that <u>such</u> does function as a correlative in the constructions <u>such as</u> and <u>such that</u>.

6. See Davidson 1980 for a description and illustration of various methods practiced currently in the ESL classrooms.

REFERENCES

Achebe, Chinua. 1965. English and the African writer. Transition 4 (18): 27-30.

Agard, F.B. and R. Di Pietro. 1965. The sounds of English and Spanish. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Agard, F. B. and R. Di Pietro. 1965. The grammatical structures of English and Spanish. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Bailey, R. and M. Gorlach. 1982. English as a world Language. Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press.

Bamgbose, Ayo. 1982. Standard Nigerian English: Issues of Identification. In B. Kachru 1982. 99-111.

Bokamba, Eyamba. 1982. The Africanization of English. In B. Kachru 1982. 77-98.

Bokamba, Eyamba. 1985. French colonial language policy in Africa and its legacies. To appear in K. Williamson. ed. Language in African Education. Amsterdam, Holland. The John Benjamin Publications.

Bowcock, Diane. 1984. Teacher attitudes about language usage in Gambian schools. Paper presented at the Conference on Language, Literacy and Communications in Africa, Fifth Annual Roundtable of African Studies Program. University of Illinois, Urbana, November 1-2, 1984.

Brumfit, C. and K. Johnson. 1979. Communicative approaches to language teaching. Oxford University Press.

Chishimba, Maurice. 1982. African varieties of English: Text in context. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois.

Cobarrubias, Juan and J.A. Fishman. eds. 1983. Progress in language planning. The Hague, Mouton.

Corder, Stephen P. 1967. The significance of learner's errors. IRAL 5. 161-170.

Corder, Stephen P. 1971. Idiosyncratic dialects and error analysis. IRAL 9. 147-159.

Croft, Kenneth. ed. 1980. Readings in English as a second language for teachers and teacher trainees. Cambridge, Mass., Winthrop. (2nd edition)

Das, Kamla. 1980. An Introduction. In K. N. Daruwala. ed. 1980. Two decades of Indian poetry: 1960-80. Bombay, India. Vikas Publishing House.

Davidson, David M. 1980. Current approaches to the teaching of grammar in ESL. In Croft 1980. 317-338.

Diller, Karl. 1981. Natural methods of foreign language teaching: Can they exist? What criteria must they meet? In H. Wintz. ed. Native and foreign language acquisition. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences. Vol. 379. 75-86.

Dulay, Heidi C. and M.K. Burt. 1974. You can't learn without goofing: An analysis of children's second language errors. In Richards 1974. 95-123.

Dulay, Heidi C. and M.K. Burt. 1976. Creative construction in second language teaching and learning. In H.D. Brown. ed. Papers in second language acquisition. Ann Arbor, MI, University of Michigan Press. 65-80.

Duskova, L. 1969. On the sources of errors in foreign language learning. IRAL 7: 11-30.

Eckman, Fred. 1977. Markedness and the contrastive analysis hypothesis. LL 27: 315-330.

Ezekiel, Nissim. 1976. Goodbye party for Miss Pushpa T.S. In R. Parthasarathy. ed. Ten twentieth century Indian poets. Oxford University press.

Finnochiaro, M. and C. Brumfit. 1983. The functional-notional approach. Oxford University Press.

Fishman, Joshua A., R.L. Cooper and A.W. Conrad. eds. The spread of English. Rowley, Mass., Newbury House.

Fries, Charles C. 1945. Teaching and learning English as a foreign language. Ann Arbor, MI. University of Michigan Press.

Gage, William. 1961. Contrastive studies in linguistics: A bibliographical checklist. Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, D.C.

Gonzales, Andrew. 1983. When does an error become a feature of Philippino English? In R.B. Noss. ed. Varieties of English in South-East Asia. Singapore, RELC. 150-172.

Halliday, M.A.K. and R. Hasn. 1976. Cohesion in English. London, Longman.

Hammer, John and F.A. Rice. 1965. A bibliography of contrastive linguistics. Center for applied linguistics, Washington, D.C.

Hancock, Ian F. and R. Angogo. 1982. English in East Africa. In Bailey and Gorlach 1982. 306-323.

Hatch, Evelyn M. ed. 1978a. Second language acquisition: A book of Readings. Rowley, Mass., Newbury House.

Hatch, Evelyn M. 1978b. Discourse analysis and second language acquisition. In Hatch 1978a. 401-435.

Kachru, Braj B. 1976. Models of English for the third world: White man's linguistic burden or language pragmatics? TESOL Quarterly 10: 221-239.

Kachru, Braj B. ed. 1982. The other tongue: English across cultures. Urbana, IL., University of Illinois Press. (Also published in paperback by Pergamon Press, 1983).

Kachru, Braj B. 1983. The Indianization of English: The English language in India. Oxford University Press.

Kachru, Braj B. 1984. The alchemy of English: The spread, functions and models of non-native Englishes. Pergamon Press. (in press)

Kachru, Yamuna. 1982. Linguistics and written discourse in particular languages: English and Hindi. ARAL 3: 50-77.

Kachru, Yamuna. 1983. Cross-cultural texts, discourse strategies and discourse interpretation. To appear in L. Smith. ed. Discourse across cultures; Strategies in World Englishes. Pergamon Press.

Kachru, Yamuna. 1984. Discourse strategies, pragmatics and ESL: Where are we going? Paper presented at RELC, Singapore, August 14, 1984.

Kufner, H.L. 1962. The grammatical structures of English and German. Chicago, University of Chicago press.

Lado, Robert. 1957. Linguistics across cultures. Ann Arbor, MI., University of Michigan Press.

Lee, W.R. 1968. Thoughts on contrastive linguistics in the context of foreign language teaching. In James E. Alatis. ed. Contrastive linguistics and its pedagogical implications. Georgetown Monograph on languages and linguistics 21. Georgetwon University, Washington, D.C. 185-194.

Lowenberg, Peter. 1984a. English in the Malay Archipelago: Nativization and its functions in a sociolinguistic area. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois.

Lowenberg, Peter. 1984b. Non-native varieties of English: New challenges for TESL. Presented at the Illinois TESOL/BE Central-Southern Regional Conference. February 4, 1984.

Magura, Benjamin. 1984. Style and meaning in African English: A sociolinguistic study. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois.

Moulton, W.G. 1962. The sounds of English and German. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Munby, John. 1978. Communicative syllabus design. Cambridge University Press.

Nelson, Cecil. 1984a. Intelligibility: The case of non-native varieties of English. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois.

Nelson, Cecil. 1984b. My language, your culture: Whose communicative competence? Paper presented at the joint AAAL/ACTFL Conference, Chicago, November 16, 1984.

Platt, John, H. Weber and Ho M.L. 1984. The new Englishes. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Ravem, Roar. 1968. Language acquisition in a second language environment. IRAL 6: 175-185.

Ravem, Roar. 1974. The development of wh- questions in first and second language learners. In Richards 1974. London, Longman. 134-155.

Richards, Jack C. ed. 1974. Error analysis: Perspectives on second language learning. London, Longman.

Richards, Jack C. 1984. The secret life of methods. TESOL Quarterly 18: 7-21.

Richards, Jack C. and Mary Tay. 1981. Norm and variability in language use and language learning. In Smith 1981. 40-56.

Rubin, Joan and B. Jernudd. eds. 1975. Can language be planned? Honolulu, University Press of Hawaii.

Savignon, Sandra. 1983. Communicative competence: Theory and classroom practice. Reading, Mass., Addison-Wesley.

Schachter, J. and M. Celce-Murcia. 1980. Some reservations concerning error analysis. In Croft 1980. 120-131.

Selinker, Larry. 1972. Interlanguage. IRAL 10: 201-231.

Shaw, Willard D. 1981. Asian student attitudes towards English. In Smith 1981. 108-122.

Skutnaab-Kangas, Tove. 1984. Bilingualism or not: The education of minorities. Clevedon, Avon. Multilingual Matters.

Smith, Larry. ed. 1981. English for cross-cultural communication. London, Macmillan.

Smith, Larry. ed. 1983. Readings in English as an international language. Pergamon press.

Sridhar, S.N. 1980. Contrastive analysis, error analysis and interlanguage: Three phases of one goal. In Croft 1980. 91-119.

Stockwell, Robert and J.D. Bowen. 1965. The sounds of English and Spanish. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Stockwell, Robert, J.D. Bowen and J.W. Martin. 1965. The grammatical structures of English and Spanish. chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Strevens, Peter. 1977. New orientations in the teaching of English. Oxford University Press.

Strevens, peter. 1981. Teaching English as an international language. Pergamon Press.

Widdowson, H. 1978. Teaching language as communication. Oxford University press.

Wilkins, D. 1976. Notional syllabuses; A contribution to foreign language curriculum. Oxford University Press.

ADDITIONAL SOURCES FOR DATA

HLI = Singh, Amrik and P.G. Altbach. eds. The higher learning in India. Bombay, Vikas Publishing House.

IL = Indian Linguistics, the journal of the Linguistic Society of India.

IT = India Today, a bimonthly magazine, comparable to Time. The quotes in this paper are from the overseas edition.