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Foreword

Over the years it has become a custom to welcome, in the foreword, incoming editors and say farewell to those moving on. In this issue, I would like to praise the unfailing commitment and professionalism of all the past and present editors, associate editors, the immediate past senior editor and the production team, who have toiled tirelessly to bring out each issue, and I would like to thank them for the expertise and time they have given so generously and voluntarily.

In its four years of existence, *The Linguistics Journal* has firmly established itself in a niche area of linguistic study and has given a powerful voice not exclusively but mainly to non-Western scholars and researchers, contributing to our knowledge about and understanding of non-European languages and sociolinguistic contexts, often in a comparative framework.

In an inclement economic climate the future of this open access journal is uncertain, but it is hoped that it will be able to continue to serve the ever growing community of its scholarly readers.

The current issue brings together a varied selection of articles. Yusuf analyses the pragmatic functions of code-switching from Malay to English by a teacher in a bilingual classroom. Her data from over a hundred students of varied ethnicities show that code-switching in the classroom context has a number of different functions, the most frequent instances being the insertion of loanwords into speech when no L1 equivalent exists, and code-switching to ensure accurate understanding of general concepts in a specific area of study.

Buyukkarci examines *and* as discourse marker and conjunction in the speech of Turkish speakers of English. He analyses spontaneous monologues and concludes that Turkish speakers’ productions show evidence that they use *and* in both these functions.

Das studies the phonological differences of the aspirated stops and */h/* in two speech varieties of Bangla: the standard dialect and the non-standard Hooghly dialect, which are mutually intelligible. He shows how an optimality-theoretic analysis can account for the distribution pattern of aspitated stops and
/h/ in these two varieties. He also demonstrates that the result of his analysis strengthens the typological implication of the analysis applied.

Al-Harbi examines the applicability of Grice’s Cooperative Principle and its maxims to jarginising and abstracting strategies. Through exploring the use, effect and role of jargon and abstraction in English political discourse during the “War on Terror,” he demonstrates how the attitude of the speaker may, at the same time, be both embodied in and revealed by such linguistic tools.

Karimi and Sadighi address the question whether it is possible to detach the knowledge of lexicon from syntax. They give an account of the structuralist continuum with generativist linguistics highlighting government and binding at one end, and those advocating the disintegration of the two elements on the other. Their study aims to test these two structuralist theories regarding the nature of lexicon-syntax integration or isolation on subjects’ verbal accounts of task performance. Based on their data they conclude that lexicon is an active component of grammar.

Wang and Cheng examine the factors affecting teachers in the implementation of English as a foreign language (EFL) curriculum. The data collected via a structured questionnaire from over two hundred EFL teachers at six universities in China show that there are six significant external and internal factors that predict teachers’ curriculum implementation. Wang and Cheng conclude that curriculum implementation in the Chinese EFL context is of a complex nature and successful implementation requires teachers to play multifaceted roles.
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Senior Editor
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Abstract
This study analyses the phenomenon of code-switching by a teacher in a bilingual classroom and explains it in terms of pragmatic function. The theoretical framework of this study is based upon Rayfield (1970), Gumperz (1982) and Jacobson & Osman (1987). Their works examine the social meaning of code-switching, and classify types of code-switching into conversational functions. Their categories have been redefined to match with the data being described in this study. Other categories have also been added to account for other instances of code-switching especially in the Malaysian context.

The data gathered from a university lecture contains examples of code-switching from Malay to English. The classroom under investigation consisted of 114 students of varied ethnicities. There were 70 Malay students, 43 Chinese students and 1 Indian student. The students were all Malaysian citizens, and
all spoke more than one language. The data shows that code-switching is used in a classroom setting to perform a number of different pragmatic speech functions. Most frequently, code-switching took the form of loanwords inserted into speech for emphasis, economy of speech, and as substitute when no equivalent existed in the L1. Less frequently, code-switching was triggered by the need to attain emphasis, and to gain attention and efficiency from the students, fulfilled by the pragmatic functions of proper name, hesitation, quotation, and transfer of subconscious markers. Other instances of code-switching illustrate the functions of addressee specification, interjections, message qualification, number, parenthetic remark, reiteration and personalization vs. objectivization. The findings also indicate that the lecturer most often code-switched for the purpose of accuracy, especially to explain general concepts used in the field of industrial ergonomics, and for facility of expression. Technical concepts were better discussed in English, the language in which was learned.

**Key Words:** code-switching, bilingual classroom, conversational functions, pragmatics, Malay-English, bilingualism.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

#### 1.1 Background

Like in so many Asian countries with multi-ethnic communities, Malaysian people speak their mother tongue while being educated in the country’s national language mixed with a lot of English. Malaysia has at least a hundred languages/dialects (David, 2004). Malay, the national language, is the medium of instruction in state schools while English is a strong second language. In addition, in vernacular primary schools, Mandarin and Tamil are used as the medium of instruction, and Malay and English are taught as compulsory subjects. It is not uncommon to hear people switching from Malay to English, Mandarin, Hokkien, Cantonese, Hakka or Tamil and vice versa.

The use of admixture of languages in Malaysia is known as *Rojak Language*. In this country, *rojak* itself is a popular dish, made of a mixture of fruits in a special dressing. Thus, in their daily conversations, Malaysians incorporate a sprinkle of Chinese and Tamil words, a spray of English and a squeeze of Arabic and Bahasa Indonesia; therefore the language is referred to as *rojak language*. 
A well-known phenomenon in the field of sociolinguistics is the use of two or more linguistic varieties in the same conversation, inclusive of dialect changes and style changes, known as code-switching (Cheng, 2003, p. 1). I personally view the rojak language used in Malaysia as relevant to the term code-switching. Suan (1990, p. 2) has also stated that the phenomenon of switching languages in Malaysia is technically known as code-switching.

Cheng (2003, p. 4) further acknowledged that any research on code-switching in Malaysia has to be seen in light of the variety of English used in this country, which is Malaysian English. Kachru (1985, p. 211) in Cheng (2003) and Ali (2000) defined this variety as one that has a long history of acculturation in new cultural and geographical contexts and has a large range of functions in the local educational, administrative and legal systems. As a result of such uses, the variety has developed to have distinctive phonological, syntactical, and lexical properties (Baskaran, 1987).

Suan (1990, p. 50) noted that Malaysians may be able to speak Malay and English but they do so without being aware of the significance of the language used. It has become a part of their style of speaking to one another and they use it subconsciously without realizing the strategies and the importance of their choice of the code used in their conversations.

1.2 Aim

As the test classroom was not an English or language class, therefore it was not my goal to explore the purpose of why teachers use or switch to their first language in teaching in the Malaysian ESL classrooms. The investigation is only to analyze the use of code-switching in an instructional context with bilingual students. Before conducting my inquiry, I provided research objectives as guidance, as follows:

1. To categorize the functions of code-switching from Malay to English used by the lecturer in the bilingual classroom.

2. To identify the most to the least used functions of code-switching from Malay to English by the lecturer in the bilingual classroom.

The code-switching in this study refers to the alternate use of the two genetically unrelated languages of Malay and English at word, phrase, and clause or sentence level in the instructional context of bilingual students. I hope the findings of this study will contribute to the understanding of code-switching in Malaysia.
2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1 Code-switching in Malaysia

As Malaysia is a multiethnic society, Soon (1987) outlined that due to this situation there is a need for inter-ethnic communication. Therefore, nearly every member of a multi-ethnic and multi-cultural society learns a second or even a third language. The social atmosphere exposes the people to various languages which are used in daily conversations. Due to this situation, Malaysian people who live in such an environment have made this country a multilingual society. Hamers and Blanc (1989) (in Jan, 1999, p. 91) stated that a bilingual person has access to more than one linguistic code as a means of social communication. He or she will be able to switch communication rapidly and effortlessly from one linguistic system to another as circumstances change. Heredia and Brown (2005) also claimed that speakers of more than one language are known to have a greater ability to code-switch or mix their languages during communication. This phenomenon occurs when bilinguals substitute a word or phrase from one language with a phrase or word from another language.

The alternating use of more than one language/dialect in their conversations has become an integral part of Malaysian speech styles. The main ethnic groups, Malay, Chinese and Indian, are faced with options of making significant and meaningful language choices when interacting with people of different ethnicities or from different dialect groups, or even within the same ethnic group (David, 2004, p. 1).

According to Ali (2000, p. 33), as far as the majority of English-speaking Malaysian are concerned, ‘aberrations’ which are used in their language such as the ‘lah’, ‘a?’, and ‘ah’ particles, and tag questions in the particular use of ‘isn’t it?’, are usually tolerated and overlooked, as long as they do not interfere too greatly with communicative purposes. It is observed that many Malaysians seem to feel quite free to insert features of the local dialect into their speech, either in a formal or an informal situation.

2.2 Functions of Code-switching in Malaysia

Nababan (1978) in Soon (1987) speculated that the main determinant of code-switching in a multilingual society is ease of expression. It also works by increasing or decreasing the social distance between speaker and listener. These adjustments in themselves are not meaningful until interpreted in the...
context of the discourse. Therefore, the speaker takes into account the topic, the listener, and the situation to create better effects of expression and understanding through a code-switch.

Kaur (1994) and David (1996) agreed with the idea that code-switching in Malaysia is a ‘strategy’ to establish understanding among interacting speakers and listeners in the same sentence or discourse (in Jan, 1999, p. 95). Therefore, in the Malaysian context, code-switching is considered functional and viewed as a positive mediator in language usage between self and other participants in the communication situation.

Jan (1999, p. 93) assumed that code-switching was triggered by a number of socio-cultural factors such as role relationships, topics, intention and effect, attitude, values and beliefs, personal emotions, situation, domain, setting and language choice. She further added that individual preferences and skills can also be another factor which may restrain language usage within a speech community. When the speaker’s communicative needs are not fulfilled by the language being used, speakers then normally switch languages as an effort to overcome the difficulty.

Situations that can activate code-switching, according to Cheng (2003, p. 3), are those which (1) appeal to the literate, (2) to appeal to the illiterate, (3) to convey a more exact meaning, to ease communication (utilizing the shortest and the easiest route), (4) to negotiate with greater authority, (5) to capture attention (stylistic, emphatic, and emotional), (6) to reiterate a point, (7) to communicate more effectively, (8) to identify with a particular group, and (9) to close the status gap and to establish goodwill and support.

2.3 Code-switching in the Bilingual Classroom

Numerous studies have been conducted on the use of code-switching in a bilingual classroom. Cheng (1984) encountered that to handle bilingual instructional materials and methodology; teachers will ideally have to be balanced bilinguals who can switch with ease between languages. In practice, Soon (1987) explained that they only have to be proficient enough to be able to make reference to the other language in the course of instruction when necessary.

Moore (2002) described that switches between the teacher and students in a French school in Spain exhibit communicative patterns in which all of the communicative resources of a bilingual collection are available and profitable. It can help bridge the gap in the discourse, set off negotiated lateral sequences about content and/or form, and generate interactional changes that may potentially
involve acquisitional dimensions. He further added that in situations when the focus is not only on the
development of linguistic skills but also on the transmission of subject contents, switches can accumulate
significantly to the enrichment of new concepts and become an active element in the learning experience.

Wha (2002, p. 1) uncovered that the teachers’ use of L1 (first language) in teaching is very much
dependent on what their priorities are in their own teaching agenda. How effectively they use language
will ultimately depend on how they construct their own models of teaching in the light of their
knowledge, assumptions and beliefs, and cognition about teaching and learning. It also depends on their
over-riding concerns with the curriculum or with social and managerial concerns.

In Mati’s study (2004), she asserted that the use of code-switching is a strategy for bilingual
education in the classroom. South Africa is a multilingual country, thus educated African language
speakers experience their world via English. Even though English is the home language of instruction,
some teachers and language aides sometimes do switch to their native languages to explain, discuss
meaning, improve the quality of information flow, regulate and control classroom activities.

Sert (2005) explained that the functions of teacher code-switching are known as topic, switch, and
effective functions. In topic switching, the teacher adjusts his or her language founded on the topic being
taught, such as noticed in grammar instruction. He further clarified that affective functions are essential
in expressing emotions and building a relationship between the teacher and the student. Finally, the
repetitive function is applied to elucidate and stress the meaning of a word.

Zabrodskaja (2007) reported that the teacher conducted code-switching in a bilingual classroom
based on the situation (when the concepts are very important, to get attention from distracted students
and when the student should be praised), revising and repeating to clarify a point.

Gabusi (n.d.) had conducted an investigation on the functions of code-switching with the focus on
the teacher’s perspective in an Italian private high school. She found that the intentions were for affective
functions (such as approvals, calls to order, and reproaches), to facilitate comprehension, linguistic
insecurity and repetitive function.

Therefore, a study of teachers’ use of code-switching in the classroom needs to take into account
not only in what ways or how much they use it but more importantly an understanding of why teachers
use code-switching in the way they do.
3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

For this research, I used a descriptive method. I collected data from a class meeting conducted by a lecturer in The Faculty of Engineering in the University Malaya. As it was a big class, consisting of 114 students, it was held in an auditorium. The lecturer was using a microphone in delivering his lectures.

I video taped the class meeting using a JVC digital video camera. I wanted to analyze code-switching in the classroom as it was used in natural interaction settings. In Marasigan (1983, p. 27) it is mentioned that studies conducted in a natural setting like those of Labov, Cohen and Mitchell proved to be valuable (Sampson, 1971, p. 56). Moreover, I placed the camera on the right side of the auditorium in order to capture the whole classroom, but the position was nearer to the front, next to the lecturer since he was the focus. I suspected that most of the dialogue would be lecturing. His voice was recorded clearly; however some of his speech was inaudible whenever he turned back to the whiteboard and spoke. Through repeated listening and viewing the video tape, I managed to make sense of the words.

I myself had sat in the very back so as not to interfere with any of the class activities. My intention was only to be an observer. I wanted to examine the gestures of the speaker as speech and acts are intertwined.

3.1 Scope

The functions of code-switching can be analyzed through many linguistics aspects, such as on the phonology, syntax, semantics, sociolinguistics and pragmatics level. This present study intends to reveal the functions of code-switching on the pragmatics level.

In relation with language functions in pragmatics, I analyzed my data of code-switching from Malay to English in the bilingual classroom by mixing the theoretical frameworks of Rayfield (1970), Gumperz (1982) and Jacobson & Osman (1987) who illustrated the social meaning of code-switching in classifications of the conversational functions of code-switching. The categories have been redefined to match with the data being described in this study. Other categories have also been added to account for other instances of code-switching especially in the Malaysian context. The list of conversational functions used in the analysis of the data are: (1) Quotation, (2) Addressee Specification, (3) Interjections, (4) Reiteration, (5) Message Qualification, (6) Personalization versus Objectivization, (7)
3.2 Subject

This study is a case study, as I was only collecting data from one Malaysian male speaker. He is in his mid thirties and is a lecturer in The Faculty of Engineering in University Malaya, Kuala Lumpur.

Due to the time available, this project is a very short one. I only recorded my data in one of the lecturer’s classes in Industrial Ergonomics, offered to students in their fourth semester. This class consisted of 114 students of varied ethnicities: 70 Malay students, 43 Chinese students and 1 Indian student. They were all Malaysian citizens, and speak at least more than one language. Due to privacy and requests from the speakers, names from my data will not be mentioned in this study.

3.3 Data Processing

To manage the data received, I transcribed the conversations from the recording between the lecturer and the students. Mostly it was a monologue spoken by the lecturer as it was a lecture. I then transferred the data into the computer. The duration of my transcription was 18 minutes 15 seconds, with a start at 1 minute and 29 seconds until 19 minutes and 14 seconds of the recording.

I provided a literal translation of the Malay words under the transcription based on Kassim (2008). The transcription and codes were the conventional transcription symbols provided by Ali (2004). An explanation of the transcription codes is in the table below:
Table 1

Transcription Mark-Ups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mark-Ups</th>
<th>Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>Interruption; when one speaker is talking and the other one interrupts him/her. Then the first speaker would stop talking and the next one continues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:</td>
<td>Latching; the case where one speaker starts talking as another one stops (without pause or overlap).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/</td>
<td>A short pause.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>//</td>
<td>A longer pause with unspecified duration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[]</td>
<td>Overlap; when two speakers speak at once.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(...)</td>
<td>Paralinguistic gestures, such as (shaking her head), (raises her arms), etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;...&gt;</td>
<td>Behavioral action, such as &lt;what&gt;, the ‘what’ word is pronounced with certain gestures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((...))</td>
<td>Inaudible; which means unintelligible speech.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The lecturer, who is the main subject of my study, was informed about this taping before it was conducted. This was done in order to collect the type of data needed in this research without being accused of infringing upon his right of privacy.

The lecture was conducted mostly in Malay, with most switches to English. I bolded the words in English in my transcription to get an easier view of differentiation between the two languages used. I numbered each line of speech in my data. This was to make it easier to identify the words, the phrase, clause or sentences of the code-switching. From there, I highlighted the various code-switching which occurred in my data. Later, I managed to sort out the switches into the various functions of code-switching by the lecturer in significance to various conversational functions of code-switching. In data analysis, I had underlined the words, phrases, or sentences which is the focus of the code-switching function.

A recorded ten-minute interview with the lecturer was also conducted to uncover deeper reasons for his conduct of code-switching. Main questions such as the language he prefers to speak in class,
which language is considered most difficult, why and how often he switches in the classroom were inquired.

4. DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

According to Scaruffi (2001, p. 1), the way language is related to the context: there is no speech without context. Thus, the only way to find out what a sentence really means is to analyze the context.

The context of my data is a lecturing of a lecturer on industrial ergonomics. The lecturer in this study is capable of speaking both Malay and English. Suan (1990, p. 1) explained that to speak Malay and switch into English and vice versa is a common form of mixing languages among Malaysians. This is because Malay people nowadays do not communicate wholly in English anymore due to the gradual transition to Bahasa Malaysia as the medium of instruction since 1967. She believed that due to the factors above and some other socio-cultural factors, switching at word, phrase, clause, and sentence or discourse level is a natural and prominent phenomenon as well among less competent people as among people who are fairly competent in both languages. Topics, participants, situation, and metaphorical switching (this is where the interlocutors (interjectors) are in control of the choice, using a particular variety to allude to their relationship with the other person) play a great role in the use of languages.

As Chuchu (2001, p. 346) quoted Kennedy (1979, p. 18) and Marasigan (1983, p. 30) that language functions deal with the social meaning of conversation in a particular speech community, my analysis is based on the conversational functions of code-switching by mixing the theoretical frameworks of Rayfield (1970), Gumperz (1982) and Jacobson & Osman (1987) where the functions of code-switching are in classifications of the conversational functions of code-switching. The categories have been redefined to match with my data being described in this study. A few categories have as well been added to describe other instances of code-switching found in the data. These categories are the transfer of the subconscious markers (revealed by Suan (1990), Ali (2000), and Cheng (2003)), and loanwords (mentioned by Soon (1987), and Cheng (2003)).

The matrix language of the data was Malay. This can be seen in the way the lecturer introduced the lecture and most of the lecture was delivered in this language. The embedded language is English. As it is in the educational domain, this language is a higher status language. Many terms and concepts were delivered in English.
4.1 Analysis on Conversational Functions of Code-Switching

A total of thirteen conversational functions were identified in the code-switched utterances from Malay to English. Each of them was examined as follows:

4.1.1 Quotations

From the data, I found that the lecturer was giving an explanation to the students about the case studies which would be assigned to them during that course. He had a paper of guidelines in front of him which he had used for directing his delivery of assignments. I was informed that it was also prepared by three other lecturers who were also involved in this project. Therefore, he quoted words or sentences from this paper related to the 14 topics of the assignment to his students. The example below taken from the data illustrates this function:

1. 30 survey untuk case study ini / Untuk yang pertama kitchen design for the
   for this For that first

   31 housing consumer / Untuk title yang pertama ni / bagi group yang pertama
   For that first this for that first

In addition to the cases above, sixteen other examples related to topics quoted from his paper were also found in the data. The lecturer was explaining in Malay. However, in providing the names of topics which were to be assigned to the students, he switched to English as he was quoting the words from his guideline paper. Quotations are often made in the language it was first heard in order to preserve the originality of the message (Soon, 1987).

Other instances of quotations observed in the data were not only in mentioning the topics, but also on how to conduct them, which were also noted in his guideline paper. One of the examples could be seen in:

2. 14 belas orang eh empat belas students / Jadi ah / setiap group tu kita divide
   -teen people fourteen So every that we

   15 by seven or six students lah / Ah / maknanya each stu - each group ah
   (that) means
From the video tape and my observation in class, I noticed that every time he gave an explanation in English, he looked down at his paper for guidance. It does not mean that his English is not proficient; however he was making sure that he was giving the right tasks for each topic. This function of quotation is to prove what was being said were facts and that the students had to listen and pay attention.

### 4.1.2 Addressee Specification

This type of switch serves to direct the message to a specific person. The address use in the Malay culture is determined by rank or status (Stapa, 1986). In face-to-face interaction a superior or senior may use personal pronouns when addressing an inferior or junior but the reverse is considered unacceptable. This habit has been instilled in them since childhood.

In addressing the students, he had called them mostly by ‘kamu’ and ‘awak’. He used ‘kamu’ 26 times and ‘awak’ 22 times during the course of the recorded lecture. In Suan (1990, p. 34), Stapa (1986) quoted that ‘awak’ is used in a polite situation whereas ‘kamu’ is a rude connotation. In my data, the two was not differentiated by any specific situation; therefore I believed he had used ‘kamu’ towards the students to indicate his superior status (as a lecturer) towards the inferior (the students). And probably at the times he addressed them with ‘awak’, he wanted to point out that this was also a somewhat formal situation, which is a lecturing in a university.

Only a small number of the use of ‘kau’ and ‘you’ were identified. The examples below give clarification:

1. 5 bagi last minute nanti kamu tak sempat nuk buat sebab case study is ah /
   for later you not have the time want (to) do because

   (interject.) clever you people (part.) to do

Stapa (1986) explained that the use of ‘kau’ or ‘engkau’ has rude connotations. As I only found two instances of this use in my data, I didn’t think that the lecturer intended to be discourteous. For example number one, it appeared at the beginning of his lecture. It could be the indication that he was the superior in class and he had wanted the students to pay attention on further things that he intended to inform them.
He also wanted them to take the assignment seriously. However, for example number two; I assumed he had blurted this out spontaneously since he was a little irritated by the minimal facilities provided by Malaysia’s public transportation for disabled people. This made him unable to provide further illustrations for the students on that particular topic.

Suan (1990, p. 33) stated that the more interesting cases of transfer in the Malay-English bilingual context is the use of the English personal pronouns ‘I’ and ‘you’ in discourse between Malaysian bilinguals in a conversation conducted primarily in Malay. However, from my data I only discovered 3 appearances of the use of ‘you’ by the lecturer. One of them is as They are as below:

3. 102 Untuk semangat **for you** / Ah / another one is tyre workshop / Dekat
   for encouragement Near

4. 137 **Malaysian consumer** / Saya tak nak **you all copy direct** dari internet lah /
   I not want from (part.)

5. 150 19. L: Ha! / Tapi ni **you** pilih / ha / **that’s why** saya / oh / mungkin kamu nak
   But this choose I maybe you want

The first two examples, ‘you’ were used in a phrase of the same language, which is English. The function may be to emphasize his statements. Thus, the third one is the common switch made by most Malaysians in code-switching between Malay and English. I could not do much analysis of this instance since this only occurs once in my data. However, I speculated that the ‘you’ there was to emphasize and clarify that each student got the chance to choose his or her own topic for the assignment.

4.1.3 Interjections

A switch is often used for interjections. It expresses strong feelings or emotions.

1. 3 bincangkan pasal **case study** / Sebab, ah / dia ni **very important** dah / On?
   Discuss about Because it this already
In the example above, after interjection ‘ah’ the lecturer switch to English to emphasize his concern of the assignment to the students-- that they must take it seriously.

2. 38 this one / the second one is ah // oh / yang nombor dua tu silap sikit / that number two that mistaken a little

The function of interjection ‘oh’ in the example above is to stop him from explaining further as he had just discovered a mistake. I presume he switched to Malay as he could express his disappointment better when discovering the mistake.

3. 134 Bus? / Ala / pandai-pandai kau orang lah / untuk buat survey. (interject.) clever you people (part.) to do

This interjection has various meanings in the Malay language. It depends on the intonation used. It can be persuasive such as in: “Ala, cakap lagi lah,” (Ala, talk some more) or to express disagreement: “Ala, tak nak lah macam tu” (Ala, (I) don’t want it like that). Thus in my data, the lecturer was trying to put aside the confusion of his explanation by using this interjection.

4.1.4 Reiteration

A message is repeated in the other code, literally or in a somewhat modified form. It is to clarify what is said, amplify or emphasize a message.

1. 38 this one / the second one is ah // oh / yang nombor dua tu silap sikit / that number two that mistaken a little

The example above showed that the lecturer reiterates the earlier message in English into Malay. He intended to name the next topic for the assignment but then he discovered that there was a mistake, therefore he switches to retrieve full attention from the students and to clarify the mistake.
2. And the fourth one / yang nombor keempat tu / power plant / and and / 

that number fourth that

The lecturer seemed to repeat the number to promote understanding from the students and to keep them on track on what topic they were discussing then.

4.1.5 Message Qualification

This function is to qualify a previous statement with sentences, clauses or phrases (Soon, 1987). The speaker believes if he switches to the other code, the message will be better understood. Some examples from the data:

1. Ah [Ah] yang ketiga design untuk bathroom design, bathroom tau kan? / that third for know (affirm.)

2. 74 saya sign lah / No problem lah! / And tol booth / tol booth tau yah? / 

1 I (part.) (part.) know (affirm.)

75 (looks at some students to get confirmation of understanding) // Tol! / Tol!

2. 76 / Dekat Malaysia ni kan banyak tol (looks at his students and they nod

Near this (affirm.) many

There were also five other examples related to message qualification in the data. From my data, this function consist a lot of translation, either directly or indirectly. In example 1, the lecturer translated the English word into Malay directly, whereas in example number 2, he provided an illustration of the word. The switched passages were meant to amplify the message so the students would get a clear idea of what he was talking about. The other reason that is possible for this switch is in case the students misheard him.
4.1.6 Personalization versus Objectivization

In some instances, the lecturer distinguishes between opinion and fact by code-switching. For examples:

1. (asks his assistant, then turn back to his students) /O.K./ Ah / sebab kalau because if

2. bagi last minute nanti kau tak sempat nak buat sebab case study for later you not have the time want (to) do because

3. very very difficult to do because you need to measure and survey /

4. maybe you need to arrange for the questionnaire / for the study lah /

At first, the lecturer was stating the fact that if he assigned these case studies near the end of the semester, the students wouldn’t have time to conduct them. A switch was made into English to support his opinion by giving specific illustrations on what possible difficulties they might face in conducting them.

5. 95 punya jabatan / CAD/CAM / pun kita ada bilik store kita / Awak boleh property department also we have room our You can

6. tengok dari segi arrangement dia or maybe you can consider another / ah (to) see from aspect it

In assigning the topics, he had used the guidelines he had discussed earlier with the other lecturers. However, he also elaborated with his own opinion or suggestions on what the students could do besides the examples from the notes.
4.1.7 Hesitation

From my data, two types of hesitation were discovered. The one characterized by ‘ah’ and another by ‘/’ (pause). They occurred at either the beginning of the sentence or in the middle of the sentence. This function is to allow the lecturer some time to think over what to say next (Suan, 1990, p. 70), what words, phrases, clauses, or sentences would be more appropriate to make his utterances more effective. There were many instances of hesitation in my data. It can appear within the same or different language. For my analysis, I only focused on hesitations that caused the lecturer to code-switch from Malay to English or vice versa:

1. 43 Bilik mandi lah / So (...) for the /ah yang (...) tak payah lah buat sebab
   Bathroom (part.) that no need to (part.) do because
   44 is very / dah banyak lah case study yang telah dibuat / Maybe kitchen
   already many (part.) that have (been) done

   The examples above are switches from English to Malay prefaced by hesitations. It seemed that he hesitated because he decided not to continue his sentence and switched to Malay to change the topic.

2. 116 laboratory / even dekat University Malaya / Pergi lah awak survey dari
   near Go (part.) you from
   117 segi ah / arrangement for the equipment / arrangement for the setting / aspect

   The hesitations from the examples above made the lecturer switch from Malay to English because he found the explanations would be more appropriate to be clarified in English. In the case of language competence, it is also possible to interpret them as difficulty in finding the right words at the time of speaking or lack of ability to grasp the language, which indicates of lack of familiarity with the style he was using. Nineteen other instances of hesitations from my data that had caused code-switching were also discovered.
4.1.8 Numbers

Suan (1990, p. 71) stated that speakers may switch to English when they utter numbers to convey quantity, time, date, year, degree and name. The lecturer had switched quantity from Malay to English or vice versa interchangeably, such as phrases like: “saya dapat enam belas case study” (line 5) (I have sixteen case studies), “Untuk title yang pertama ni” (line 31) (For this first title), “Six! / Ah this one is ah biasa yang dibuat…” (line 58 and 59) (Six! Ah, this one is ah commonly done), “Ah / the third / the seven one is…” (line 62). Thus the switches on time in my data were mostly uttered in English. For examples:

1. 5 bagi last minute nanti kau tak sempat nak buat sebab case study for later you not have the time want (to) do because

2. 79 case study ni awal / so boleh awak take time for ah / untuk buat this early can you to do

Soon (1987) acknowledged that culture plays an important role in code-switching. The Roman calendar is a Western design; its way of measuring time is often an inherently ‘foreign’ concept to Asians. Marasigan (1983) speculated that as this ‘time’ concept is not originally inbuilt in their cultures, they express it in English.

4.1.9 Proper Name

Suan (1990, p. 73-74) stated that speakers switched codes for technical terms for several reasons such as the wish to express their ideas adequately by maintaining the original language of the terms. The lack of an equivalent in the other language or the wish to use the terms in the translated language is because these translated codes are commonly known for that particular object or concept.

Original terms in the Ergonomics field are from the West; this is due to the fact that this discipline was first applied by Westerners. As a result, almost all textbooks are written in English. This situation caused the lecturer to use a lot of foreign terms related to the class assignment. The examples are:
1. 32 / ah dia akan **investigate** semua / ah / mungkin kamu akan pergi buat **survey**
    they will all maybe you will go do

2. 51 dekat bilik **technician** / dia ada dia punya **button** / **button** apa semua kan /
    near room it has its own what all (affirm.)

Other words related to the case from the data are: *case study, assignment, ergonomics, measurement, station control, display, design, science, physics, vending machine, take-out counter, arrangement, workshop, installing, manual, machine, fully automatic and jack*. Then there are phrases such as: *safety and hazard, Malaysian consumer, Malaysian population, copy direct dari internet, video presentation.*

For the technical terms above, he did not provide any translation into the Malay language. This is due to the fact that these terms are common and well-understood by the students since it is related to their study.

### 4.1.10 Parenthetic Remark

This function can be in the form of a sentence or word complement to emphasize the commentary of the earlier statement. The ability to express more adequately and competently their feelings in this code is a natural process *(Suan, 1990, p. 76)*. From my data, they are illustrated in the examples below:

1. 105 11. L: [Banyak kedai tayar lah!] Tayar ini saya lebih **consider** pada kereta
   Many shop tyre (part.) Tyre this I more to car
   106 Bukan **motor** / **motor** / **motor very simple** lah / So dekat situ awak
   Not (part.) near there you

2. 120 dapat / boleh dapat kerjasama daripada dia punya orang / **And** / **door**
   get can get cooperation from he/she owner
   121 **assembly** / Ah / ini pelik sikit lah / Mungkin dia / susah sikit awak nak cari /
   This difficult a little (part.) Maybe it difficult a little you want find
The parenthetic remarks made by the lecturer based on the examples above were meant to signify his comments and feelings towards how the assignment should be done.

4.1.11 Transfer of the Subconscious Markers

There were two types of markers which were elicited from the data. They are:

1. The insertion of the particle ‘lah’

In Malaysian discourse it is common to tag a sentence with the particle ‘lah.’ Thus this also happens when a Malaysian speaks English with another Malaysian. This particle is naturally inserted into the English sentences as it has become a habitual expression for the speakers (Suan, 1990, p. 94). This is one of the features of Malaysian English (Cheng, 2003, p. 11). There are many functions of this particle in a conversation, depending on the context in which it is used. With regards to the data, there were 5 functions of ‘lah’ discovered. They are as follows:

(a) To emphasize or enquire (Suan, 1990, p. 94, Cheng, 2003, p. 11, and Ali, 2000, p. 140). A lot of the occurrences of ‘lah’ in the data are for this function. The examples from the data are:

1. maybe you need to arrange for the questionnaire / for the study lah /
   (part.)

   The lecturer used the particle to make a strong remark and to strengthen points that he was making.

(b) To disagree or repair (Ali, 2000, p. 141). The lecturer used ‘lah’ to make a point of what he is disagreeing about. The examples are:

2. 105 11. L: [Banyak kedai tayar lah!] Tayar ni saya lebih consider pada kereta
   Many shop tyre (part.) Tyre this I more to car
   106 / Bukan motor / motor very simple lah / So dekat situ awak pergi
   Not (part.) near there you go
(c) To become a tool of persuasion (Ali, 2000, p. 29 and Cheng, 2003, p. 12). I only found one example of this function in the data:

3. 79 case study ni awal / so boleh awak take time for ah / untuk buat
     this early can you to do

80 administration ah / permission lah tol booth ni (looks down at his paper) //
     (part.) this

The lecturer stated that the reason for him to assign the project earlier was to give the students time to conduct them. He was trying to encourage the students.

(d) To soften the effect of the utterance (Cheng, 2003, p. 12, and Ali, 2000, p. 147). I discovered only one instance of this function in the data:

4. 19 tiga penilai / Ah / Puan S / saya / dengan / seorang lagi mungkin yang /
     three evaluator Madam S I with a person more maybe that

20 kamu kenal kan? / R A ya?
     You know (affirm.) R A (affirm.)

21 4. Ss: Kenal...[(murmurings, talking to each other)]
     Know

22 5. S2: [Haa?]

23 6. S3: [Oh no!]

24 7. L: [Because dia dulu juga dalam ergonomics] / So maybe ah dia ah
     he before also in he

25 have a lot of question lah to / because apa yang saya buka ni semua telah
     (part.) what that I open this all have

Ali (2000, p. 147) explained that this function is an effort to soften or downplay the effect of what is said. From the example above, it can be seen that the lecturer inserted this particle when his explanation was getting tense and needed to be smoothened. He was appealing to the students by giving a soft tone of ‘lah.’
To compromise (Ali, 2000, p. 31). The ‘lah’ in this function is used in the utterance to seek agreement from the students. Two examples of these functions were found, they are:

5. 13 Ah / maknanya tak dapat enam belas **group lah** / Kita ada seratus empat (that) means not get sixteen (part.) We have one hundred and four

6. 15 **by seven or six students** lah / Ah / maknanya **each stu - each group** ah (part.) (that) means

Furthermore, it is discovered that the way the Malaysian use ‘lah’ at the end of sentences is similar to the way some Cork people tend to add the word "like" to the end of sentences for emphasis, as in "I don't know him at all, like" (Hickey, 2005) and in Malay this version would mostly be, “I don’t know him at all, lah.”

2. *The use of ‘ya?’*

The use of ‘ya’ varies depending on the tone the speaker uses and the context which he is involved in. In the case of my data, I had discovered two functions of ‘ya’ in the data. The first reason was to seek for agreement from his students, for example:

1. 9 Nampak you dibelakang? / **No problem ya?**
   See at the back

   The second reason was found in the example below:

2. 47 **power and control plant** / Ini contohnya kalau kamu pergi dekat ah **sta –**
   This (the example) if you go near

48 **station / station control** ya? / Contohnya kalau macam ni kan (points to the)
   (The) example if like this (affirm.)

From Ali (2000, p. 150), it is illustrated the case of ‘ya?’ above was to signal commitment to a positive fact in the prior utterance.
4.1.12 Loanwords

This last category is more of an observable fact than a function. Soon (1987) quoted that ‘foreign’ words are incorporated into one’s discourse and used as exact substitutes for L1 words. However, from my data analysis, I speculated that the function of loanwords consist of four. They are:

1. *Used when there is a lack of an equivalent word in a language.*
   For examples:

   1. 27 *ah lepas ni saya akan putar video macam mana case study dijalankan dan*
       after this I will turn (on) how conducted and

   2. 29 *kamu akan dapat idea macam macam mana kamu nak ah menjalankan*
       you will get like how you want to perform

   For example 1, the word ‘video’ was used as a direct replacement of itself. There were three other examples as such discovered in the data. Therefore it can be concluded that as the word is originally a foreign word seeing that video technology was first discovered by Westerners, therefore we borrow it.

   For number 2, the word ‘idea’ in Malay is ‘ide.’ The Malay pronunciation system had redefined it to make it easier to utter. Therefore, from this situation, we can see that it is also originally from the English vocabulary. Other words which I discovered from my data prior to this circumstance are: *topic, lab, control, manager, analysis, sign, ticket, bus, taxi, copy, market, presentation, and permission.*

2. *Used when to obtain economy of articulation.*
   For example:

   1. 12 *the class) // Tapi tak apa / apa ni / setiap group cuma ambil satu title sahaja*
       But it’s o.k. what (is) this every only take one only

   2. 65 *ah / kalau boleh saya nak include semua sekali lah / Ah / termasuk di / tapi*
       if can I want all (at) once (part.) included in but
It is possible that English was used in the above examples to gain economy of articulation. If the lecturer were to give the Malay equivalents for the words expressed in English, then they would require more time and effort for articulating those expressions. For instance, the word ‘group’ in Malay is ‘kelompok.’ The term in English has one syllable whereas the equivalent term in Malay consists of three syllables. This function also applies for ‘possible’ (3 syllables) and ‘include’ (2 syllables), which in Malay are ‘memungkinkan’ (4 syllables) and ‘termasuk’ (3 syllables). Prior to this consideration, other words revealed in my data are: on, data, good, record, scope, discuss, store.

Besides the words above, most of the conjunctions used by the lecturer were in English. Besides reducing the effort of articulation, this could also be used to emphasis a point that he was making. They are such as:

1. 24 7. L: [Because dia dulu juga dalam ergonomics] / So maybe ah dia ah have
   he before also in he

2. 54 aspects / Mungkin ah agak lama sikit lah / apa ni / video tu / Ah / then
   Maybe rather long (of time) a little (part.) what (is) this

   55 nombor lima tu lecture room / Lecture room macam yang kamu ada
   number five that lecture room like that you have

The conjunctions from the data above, and others found in the data such as and and even, were repeated several times in other utterances. Twenty other instances were revealed in the data. They were embedded within a Malay sentence. In Malay, ‘so maybe’ is ‘jadi mungkin’ consisting of 4 syllables while in English it is much more efficient as the pronunciation only takes up 3 syllables. The conjunction ‘then’ in Malay is ‘kemudian’ which consists of 4 syllables.
3. *Used for emphasis.*

Another possible illustration for this switch could be for emphasis to attract the student’s focus and attention to the issue being discussed. Examples where a single word or phrase was switched into English could show its use as a dramatic effect to arouse the curiosity of the hearer. For example:

1. bincangkan pasal **case study** / Sebab, ah / dia ni **very important** dah / On?
   discuss about Because it this already

2. **Ah this one is** ah biasa yang dibuat **computer work station** / Mungkin
   common that made (by) Maybe

A clear phrase which illustrated a dramatic effect was found in one of the students’ comments in line 23:

3. S3: [**Oh no!**]

4. *Used as borrowed words assimilated into the language.*

   It is questionable whether any change of code is involved as the speaker probably regards these ‘foreign’ words as part of the L1 vocabulary. In other words, these ‘borrowed’ words have been assimilated in some degree into the borrowing variant (Suan, 1987, p. 9). For example from the data, the word ‘fakulti’ (line 61) and ‘tayar’ (line 103) in Malay were originally assimilated from ‘faculty’ and ‘tyre’ in English. Additionally, I had speculated that the word ‘student’ and ‘market’ used by the lecturer were considered borrowed words. They are commonly used in the everyday speech of Malaysians. From the data:

1. semua kan / **Maybe** kalau **possible** dekat **market-market** besar lah macam
   all (affirm.) if near markets big (part.) like

2. pengalaman **student-student** yang lepas ah mungkin kamu tak boleh buat
   Experience students that before maybe you not can do
The words underlined in the examples above are from the English vocabulary. However, the plural forms of the words were not used in the correct forms as of the English grammar. Usually a noun becomes plural by adding an –s or –es at the end of the word. Yet, I speculated that as they are borrowed words, therefore he unconsciously turned their plural form into the Malay system. As the lecturer is a bilingual, it is probable that some words just came up in his head faster in one language than the other.

Further, I discovered two employments of code-switching in the data which I considered negative usages. This is found in line:

3. 18 kamu untuk _dipresentation_ and penilaian akan dinilai oleh mungkin ada

   you for

4. 99 _problemnyaa_ industri sini kita susah sikit nak minta _permission_ sebab

   In Malay, _di_- is a prefix for verbs (to form passive voice), whereas _-nya_ is use as a possessive pronoun of the third person and is affixed to the noun (Kassim, 2008).

   I regard the usage above as the wrong usage as he was mixing a prefix and a suffix of one language with a different language. When these morphemes are assimilated into another language, I think that the word is not proper anymore. I judge it as incorrect to combine half of a word from a language and half of a word from another language. When conducting a code-switch, a whole word of that language is to be used.

   As this instance was only found twice in the data, therefore I think the lecturer was aware of his mistakes since he did not apply it to other code-switches from Malay to English.

### 4.2 List of Frequency of Conversational Functions of Code-Switching

With regard to my second research question and the data, I calculated the most to the least used conversational functions of code-switching in an instructional bilingual classroom. They are listed in the table below:
Table 2
The Frequency of Conversational Functions of Code-Switching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Conversational Functions</th>
<th># of Occurrences</th>
<th>% of Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Loanwords</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>26.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Technical Terms</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hesitation</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Quotations</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Transfer of the Subconscious Markers</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Addressee Specification</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Interjections</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Message Qualification</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Parenthetical Remark</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Reiteration</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Personalization versus Objectivization</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, from the table above, I concluded that in the case of the data, the lecturer most frequently code-switched for the purpose of using loanwords. I deduced that this may be associated to the fact that most of the words in Malay are borrowed from various sources such as from Sanskrit, Arabic, Chinese, Tamil, Mon, Cham, Javanese, Ternatenese Persian, Portuguese, Italian, Greek, French, Dutch and English (see in Omar (1993), Collins (1998) and Kassim (2008) for further descriptions).

After loanwords, the lecturer’s code-switching most often played the functions of proper name, hesitation, quotation, and transfer of the subconscious markers. This analysis is also supported by the lecture’s explanation during our interview on why he conducted code-switching. Even though his first answer of why he code switches was because of habit, he did give further explanations after deeper discussion. He explained that since the source materials for this course were mostly in English, it was inevitable for him to use English terms in order for the ideas to be expressed effectively (proper name).
As he was giving details to the students about the assignment with the support of a guideline, it was necessary that he quoted the words or sentences from it to assist him to be on track (quotation).

He also claimed that the use of “ya?” and “lah” in most of his sentences had become an unavoidable practice in speaking with other Malaysians (transfer of the subconscious markers). He alleged that “it is the habit of all Malaysian speakers in Malaysia.” Thus he also said that it is possible for him to not employ it when speaking English to foreigners (e.g. Japanese, Englishmen or Americans). It all depended on whom he was speaking to.

When asked which language he considers most difficult, he answered that both is neither easy nor difficult. They measure about the same to him in different situations. He had acquired Malay at home as his first language, therefore communication with family and friends would be in Malay. Though, as he started school, English was also extensively introduced to him as he studied to further levels of education. In his profession, it is an essential requirement.

He further added that code-switching made it easier for him to express himself as there were just some words that “work better” in a certain language than the other. Most of the time, he is unconscious of code-switching when he is communicating with other Malaysians, especially in daily conversations.

In his class, code-switching is allowed during lectures and discussion, but for writing assignments such as essays, reports, or theses where English is required by the university, it is not. He fully expects his students to write well in English.

Though he did not mention the use of hesitation in his code-switching, I presume that the function was to simply gain him some time to consider what to say next.

The last seven functions were also frequent triggers for the lecturer to switch to attain emphasis, attention, and efficiency from the students. Thus, I could not state definitively that these play a lesser role and significance in activating code-switching as my data was very restricted due to the limited time and scope of the project paper.

5. CONCLUSION

In the case discussed above, I do not discourage the use of rojak language, or in its proper term, code-switching, especially in the bilingual classroom such as is the case in the Malaysian context. It is mutually unavoidable and crucial in the teaching and learning process in this situation. Overall, the
functions of teacher’s code-switching help to increase attention among students, to qualify messages and facilitate further understanding on the topic discussed.

On the other hand, if the teacher code-switches as a consequence of having inadequate capabilities in the medium of instruction, then this may well be a reason for concern. I also think too much language mixing could make the instruction unintelligible, and in the end we do not pick up the good part in either language. This of course will not be a good example for the students.

Thus, after analyzing my data on code-switching, it seems that the lecturers mostly code-switch for accuracy, especially with the general concepts used in the field of industrial ergonomics, and facility of expression. I suppose the reason for this is that technical concepts were better discussed in English as this is the language in which the concepts were learnt. The advantage of a bilingual classroom is having the vocabulary to describe a wider range of concepts and ideas that may not even have appropriate words to articulate these fully in one language. What the students and teachers can and how they are able to express things in various languages makes up a significant part of how they view the world (in Koettke, 2003).

In this case, I speculated that the lecturer had performed various functions of code-switching so that his students could fully understand the message that he wanted to deliver to them. In this context, understanding the message is equal to the students knowing the content of his lecture, specifically referring to the case studies that they would be conducting that semester.

During the early studies on code switching, it was found that this phenomenon was ranked “least acceptable” by teachers (Ramirez and Milk, 1986 in MacSwan, 1999, p. 4). Although people's attitudes toward code switching have until recently generally been negative, code-switching has imposed itself as the norm of language use in most bilingual communities (Kamwangamalu, 1989).

The purposes of code-switching can be better understood in interactive circumstances, in which diverse social variables are embedded. Also, in a different culture, unambiguous social and pragmatic variables might trigger code-switching which are not accounted for in the present study. The effects of topic, situation, interlocutor on code-switching and also its possible disadvantages were also not dealt with in this paper. For these limitations, further analyses are suggested to be conducted in future related studies.
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**Abstract**

Discourse markers are the words and phrases that help us to develop and relate ideas to one another. In this study, the usages of *and* as both a discourser marker and a conjunction in the speech of Turkish speakers of English were examined. First, *and* tokens in spontaneous monologues were identified using text-only data. Then we examined textual features of *and* and attempted to find a set of features that could be used to distinguish between *and*’s Sentential function (conjunctive) and its Discourse function (initiating a new topic). Results of the analysis illustrated that in the Turkish speakers’ productions *and* has a role both as a discourse marker and as a conjunction.
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1. Introduction

While ideas may relate to each other in many different ways, there are some common logical relationships that deserve special emphasis. These include (a) the additive relationship, (b) the oppositional or contrastive relationship, (c) the time relationship, (d) the reason-result relationship, (e) the conditional relationship, and (f) the example relationship (Badalamenti & Stanchina, 2003). Perhaps it is because these relationships are so common, that the English language has developed many different ways to express them.

Discourse markers are linking words that indicate how one piece of discourse is connected to another piece of discourse. They show the connection between what has already been written or said and what is going to be written or said. Fraser (1990) defines the expressions now, well, so, however, and then as discourse markers. They signal a sequential relationship between the current message and the previous discourse and thus should be distinguished from other types of commentary markers, such as vocatives, interjections, and expressions such as oh, you know, I mean, and because. A discourse marker (DM) is a word or phrase that functions primarily as a structuring unit of spoken language. To the listener, a DM signals the speaker’s intention to mark a boundary (either ‘clause-like’ or ‘paragraph-like’) in discourse. DMs serve as active contributions to the discourse and signal such events as a change in speaker, taking or holding control of the floor, relinquishing control of the floor, or the beginning of a new topic.

In their study on the use of men ‘but/and/so’ among Swedish speakers, Horne et al (1999) argue that in the analysis of speech recognition and understanding, one area of current research is centred on the issue of segmentation of spontaneous speech into ‘clause-like’ and ‘paragraph-like’ units. This information can be useful for recognizing and synthesizing topic boundaries.
2. Literature Review

Green (2006) describes discourse markers as little words or phrases which generally add nothing to the truth of the sentence they are part of; they, however, reflect an attitude of the speaker toward what is being said in the present utterance. According to Green (2006) there are two basic kinds of discourse particles: a) attitudinal discourse markers, such as well, uh, like, gosh, oh, OK, I mean, and you know, which indicate something about how the speaker feels about what is being said, or how one feels about how the addressee feels about what is being said, and b) structural discourse markers like the sentence-initial particles Now, OK, And, But, which speakers use to indicate a structural boundary, and a hint of how what follows relates to what went before.

Since discourse markers occur at clause boundaries and mark relations between preceding and following units of discourse, it is not really appropriate to consider them as an integral part of either one of these units. Discourse markers are neither the initiating nor the final parts of any discourse and this “in between” character of discourse markers is often signalled through prosodic cues or pauses. Since discourse markers are either preceded or succeeded by pauses, they are set off from preceding and following tone-units and have the status of structurally peripheral elements (de Rooij, 2000).

A discourse marker is a word or phrase that marks a boundary in a discourse; therefore, they appear in syntactically different environments ranging from the word-level to discourse markers which are clausal units. For example, there are word-level discourse markers like oh, well, and, but, or, so, because, like, now, and then. On the other hand, discourse markers such as I mean, let me think, and y'know are classified as clauses. Each discourse marker functions in a different way and occurs in a variety of positions in an utterance.

Regarding coherence (or creating semantically meaningful texts both in written and in spoken language) within a particular segment of discourse, discourse markers operate at two levels: to provide various kinds of coherence relations between the constituent units of the text involved, and they also involve relations between such units and aspects of the communicative situation, which includes the speaker and the addressee (as well as their attitudes, beliefs, and intentions (Risselada & Spooren, 1998).

Fraser (1999) argued that the first and most detailed effort to explain the phenomena of discourse markers was conducted by Schiffrin (1987), who was concerned with “sequentially dependent elements which bracket units of talk” (p. 31). She labelled them ‘discourse markers’ and analyzed in detail the expressions and, because, but, I mean, now, oh, or, so, then, well, and y'know as they occur in
unstructured interview conversations. Then Schiffrin set forth some suggestions as to what constitutes a discourse marker:

- “It has to be syntactically detachable from a sentence.
- It has to be commonly used in initial position of an utterance.
- It has to be able to operate at both local and global levels of discourse.
- It has to be able to operate on different planes of discourse.
- It has to have a range of prosodic contours” (Schiffrin, 1987 qtd in Fraser, 1990).

Discourse markers may well be conjunctions, as these are natural grammatical connectors between phrases. Discourse markers may not be used grammatically correctly, but in spoken language this is seldom important. They may not even be official words and are used outside of normal syntactical structures.

*And* is classified lexically as a conjunction, a classification which reflects its function within sentence grammar to link together two or more clauses, nouns, and/or adjectives. In addition to this clausal or sentential (S) function, *and* has another function in spoken language, i.e., to introduce a new ‘speech paragraph’ containing a new discourse (D) topic.

Most of the work in the area of discourse markers has been done in English and with native speakers of English (Fuller, 2003), non-native speakers (Hellermann & Vergun, 2007; Dulger, 2007) and with both native and non-native speakers (Waring, 2003). At the same time, most of the previous studies either concentrate on a single discourse marker or analyze several discourse markers (e.g., Archakis, 2003). In this study we analyzed the usage of *and* both as a discourse marker and as a conjunction in the spontaneous speech of Turkish speakers. The reason we focussed on *and* was that it is also used for both functions above in spoken Turkish as well.

### 3. Research questions

In this study, we sought responses to the following questions:

- What is the frequency of *and* usages in the narratives of Turkish speakers of English?
- What may be the potential reasons for using *and* predominantly in the narratives?
4. Data collection

4.1. Participants

The participants in this study were 17 (14 women and 3 men) who were first-year Turkish student-teachers of English at the English Language Teaching Department of Çukurova University. They were graduates of either private or state secondary schools from all over Turkey. They were between 18-21 years old. Therefore, they share common cultural characteristics. Most of them planned to be teachers of English following their graduation.

4.2 Procedure

The data was drawn from individual narratives of the 17 student-teachers of English. These participants were asked to speak about a memorable event in their life. Student narratives were first video-recorded and then transcribed into standard orthography to be analyzed later. It took each student about 3-9 minutes to complete the assignment.

4.3 Data Analysis

The two researchers collaborated in coding the data in which case, as mentioned above, only the text was used. In addition to context, prosody (especially the presence of a pause) can help to distinguish cases of DM from non-DM. Significantly long pauses were indicated using three dots. In the case of and it is not very difficult to distinguish uses of and as a conjunction versus and as a discourse marker. Both the context of the utterances and pause times, especially preceding, the ands were helpful in determining which discourse function was intended.
5. Results and Discussion

The distribution of frequencies of functions of *and* as a discourse marker and and as a connector and their percentages in the oral narratives of the participants appear in Table 1 below. As noted, the total number of *and* tokens in narratives was 240. Considering that the total number of words used in the narratives was about 5500, the major role of *and* in the narratives is evident. Unlike productions of native English speakers in which we see ample examples of such discourse markers as *now, well, so, however, then, you know, I mean*, in our participants’ narratives only few instances of these discourse markers were observed. Given that the main linking words and phrases could be grouped according to the similarity of their meaning to the three basic connectives *and, or, but* (the most commonly used coordinate conjunctions), we were able to account for the high frequency usage of *and* in the narratives.

Table 1: Distribution of functions of *and* as a discourse marker and as a connector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discourse Marker</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunction</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>86.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 indicates that nearly 14% of the *and* tokens were discourse markers and 86% were conjunctions. As the table indicates the usage of *and* as a conjunction is more common than its usage as a discourse marker.

Below are some excerpts of *and* usage as a discourse marker and as a conjunction:

1. Discourse marker *and*

   - *When they were engaged in the seventies, it was it was strict government, strict management on the government, on the government.*
And one day my father went to my grandma's house, grandmother's house.

- I will talk about computers and internet. I know this is along topic because ** by hours but I will touch only a little of it.

And the importance of internet cannot be ignored in our age, and the importance of it and getting more and more important by time.

Byron and Heeman (1997) argued that and is used extensively in turn-initial position in dialogs. As Schiffrin (1987) suggested, while and is used primarily to mark that the current utterance is a continuation of the same speaker’s prior turn, it also correlates strongly, though not absolutely, with the presentation of new information.

In this study and as a discourse marker served several functions: it was used to indicate a sequence of topics or main points; it introduced topics; signalled topic shifts or was used to introduce a summary of what had been discussed. The sentence below is an example of this function: The student talks about how to cope with stress, and finishes his/her utterance:

- And there these are my suggestions. You can use them. I am using but they don’t work. May be they work for you

(2) Sentential and

- I will talk about computers and internet
- I went to Antalya with school tour, and it was very perfect time for me and my friends

Regarding sentential and there are a number of functions which and plays within or between sentences. And is mainly used to a) connect two homogeneous (similar) words or phrases, b) indicate the last item at the end of a list, c) join sentences or sentence fragments in chronological order, and d) indicate causation. Besides this and also has special uses: to show progression (faster and faster), a large number or quantity (bigger and bigger), addition (four and four are eight), purpose (in this case and
replaces *to*: e.g., an interlocutor constructs a sentence like “Try and get up early tomorrow” when s/he means “Try to get up early tomorrow”). In our study we observed the main four functions of and.

\[ \text{a) Used to connect two homogeneous (similar) words or phrases;} \]
\[ \text{e.g., } \text{... it was very perfect time for me and my friends.} \]

\[ \text{b) Used to join sentences or sentence fragments in chronological order;} \]
\[ \text{e.g., } \text{... Then assistant went for the man and warned him} \]

\[ \text{c) Used to indicate causation.} \]
\[ \text{e.g., } \text{... sea was perfect and we want to jump at sea.} \]

\[ \text{d) Used to indicate purpose } \]
\[ \text{e.g., } \text{... to solve this problem something must be done such as founding a common committee, and looking at historical documentaries.} \]

Table 2: Distribution of functions of (and) as a connector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linking</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>35.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicating</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>28.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronological Order</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causation</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>19.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From Table 2 above, we can see that nearly 35% of the *and* tokens served to link words (noun, adjective or verb phrases) or clauses; 28% were used to indicate a chronological relationship between clauses; 19.5% were used to indicate a cause-effect relationship and only 7% of the *and* tokens were used to indicate purpose.

The usage of linking words in spoken and written discourses can cause students difficulty in three basic ways. They can be left out, or overused, or the wrong linking word can be used. 240 tokens of *and* in a corpus of 5500 words indicates that *and* is overused by the participants.

It is common knowledge that the most basic function of *and* is to link similar words, phrases or clauses. Especially *and* is used in spoken language by native and non-native speakers of English. Spoken language owes this simplicity to its main characteristics which written language lacks. Written language is removed from the present, thus requiring a greater focus on the linguistic information being communicated because of minimal non-linguistic cues. The syntax of written language tends to be more formalized and complex than that of spoken language. Information across spoken utterances may be linked by intonation and phrasing, whereas the same information in written language is interconnected via specific linguistic cohesion devices. Hence in spoken language *and* is used in order not only to link similar words and phrases but also to indicate chronological order. As Schleppegrell (1996) observed in spoken language, speakers mostly employ clause chaining strategies in which they link segments of clause containing finite verbs using conjunctions. In comparison, written language tends to use nominalizations, adjectives, complex verbs, and prepositional phrases to condense information and ideas into single-clause structures.

On his book on linguistics Celik (2007) argues that sound patterns in language are what; in the same way we could argue that discourse markers usage is also another factor that gives a language its specific flavour of speaking. Turkish speakers’ employing *and* excessively causes there discourse to be less like that of a native speaker.

### 6. Conclusion

Bearing in mind *and*’s clausal or sentential function and its function in spoken language to introduce a new ‘speech paragraph,’ this study aimed to investigate the frequency and potential reasons for usage of *and* in Turkish speakers’ of English narratives. Since *and* occurred frequently in student narratives, the investigation of potential underlying causes for its overuse was essential and provides valuable insight into how to help students perform better in speaking the target language.
The results of this study on the use of *and* in the narratives of Turkish participants indicate two major points: (a) *and* is used both as a discourse marker and as a connector (also evident in native speaker discourse); (b) *and* is most commonly used as a connector rather than as a discourse marker by Turkish speakers. As shown in the findings, the participants usage of *and* displays mainly four functions: a) to connect two homogeneous words or phrases, b) to indicate the last item at the end of a list, c) to join sentences or sentence fragments in chronological order, and d) to indicate causation.

Regarding the functions of *and* we could argue that sentential *and* is more functional than discourse *and*, which also accounts for the fact that usage of *and* as a conjunction is more prevailing than its usage as a discourse marker. Relying heavily upon *and* as a discourse marker is one of the main factors differentiating the discourses of a native and a non-native speaker. While the discourse of native English speakers exhibits a variety of discourse markers such “oh,” “well,” “now,” “then,” “you know,” and “I mean,” the discourse of Turkish EFL speakers proves poor in terms of discourse marker usage.

To sum up, this study shows that Turkish EFL speakers need to develop not only their active vocabulary and oral language skills but also the usage of discourse markers in order to sound more like native speakers. This study also has implications for speaking courses in EFL/ESL settings in Turkey; namely, Turkish EFL teachers should better understand the speaking problems of their students not only in terms of fluency and accuracy in syntax and vocabulary choice, but also in discourse marker usage. By doing so teachers will help students to achieve more native-like discourse. This means teachers should both serve as good models using various discourse markers in their discourse. Additionally, authentic materials must be provided, especially in speaking classes, with examples of discourse marker usage; or attention could be drawn to the discourse markers available in the oral and written language samples used in the classroom.
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Abstract
A typological trend that often surfaces in languages is for aspirated stops and the phoneme /h/ to display some parallelism in their distribution. This paper investigates two speech varieties of Bangla: standard Dialect and Non-standard Hooghly dialect of which both have aspirated stops and /h/. These two varieties are highly mutually intelligible to the members of each group yet they show some phonological differences from each other. The distribution pattern of aspirated stops and /h/ in these two varieties is not identical. For each of these varieties, I delineate their distribution and unveil how an optimality-theoretic analysis can account for it. Crucial to my analysis are alignment constraints that show that the distribution of the feature [spread glottis] can be accounted for in terms of alignment to prosodic categories or position in a word. Finally, I demonstrate that the result of our analysis strengthens the typological implication of the optimality-theoretic analysis which predicts a range of patterns that are instantiated.
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1. Introduction

Over the past two decades several linguists have shown that languages that have both aspirated stops and the phoneme /h/ typically display a close parallel in their distribution. In fact, this phenomenon was first studied in phonetics (Goldstein, 1992; Pierrehumbert & Talkin, 1992) rather than in phonology. Goldstein (1992, p. 22) noted:

…there is strong parallelism between prosodic effects on laryngeal gestures for /h/ and on those that are coordinated with oral stops. This similarity is particularly impressive in the face of very different acoustic consequences of laryngeal gestures in the two cases: generation of breathy voice (/h/) and generation of voiceless intervals.

The observation of Goldstein (1992) is one of the major motivations to the current study since the language varieties under observation possess both aspirated oral stops and /h/ and Goldstein’s study is the only study that explicitly compares the laryngeal gestures associated with the oral stops and with /h/.

Phonological analysis of this phenomenon is relatively recent. Davis and Cho (2003), in analyzing the distribution of aspirated stops and /h/ in American English and Korean by adopting the Optimality theoretic approach, argue that this parallelism can be explained in the light of the feature [spread glottis] (henceforth, [s.g.]) that these sounds have in common. They further mention that languages that have both aspirated stops and the phoneme /h/ in their phonemic inventory often show a close parallel in their distribution. This observation may not surprise us given that such sounds are characterized by the feature [spread glottis]. They then demonstrate how the alignment analysis predicts a typology of patterning of aspirated stops and /h/.

Davis and Cho observed that there are certain positions in American English where aspirated stops and /h/ can occur and other positions where they are restricted. The following table will present some of the examples that were used by Davis and Cho (2003). Examples in (1)-(4) are environments showing their presence while (5)-(7) show their absence.
Aspirated stop /h/

1. At the beginning of a syllable with primary stress
   - póny [pʰ]
   - térrible [tʰ]
   - hábit [h]
   - héreo [h]

2. At the beginning of a syllable with secondary stress
   - dávenpòrt [pʰ]
   - Atàscadéro [tʰ]
   - álcohòl [h]
   - Ahàsuérus [h]

3. At the beginning of a word-initial unstressed syllable
   - Pacífic [pʰ]
   - tomáto [tʰ]
   - horízon [h]
   - Hawáii [h]

4. At the beginning of an unstressed syllable when immediately preceded by an unstressed syllable and followed by a stressed one
   - Mèditerrànean [tʰ]
   - Nàvratilòva [tʰ]
   - Tàrahumárà [h]

5. In coda position (h indicates a possible /h/ that does not surface)
   - at.las [tʰ]
   - ac.ne [kʰ]
   - Te’h.ran
   - brah.min

6. At the beginning of a (noninitial) unstressed syllable following a stressed one
   - átom [r]
   - Mickey [k]
   - vè.hí.cle
   - prò.hí.bí tion

7. As a possible second member of an onset
   - ski [k]
   - exposition [p]
   - Bhután
   - exhibítion

Table 1: Distribution of aspirated stops and /h/ in American English (Source: Davis & Cho, 2003)

On the contrary, the distribution of aspirated stops and /h/ in standard Korean (Seoul dialect) appears to be less parallel than in American English (Davis & Cho, 2003). They found that the distribution in Korean is parallel in that neither aspirated stops nor /h/ occur in coda position whereas both can appear in word-initial position. It was also observed that the parallelism breaks down if the onsets of non-initial syllables are considered. Davis and Cho (2003) found that in such environments, aspirated stops can appear but /h/ normally gets deleted. The data in the following table may help us understand their distribution in standard Korean.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Phonemic Transcription</th>
<th>Phonetic Transcription</th>
<th>English Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(8) No [h] in coda position</td>
<td>/anh/</td>
<td>[an]</td>
<td>‘inside’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/anh+pak/</td>
<td>[am.p^bak]</td>
<td>‘inside and outside’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) No aspiration in coda position</td>
<td>/n^p^h/</td>
<td>[n^p]</td>
<td>‘swamp’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/p^b^at/</td>
<td>[p^b^at]</td>
<td>‘red bean’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) [h] at the beginning of the word</td>
<td>/hilk/</td>
<td>[hilk]</td>
<td>‘dirt’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/ha-ta/</td>
<td>[ha-ta]</td>
<td>‘to do (declarative)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) Aspirated stops at the beginning of the word</td>
<td>/p^h^a/</td>
<td>[p^h^a]</td>
<td>‘green onion’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/t^h^al/</td>
<td>[t^h^al]</td>
<td>‘mask’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12) Lack of [h] in onset position beyond the initial syllable</td>
<td>/co.ha/</td>
<td>[co.a]</td>
<td>‘like (stative)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/man.ha/</td>
<td>[ma.na]</td>
<td>‘much (stative)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13) Aspirated stops in onset position beyond the initial syllable</td>
<td>/ki.p^h^o/</td>
<td>[ki.p^h^o]</td>
<td>‘air bubble’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/hwан_.t^h^o/</td>
<td>[hwан_.t^h^o]</td>
<td>‘mud’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14) Korean aspiration merger</td>
<td>/anh+pak/</td>
<td>[am.p^b^ak]</td>
<td>‘inside and outside’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/coh-ko/</td>
<td>[co.k^b^o]</td>
<td>‘like (and)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15) Korean /h/ deletion without aspiration merger</td>
<td>/norah-myэн/</td>
<td>[noramьэн]</td>
<td>‘if it is yellow’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/anh+sarm/</td>
<td>[ans’aram]</td>
<td>‘wife’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Distribution of aspirated stops and /h/ in standard Korean (Source: Davis & Cho, 2003)

Given that Bangla (Bengali) is a language that has both aspirated stops and /h/, it will be interesting to examine if Bangla follows the same path and strengthens the typological implications. The study, thus, analyzes the distribution of aspirated stops and /h/ in standard Bangla and in the Non-standard Hooghly dialect.
Bangla, one of the major languages of the Indo-European family, is an SOV type of language spoken both in the eastern state of India (West Bengal) and Bangladesh. The Hooghly dialect is spoken in the neighboring district of Kolkata (previously known as Calcutta). On the other hand, the Standard dialect is largely spoken in and around Kolkata- the capital of West Bengal. While these two varieties are mutually intelligible to most people, they show some phonological differences which make them distinct from one another. The Bangla phonemic inventory consists of 28 consonants and 7 vowels (Chatterji, 1986) in which both voiceless and voiced aspirated stops are phonemic in nature. The tables 1 and 2 display Bangla vowels and consonants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vowels</th>
<th>Front</th>
<th>Central</th>
<th>Back</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>u</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-mid</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-mid</td>
<td>æ</td>
<td>ɔ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Bangla Vowel chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consonants</th>
<th>Labial</th>
<th>Dental</th>
<th>Apico-Alveolar</th>
<th>Retroflex</th>
<th>Lamino-Postalveolar</th>
<th>Velar</th>
<th>Glottal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voiceless stops</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>t</td>
<td></td>
<td>t̂</td>
<td>t̂̂</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k̂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pʰ</td>
<td>tʰ</td>
<td></td>
<td>t̂ʰ</td>
<td>t̂̂ʰ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiced stops</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td>d̂</td>
<td>d̂̂</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>ĝ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bʰ</td>
<td>dʰ</td>
<td></td>
<td>d̂ʰ</td>
<td>d̂̂ʰ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiceless fricatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f̂</td>
<td></td>
<td>h</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasals</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>η</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquids</td>
<td>l, r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>l̂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Bangla Consonant Chart
In this analysis, I will make reference to a constraint requiring alignment between the beginning of the word and the feature [s.g]. The distinction between word-initial position (which allows for the surfacing of both aspirated stops and /h/ in standard Bangla as well as in Hooghly dialect) and syllable-initial position word-internally (which allows for /h/ but not aspirated stops in Hooghly dialect) is accounted for by the interaction of this alignment constraint with other constraints. In the first part of this paper, I describe the distribution of aspirated stops and /h/ in standard Bangla, which is immediately followed by the description of the distribution of aspiration, and /h/ in Hooghly dialect. The outline of the paper is as follows. At the outset of the description, I first present the data that display the parallel distribution between aspirated stops and /h/ in standard Bangla and Hooghly dialect while indicating places where they differ from each other. Next, I offer comprehensive definitions of all the constraints that are relevant for the analysis. I then offer the optimality-theoretic analysis of their distribution for both dialects. I conclude the paper by comparing the distribution of aspirated stops and /h/ in four speech varieties i.e. Standard Bangla, Hooghly dialect, American English, and Korean referring to Davis and Cho (2003).

2. Data

In this section, I present the data showing the distribution of aspirated stops and /h/ in both the standard Bangla and the non-standard Hooghly dialect. The analysis will show that while aspirated stops occur both in the onset and in the coda positions in standard Bangla, they are restricted to word initial onset positions in the non-standard Hooghly dialect. On the other hand, both the speech varieties allow /h/ in syllable initial position whether that syllable is word-initial or elsewhere in the word, but /h/ does not occur in any coda position.

Let us now consider the data on aspirated stops in the two varieties of Bangla. The data in (16) show a single aspirated stop in word initial onset position.
### (16) Standard Bangla

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Non-standard Hooghly dialect</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cʰi</td>
<td>cʰi</td>
<td>‘disapproval’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gʰɔɾ</td>
<td>gʰɔɾ</td>
<td>‘house’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cʰai</td>
<td>cʰai</td>
<td>‘ash’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dʰup</td>
<td>dʰup</td>
<td>‘incense stick’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pʰal.gun</td>
<td>pʰa.gun</td>
<td>‘eleventh month of the Bengali calendar’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here both dialects allow for aspirated stops in word-initial position. This should be contrasted with (17) which shows a potential aspirated stop in word internal onset position.

### (17) Standard Bangla

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Non-standard Hooghly dialect</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>la.ᵱer</td>
<td>la.ber</td>
<td>‘profit (gen)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ci.tʰi</td>
<td>ci.tʰi</td>
<td>‘letter’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŋu.dʰu</td>
<td>ŋu.du</td>
<td>‘bare’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŋä.kʰa</td>
<td>ŋä.ka</td>
<td>‘conch-bangle’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ma.cʰi</td>
<td>maci</td>
<td>‘fly’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kor.cʰi</td>
<td>kor.ci</td>
<td>‘do (1st present progressive)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lik.cʰi</td>
<td>lik.ci</td>
<td>‘write (1st present progressive)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mak.cʰi</td>
<td>mak.ci</td>
<td>‘mix (1st present progressive)’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In (17) where standard Bangla has aspirated stops in word internal onset position, they surface without any aspiration in the cognate forms in the non-standard Hooghly dialect. This difference between the two dialects is made clear by the forms in (18) and (19) where there are multiple aspirated stops in different onsets within the word. In the non-standard Hooghly dialect, the stop shows up as aspirated only in word-initial position.
In (20), we consider aspirated stops in coda position.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(20) Standard Bangla</th>
<th>Non-standard Hooghly dialect</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mag&lt;sup&gt;h&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>mag</td>
<td>‘eleventh month of the Bengali calendar’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mak&lt;sup&gt;h&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>mak</td>
<td>‘mix’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rɔt&lt;sup&gt;h&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>rɔt</td>
<td>‘chariot’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaɿ&lt;sup&gt;h&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>kaɿ</td>
<td>‘wood’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ɔ.po.rad&lt;sup&gt;h&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>ɔ.po.rad</td>
<td>‘guilt’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rād.be</td>
<td>rād.be</td>
<td>‘cook (2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;/3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; future)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pūc.e (pūc&lt;sup&gt;h&lt;/sup&gt;e)</td>
<td>pūc.ce</td>
<td>‘wipe (3rd present progressive)’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Aspirated stops can surface in coda position in standard Bangla but not in non-standard Hooghly dialect.

Despite the fact that standard Bangla, more or less, allows aspirated stops both in onset and coda positions, there appears to be at least one restriction on the occurrence of aspirated stops i.e., two consecutive aspirated stops can never occur. Consider the following examples in (21) where a word final aspirated stop loses its aspiration when a following suffix starts with an aspirated consonant.
Thus, we see that in Standard Bangla, aspirated stops occur in both onset and coda position with the only restriction being that a coda cannot be aspirated if an immediate following onset is aspirated.

The data in (21) reveal that the distribution of /h/ is identical both in Standard Bangla and in the Hooghly dialect. In both the varieties /h/ can occur in onset position both word-initial as well as word-internal position but not in coda position; thus avoiding the occurrence of consecutive /h/ in words.

Let us now consider the distribution of /h/ in the two Bangla dialects.

(22) **Standard Bangla/ Non-standard Hooghly dialect**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hat</td>
<td>‘hand’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hâʃʃ</td>
<td>‘duck’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hɔtʰat (Standard Bangla), hɔtʃat (Hooghly dialect)</td>
<td>‘suddenly’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.ti.haʃʃ</td>
<td>‘history’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʃɔ.hai</td>
<td>‘helper’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pa.ha.ra</td>
<td>‘guard’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ha.hu.taʃʃ</td>
<td>‘regret’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following table accommodates a few representative samples that I will use in section 4 to show crucial constraint ranking arguments, and it may at the same time help us take a quick glance at the distribution pattern of aspirated stops and /h/ in both the speech varieties.

---

1 Very marginally /h/ can occur in word final position in Standard Bangla as in the onomatopoeic bah ‘sound (of admiration)’ with a pronounced [h] in Standard Bangla but not in non-standard Hooghly dialect.
### Distribution of Aspirated stops and /h/ in standard Bangla and Hooghly dialect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word initial onset</th>
<th>Standard Bangla</th>
<th>Hooghly dialect</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Standard Bangla/ Hooghly dialect</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cʰi</td>
<td>cʰi</td>
<td>‘disapproval’</td>
<td>hat</td>
<td>hₐʃ</td>
<td>‘hand’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gʰɔr</td>
<td>gʰɔr</td>
<td>‘house’</td>
<td>hɔtʰat</td>
<td>hɔtʰat</td>
<td>‘suddenly’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dʰup</td>
<td>dʰup</td>
<td>‘incense stick’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word initial onset</th>
<th>Standard Bangla</th>
<th>Hooghly dialect</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Standard Bangla/ Hooghly dialect</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>la.ʰer</td>
<td>la.ber</td>
<td>‘profit (gen)’</td>
<td>i.ti.ʰaʃ</td>
<td>‘history’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kor.ʰi</td>
<td>kor.ci</td>
<td>‘I am doing’</td>
<td>ʃ̣.ʰai</td>
<td>‘helper’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lik.ʰi</td>
<td>lik.ci</td>
<td>‘I am writing’</td>
<td>pa.ʰa.ra</td>
<td>‘guard’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>puc.ʰe</td>
<td>puc.ce</td>
<td>‘He/she/ they are mopping.’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Distribution of /h/ in standard Bangla and Hooghly dialect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word initial and internal onsets</th>
<th>Standard Bangla</th>
<th>Hooghly dialect</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Standard Bangla/ Hooghly dialect</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kʰac.ʰi</td>
<td>kʰac.ci</td>
<td>‘eat (1st progressive)’</td>
<td>ha.hu.ᵗaʃ</td>
<td>‘regret’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gʰam.ʰi</td>
<td>gʰam.ci</td>
<td>‘sweat (1st progressive)’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word final coda</th>
<th>Standard Bangla</th>
<th>Hooghly dialect</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Standard Bangla/ Hooghly dialect</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rɔtʰ</td>
<td>rɔt</td>
<td>‘chariot’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaɾʰ</td>
<td>kat</td>
<td>‘wood’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word internal coda</th>
<th>Standard Bangla</th>
<th>Hooghly dialect</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Standard Bangla/ Hooghly dialect</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rādʰ.be</td>
<td>rād.be</td>
<td>‘cook (2nd/3rd future)’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Distribution of aspirated stops and /h/ in standard Bangla and Hooghly dialect

From the table above, one can see that in each dialect of Bangla the distribution of aspirated stops and /h/ is close but not exactly parallel. Specifically, in Standard Bangla, while both segment types can appear in onset position, only aspirated stops (but not /h/) can appear in coda position. In non-standard Hooghly dialect, while both segment types are restricted to onset position, aspirated stops are limited to word initial onset position but not /h/. One interesting difference between the two dialects is that in Standard Bangla /h/ has a more restricted distribution than aspirated stops while in non-standard Hooghly dialect the aspirated stops have more restricted distribution.
3. Relevant Constraints

In this section, I will present nine constraints that I will make use of in the following section when presenting the optimality-theoretic analysis of the Bangla data. Many of these are constraints utilized by Davis and Cho (2003) in their analysis of the distribution of aspirated stops and /h/ in American English and Korean.

Central to the analysis is the constraint in (23) that aligns the left edge of the word with the feature [s.g.].

(23) **AlignL (Wrd,[sg]):** (Davis & Cho, 2003)
Align the left edge of the word with the feature [s.g.].

The next constraint in (24) requires any instance of the feature [s.g.] in the input to be realized in the output.

(24) **MAX-sg:** (Davis & Cho, 2003)
The feature [s.g.] in the input must have a corresponding feature [s.g.] in the output.

The Coda Condition constraint in (25) prohibits the feature [s.g.] from appearing in coda position.

(25) **Coda Condition (CodaCon):** (Kager, 1999)
The feature spread glottis [s.g] is not allowed in the coda position.

The constraint in (26) is a general markedness constraint militating against the feature [s.g.]

(26) ***s.g.:** (Davis & Cho, 2003)
The feature spread glottis [s.g] is prohibited.

In (27), we have a constraint against multiple correspondence. That is, a segment on the surface should not have features from two different input phonemes. The relevance of this constraint for our analysis is that it prevents the feature [s.g.] from shifting from one phoneme in a word to another.
(27) *MC (No Multiple Correspondence): (Davis & Cho, 2003)

The features on a phoneme in the output must come from the corresponding phoneme in the input.

In (28) we have an OCP constraint on the feature [s.g.].

(28) *OCP-sg: (Motivated by Goldsmith, 1979; ‘no identical adjacent autosegments’)

Avoid two instances of adjacent [s.g.] in any given word.

In (29) we have the commonly used MAX constraint that militates against the deletion of an input phoneme.

(29) MAX: (Kager, 1999)

The phoneme in the input must have a corresponding phoneme in the output.

Finally, in (30) we have a constraint disallowing /h/ in coda position. While this constraint is similar to the * [s.g.] constraint in (26), it is needed to account for the asymmetry between aspirated stops and /h/ in coda position in Standard Bangla.

(30) *h-Coda:

/h/ does not occur in coda position.

4. Optimality-theoretic Analysis

Linguists (Smolensky, 1995; Zoll, 1998) have observed that the loss of marked feature specification can be viewed as the converse of the licensing of marked feature specification in prosodically strong positions e.g. German, Dutch, Polish, and Catalan display coda devoicing. Adopting the notion of Somlensky (1995) and Zoll (1998), I develop an alignment analysis that accounts for the distribution of aspirated stops and /h/ in standard Bangla and its Hooghly dialect. In so doing, I also make reference to constraints that require positions of prominence to be aligned with the feature [s.g.]. For the purpose of analysis, I selected a few representative tokens with their possible set of outputs that eventually help us establish the crucial constraint rankings. The tableaux are organized in such a way that constraint ranking...
arguments appear coherent to the readers. It may be worth mentioning that some possible outputs for any given set of tokens are not discussed as they do not necessarily show any crucial ranking arguments between the constraints.

4.1 Aspirated stops and /h/ in Standard Bangla

The study first offers the analysis of aspirated stops and /h/ in standard Bangla by examining the form /korchhi/ ‘do-1st present progressive’. A set of possible outputs for the representative tokens is introduced before each tableau. However, only those possible outputs that clearly indicate a constraint ranking arguments are analyzed. It may be noted that some of the possible outputs of a given token are not analyzed consecutively; instead, they are analyzed wherever they seem to be suitable with respect to the coherence of the arguments. Consider the following token and those of its possible outputs in (31) that help us determine the ranking argument. The form in bold is the actual output.

(31) (a) kor.chi (b) kor.ci (c) k^hor.ci (d) k^hor.chi

The tableau 32 illustrates the ranking relationship between MAX-sg and *sg

(32) /korchhi/---[ kor.chi ] ‘do (1st present progressive)’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>/korchhi /</th>
<th>MAX-sg</th>
<th>*sg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓(a)kor.chi</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) kor.ci</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In tableau (32) we notice that (31b) loses to (31a) as (31b) violates MAX-sg. Consequently, Max-sg must outrank *sg or else (31b) would wrongly be the winner.

Since, both (31a) and (31b) violate AlignL(Wrd,[sg]), the ranking relationship between MAX-sg and *sg will not be affected no matter where we place this constraint in tableau 32.

(33) Constraint ranking: MAX-sg>> *sg
Tableau (35) displays the ranking relationship between MAX-sg, CodaCon, and *sg. A set of possible outputs for the token /katʰ/ ‘Wood’ is introduced in (34).

(34) (a) katʰ (b) kʰat (c) kat (d) kʰatʰ

(35) /katʰ/ -- [katʰ] ‘wood’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>katʰ</th>
<th>MAX-sg</th>
<th>CodaCon</th>
<th>*sg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✅(a) katʰ</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) kat</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(34a) appears to be the winner despite violating two of the constraints shown while (34c) violates only one. The only logical conclusion we can draw from tableau (35) is that MAX-sg is higher ranked than CodaCon and *sg.

(36) Constraint ranking: MAX-sg >> CodaCon, *sg

A set of possible outputs for the token /kʰacʰci/ ‘eat (1st present progressive)’ is introduced in (37).

(37) (a) kʰacʰ.ci (b) kʰacʰ.ci (c) kʰac.ci (d) kacʰ.ci (e) kac.cʰi (f) kac.ci (g) kac.h.ci (h) kʰacʰ.ci

In tableau 38 we will see why *OCP-sg is higher ranked than MAX-sg, CodaCon and *sg.

(38) /kʰacʰci/ ---[ kʰac.cʰi ] ‘eat (1st present progressive)’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>/kʰacʰci/</th>
<th>*OCP-sg</th>
<th>MAX-sg</th>
<th>CodaCon</th>
<th>*sg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) kʰacʰ.ci</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✅(b) kʰacʰ.ci</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h) kʰacʰ.ci</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It appears that the winning candidate (37b), in addition to violating lower ranked *sg twice, violates MAX-sg which is higher ranked than CodaCon, and *sg. The question is what prevents (37a) and (37h) from being the winning candidate. (37a) violates *OCP-sg which outranks all other constraints in tableau 37. On the other hand, both (37h) and (37b) violate *sg twice and MAX-sg once; yet (37b) is the winner. This is because (37h), in addition to violating *sg and MAX-sg, violates CodaCon.

(39) Constraint ranking: *OCP-sg>> MAX-sg >> CodaCon, *sg

Let us now return to candidates (31a) and (31c) in tableau 40 to show the effect of the constraint *MC and why it is higher ranked than AlignL(Wrd.[sg]) and *sg.

(40) /korehi/--- [kor.ehi] ‘do (1st present progressive)’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>/korehi /</th>
<th>*MC</th>
<th>AlignL(Wrd,[s.g.])</th>
<th>*sg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔(a)kor.ehi</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) koreri</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(31a) and (31c) both violate two constraints yet (31c) loses to (31a) only because (31c) violates higher ranked *MC. (31c) violates *MC because the [s.g.] feature on the initial [kʰ] originates in a noncorresponding underlying segment².

(41) Constraint ranking: *MC>> AlignL(Wrd,[sg]) , *sg

In tableau (42) candidates (34a) and (34b) are compared to show that *MC is not only higher ranked than AlignL(Wrd,[sg]) but also higher to CodaCon.

(42) /katʰ/-- [katʰ] ‘wood’

² The candidate in (31d) kʰor.ehi from underlying /kor. ehi/ would be eliminated because of the undominated nature of the constraint Dep-s.g. (i.e. do not insert the feature s.g.). This is an important constraint in Bangla dialects because it captures the fact that the feature [s.g.] is never inserted on a segment but is there in the input.
Let us now consider, if there is any ranking argument between *MC and MAX-sg. Consider the token /pūcʰ.cʰe/ and its possible outputs in 44.

(44) (a) pūcʰ.cʰe (b) pūc.cʰe (c) pʰūc.cʰe

Tableau (45) will show the crucial constraint ranking.

(45) /pūcʰ.cʰe/--- [pūc.cʰe] 'swap (3rd present progressive)'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>/pūcʰ.cʰe/</th>
<th>*MC</th>
<th>MAX-sg</th>
<th>AlignL(Wrd,[s.g.])</th>
<th>*sg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔ (b) pūc.cʰe</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) pʰūc.cʰe</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In candidate (44a), the initial aspiration originates on the first /cʰ/. The only reason that (44b) wins over (44c) is because (44c) violates the higher ranked constraint *MC. Additionally, tableau 38 indicates that there is no ranking argument between MAX-sg and AlignL(Wrd,[sg]).

(46) Constraint ranking: *MC >> MAX-sg, AlignL(Wrd,[sg])

Thus, based on the above analysis we can claim that the distribution of aspirated stops in standard Bangla is the outcome of the following constraint ranking.

(47) Constraint ranking:

(a) *OCP-sg, *MC >> MAX-sg >> CodaCon, *sg
(b) *MC>> AlignL(Wrd,[sg]) – otherwise AlignL(Wrd,[sg]) does not appear to be crucially ranked with respect to the other constraints discussed here.

Now, let us turn to the issue of the distribution of /h/ in standard Bangla. Our primary goal, at this point, will be to reveal the constraint ranking that determines the distribution of /h/ and then to see how this ranking fits into the constraint ranking that we have already established for the distribution of aspirated stops.

A set of possible outputs for the token /hat/ ‘hand’ is introduced in (48).

(48) (a) hat (b) at

(49) /hat/---[ hat] ‘hand’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MAX-sg</th>
<th>AlignL(Wrd[sg])</th>
<th>*sg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓(a) hat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) at</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Though the tableau in (49) does not offer any new crucial ranking, it is important to understand why (48a) wins over (48b) and, consequently, we learn that if /h/ exists in the input it should also be present in the output.

A set of possible outputs for /pahara/ ‘guard’ is introduced in (50) which eventually gives us an idea of what the constraint ranking that accounts for the distribution of /h/ in word-internal onset positions.

(50) (a) pa.ha.ra (b) pah.ar.a (c) pʰa.a.ra (d) pa.ar.a

The tableau in (51) shows why faithful candidate (50a) wins over (50b) and (50c).
(51) /pahara/--*[ pah.ara] ‘guard’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>*MC</th>
<th>MAX</th>
<th>AlignL(Wrd,[sg])</th>
<th>CodaCon</th>
<th>*sg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓(a) pah.ara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) pah.ar.a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) pʰa.ar.a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) pa.ar.a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The faithful candidate (50a) wins because (50c) and (50d) violate *MC and MAX respectively which outrank all other constraints in tableau (51). However, (50b) is singled out because it violates one more constraint than the winning candidate. Thus, on the basis of the above analysis we can safely draw the following ranking argument.

(52) Constraint ranking: *MC, MAX >> AlignL(Wrd,[sg]), CodaCon, *sg

What we can notice here is that an additional constraint MAX that occurs highest ranked with *MC is required in order to explain the distribution of /h/ in standard Bangla.

In order to account for the absence of /h/ in coda position in standard Bangla, let us consider the hypothetical candidates in (53), based on a Bangla word of Sanskrit origin.

(53) (a) brah.ma (b) bra.ma (c) bʰra.ma

(54) /brah.ma /---*[ bra.ma]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>*h-Coda</th>
<th>*MC</th>
<th>MAX</th>
<th>MAX-sg</th>
<th>*sg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) brah.ma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓(b) bra.ma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) bʰra.ma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 A loan word from Sanskrit meaning ‘illusion’ which is ‘bʰram’ in Bangla.
Candidate (53b) wins over (53a) and (53c) despite the fact that it violates higher ranked constraint MAX and lower ranked MAX-sg. The only possible logical solution that tableau 54 offers to account for the absence of /h/ in coda position is that both (53a) and (53c) violate constraints which are higher ranked constraints than MAX and MAX-sg, namely *h-Coda and *MC. However, a ranking argument between *h-coda and *MC cannot be established from the tableau (54).

(55) *h-Coda, *MC >> MAX, MAX-sg>>*sg

At this point we can logically draw our final ranking for the distribution of aspirated stops and /h/ in standard Bangla.

(56) **Final ranking**

(a) **OCP-sg, *h-Coda, *MC>> MAX, MAX-sg >> CodaCon, *sg**

(b) **MC>> AlignL(Wrd,[sg])**

The final tableau in (57) accommodates all the representative samples that were analyzed above to determine the constraint ranking.

(57) **Final Tableau**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Input</th>
<th>Output</th>
<th>*OCP</th>
<th>*h-Coda</th>
<th>*MC</th>
<th>MAX</th>
<th>MAX-sg</th>
<th>AlignL (Wrd[sg])</th>
<th>CodaCon</th>
<th>*sg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/k orc hi/</td>
<td>kor c hi</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/kat h/</td>
<td>kat h</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/kc ac h i/</td>
<td>kc ac c hi</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/puc h c e/</td>
<td>puc c e</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/hat/</td>
<td>hat</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/pahara/</td>
<td>pa ha ra</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/brah ma/</td>
<td>bra ma</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2 Aspirated stops and /h/ in Non-Standard Hooghly Dialect

The distribution of aspirated stops in Hooghly dialect differs from Standard Bangla in two ways – (a) no aspirated stops occur in coda positions (b) word internal onsets do not allow aspirated stops. In the following tableaux, we will see why these two positions are restricted only to non-aspirated segments.

A set of possible outputs for the token kor\(^h\)i ‘do-1\(^{st}\) present progressive’ is reintroduced in (58) for the convenience of readers. Recall that in Standard Bangla (58b) is the winning candidate.

(58)  (a) k\(^h\)or.c\(^h\)i (b) kor.c\(^h\)i (c) kor.ci (d) k\(^h\)or.ci

However, in Hooghly dialect (58c) wins over other possible outputs. The tableau in 59 will show the ranking argument that allows (58c) to win.

(59) /korc\(^h\)i/---[ kor.ci] (do-1\(^{st}\) present progressive)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>*sg</th>
<th>MAX-sg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/korc(^h)i/</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) kor.c(^h)i</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) kor.ci</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unlike Standard Bangla, we notice that *sg outranks MAX-sg and that is how (58c) wins over (58b).

(60) Constraint ranking: *sg\(>>\)MAX-sg

A set of possible outputs for the token c\(^h\)i ‘sound (of disapproval)’ is introduced in (61) and by comparing them we can determine the ranking between AlignL (Wrd,[sg]), *sg, and MAX-sg.

(61). (a) c\(^h\)i (b) ci
(62)  /cʰi/ ---[cʰi]  ‘disapproval’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>/cʰi/</th>
<th>AlignL(Wrd,[sg])</th>
<th>*sg</th>
<th>MAX-sg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ (a) cʰi</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) ci</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tableau (62) clearly states that AlignL(Wrd,[sg]) is higher ranked than *sg, else (61b) would have wrongly been the winner.

(63)  Constraint ranking: AlignL(Wrd,[sg])>>*sg>>MAX-sg

In the tableau in (64) we can observe that (58c) wins over (58d) only because *MC is higher ranked than any other constraints.

(64)  /korcʰi/---[ kor.ci] (do-1st present progressive)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>/korcʰi/</th>
<th>*MC</th>
<th>AlignL(Wrd,[s.g.])</th>
<th>*sg</th>
<th>MAX-sg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(c)✓kor.ci</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) kʰor.ci</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, based on tableau (64) we can draw the following constraint ranking.

(65)  Constraint ranking: *MC>>AlignL(Wrd[sg])>>*sg>>MAX-sg

The analysis of the distribution of aspirated stops in the Hooghly dialect thus offers us the following constraint ranking.

(66)  Constraint ranking: *MC>>AlignL(Wrd[sg])>>*sg>>MAX-sg

If we now compare the constraint ranking in (66) with that of (56) we can clearly see what causes the differences in the distribution of aspirated stops in the two varieties. The constraint ranking in (56) is reprinted here for ease of comparison.
Constraint ranking: *OCP, *MC >> MAX-sg >> AlignL(Wrd,[sg]), CodaCon, *sg

What similarities do we notice between these two rankings? In both the varieties *MC is highly ranked. However, the difference in the crucial ranking of AlignL(Wrd,[sg]), *sg, and MAX-sg is the main cause of the differences in the distribution of aspirated stops in these two varieties.

We will now see what the constraint ranking explains regarding the way /h/ is distributed in the Hooghly dialect and afterwards we can compare constraint ranking between the standard dialect and the Hooghly dialect. A set of possible outputs for the token in (49) / hat / ‘hand’ is reprinted in (68) for convenience.

(68) (a) hat (b) at

(69) /hat/---[ hat] ‘hand’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>/hat/</th>
<th>AlignL(Wrd[sg])</th>
<th>*sg</th>
<th>MAX-sg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓(a) hat</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) at</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Tableau in (69) is particularly important because it explains one very important fact. If we compare the tableau in (69) with the tableau in (49) then we can observe that in both the cases, the winning candidates take the same phonetic form, yet they are the result of two different constraints ranking argument.

We will now deal with the distribution of /h/ in word internal onset position in the Hooghly dialect, which will then make clear to us that the same phonetic form in two different varieties can be the result of two different constraint rankings. A set of possible outputs for pahara ‘guard’ is reintroduced in (70).

(70) (a) paha.ra (b) pah.ar.a (c) pʰa.ar.a (d) pa.ar.a
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(71) /pahara/---[ pa.ha.ra] ‘guard’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>/pahara/</th>
<th>*MC</th>
<th>MAX</th>
<th>CodaCon</th>
<th>AlignL(Wrd,sg)</th>
<th>*sg</th>
<th>MAX-sg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ (a) pa.ha ra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) pah.ar.a</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) pʰa.ar.a</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) pa.ar.a</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The tableau in (71) offers a crucial ranking argument. Candidate (70a) wins over (70c) and (70d) only because they violate one of the higher ranked constraints that dominates AlignL(Wrd,[sg]). (71c) violates *MC, and (71d) has a fatal violation of MAX brought about by the deletion of /h/. (70b) loses because of the additional violation of CodaCon compared to (70a).

Finally, we will account for the absence of /h/ in coda positions in non-standard Hooghly dialect in tableau 73. The hypothetical candidates in (53) are reprinted in (72).

(72) (a) brah.ma (b) bra.ma (c) bʰra.ma

(73) / brah.ma /---[ bra.ma]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>/ brah.ma/</th>
<th>*Mc</th>
<th>*h-Coda</th>
<th>CodaCon</th>
<th>MAX</th>
<th>*sg</th>
<th>MAX-sg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) brah.ma</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ (b) bra.ma</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) bʰra.ma</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, we can see the following ranking arguments.

(74) Constraint ranking: *MC, *h-Coda, >> Max>> AlignL(Wrd,sg)], CodaCon >> *sg >> MAX-sg

Interestingly, if we recall the constraint ranking in (56) (Constraint ranking: *OCP-sg, *h-Coda*, MC, >> MAX, MAX-sg, AlignL(Wrd,[sg]) >> CodaCon, *sg) which accounts for the distribution of /h/ in the standard dialect then we find an important difference in constraint ranking. In the Hooghly dialect, the constraint CodaCon occupies a higher place in the ranking whereas in the standard dialect it is a lower
ranked constraint. This can be seen by considering the form [ka\(^{h}\)] from underlying /kat\(^{h}\)/ in nonstandard Hooghly dialect. In this dialect aspiration is not realized in coda position (output is [ka]) – thus showing that CodaCon>>*sg. In contrast, constraint MAX is placed higher in the ranking in the standard Bangla while it is lower ranked constraint in the Hooghly dialect.

The constraint ranking in (75) and the tableau in (76) shall help us see the constraint ranking that account for the distribution of aspirated stops and /h/ in the Hooghly dialect.

(75) **Final ranking:**

\[ *MC, *h-Coda >> MAX >> \text{AlignL(Wrd[sg])}, \text{CodaCon} >> *\text{sg} >> \text{MAX-sg} \]

(76) **Final Tableau**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Input</th>
<th>Output</th>
<th>*MC</th>
<th>*h-Coda</th>
<th>MAX</th>
<th>AlignL (Wrd[sg])</th>
<th>CodaCon</th>
<th>*sg</th>
<th>MAX-sg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/korc(^{h})i/</td>
<td>kor.ci</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ch(^{h})i/</td>
<td>ch.i</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/lik(^{h})c(^{h})i/</td>
<td>lik.ci</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/k(^{h})ac(^{h})c(^{h})i/</td>
<td>k(^{h})ac.ci</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/hat/</td>
<td>hat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/pahara/</td>
<td>pa.ha.ra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/brah.ma/</td>
<td>bra.ma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Conclusion

The analysis points out two major facts – on the one hand we see there is a close parallelism in the distribution of aspirated stops in /h/ in Standard Bangla and in the Hooghly dialect and on the other it indicates the differences that these two speech varieties display. Thus, our analysis reconfirms Smolensky’s (1995) claim that the loss of marked feature specification is the converse of licensing of
marked feature specification in prosodically strong positions. Furthermore, adopting the result of Davis and Cho (2003), we can claim that the alignment analysis does indicate a typology of patterning of aspirated stops and /h/.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Aspirated stops</th>
<th>/h/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Word initial</td>
<td>Non-initial Onset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American English</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Bangla</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooghly dialect</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Parallelism and differences in the distribution of aspirated stops and /h/ in four languages

What table 6 indicates is that the American English displays exact parallel in the distribution of aspirated stops and /h/ whereas other three speech varieties slightly differ in their distribution. In fact, the American English and the Standard Bangla seem to behave in similar fashion in distributing aspirated stops and /h/ while Korean and the Non-standard Hooghly dialect appear to have more similarities in the distribution of aspirated stops and /h/ than American English and Standard Bangla. It is, however, important to note that typology does not predict that every language should have a close parallel in their distribution like Standard Bangla; rather what it predicts is a range of patterns that are instantiated.
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Introduction

Discourse is not a neutral representation of the world (Van Dijk 1988, 1992, 1995; Fairclough 1995a, 1995b; Fowler 1987; Mcleod and Hertog 1992; Downing 1990). Politicians make choices at different levels of discourse in order to represent events in a way that fits with their ideology. Butt et al. (2004) claim that “the very use of language is ideological” (p.288). Accordingly, the choice one makes among different choices matters. The choices, which are made at any level (e.g., semantic, syntactic, lexical, etc.), could be used by politicians in order to produce positive/negative effects (Wilson, 2001). Hasan (1996) adds, “We not only use language to shape reality, but we use it also to defend that reality, against anyone whose alternative values might threaten ours” (p.34).

At the semantic level, Van Dijk (1997) states that one of the most important semantic choices “is to make propositions with positive predicates about the ["self"] rather explicit than implicit, rather direct than indirect, and stated rather than presupposed” (p.31). Also, Wodak et al. (1999) believe that in political discourse, the repetition of the pronoun we is a “persuasive linguistic device which help[s] invite identification and solidarity with the ‘we-group,’ which, however, simultaneously implies distancing from and marginalization of ‘others.’” (p.160). At the lexis level, on the other hand, choices seem to be “less overt operations, in the sense that they rarely go fully unnoticed by the listener or reader since they lie above the threshold of consciousness” (p.4). Volosino claims, “the word is the fundamental object of the study of ideology” (qtd. in de Beaugrande, 1999, p.259). He stresses the importance of lexical choices to reveal ideology; lexical choices carry the speaker’s negative or positive evaluation of the people, events, or actions (Sykes 1988; Van Dijk 1988, 1995; Fairclough 1995b).

This paper comprises some illustrative and representative samples of some transcribed English press conferences held after the attack on the World Trade Center (WTC) and during the War on Terror by the following English-speaking politicians: US President George Bush, British Prime Minister Tony Blair, President Aznar, Prime Minister Barroso, Secretary-General Kofi Annan, Secretary of Defense Donald H. Rumsfeld, and Secretary of State Powell. They held press conferences after the attacks on September 11 discussing the terrorists’ attacks and the so-called “war on terror.” These leaders are considered as allies in the “war on terror.”

This study attempts to contribute to the field of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), and examine how lexical tools, e.g., jargon and abstraction, may embody and reveal the ideology and the images of the “self” and the “other” created by politicians during the “war on terror.” In addition, it aims at uncovering the construct underlying the politicians’ discourse at a global level, i.e., the political goals of
the leaders. To achieve this goal, Van Dijk’s (2000a) ideological square will be applied to the lexical choices of the political discourse to uncover some of the functions of such tools.

**Analytical Framework**

CDA has become a significant field because of the current political changes that have affected the world map. The ideological/political nature of language is no longer a hypothesis to be tested. Language is, and has always been, ideological. It is a tool and an index: a tool for influencing others and an index for uncovering its producers’ emotions, attitudes, and world-views.

CDA connects and produce three important aspects: language, power, and ideology (Fairclough 1995a, 1995b; Fairclough & Wodak 1997; Van Dijk 1988, 1998). It is “distinctive in its views of (a) the relationship between language and society, and (b) the relationship between analysis and the practices analyzed” (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997, p. 258). It is a means “to explore the imbrications between language and social-institutional practices and between these, taken together, with broader social and political structure” (Fairclough, 1995, p. vii). It “employs interdisciplinary techniques of text analysis to look at how texts construct representations of the world, social identities, and social relationships” (Luke, n.d.). Thus, it can shed light on how the world is portrayed and how human and political actions are represented, explained, and justified. Accordingly, discourse serves as a medium by which one can communicate ideologies in society, “thereby helps reproduce power and domination of specific groups or class” (Van Dijk, 1977b, p. 25).

This study employs Van Dijk’s (2000a, p.4) strategy of most, if not all, ideologies which embodies these two concepts:

- Say positive things about Us
- Say negative things about Them

This positive-negative representation of the “self” and the “other” is a general one. It conforms to the essential function of any ideology, which is to maintain the status-quo by legitimating current power structures. Van Dijk (2000a) modifies this strategy and names it an “ideological square,” applying it to the analysis of all levels of discourse structures (p. 44). It is made up of the following sub-strategies:

- Emphasize positive things about Us.
- Emphasize negative things about Them.
De-emphasize negative things about Us.

De-emphasize positive things about Them.

Van Dijk (2000a) indicates that this ideological square gives us variable possibilities to apply to semantic and lexical analysis and many forms of structural variation (p. 44). This study will employ Van Dijk’s (2000a) ideological square, applying it to the lexical choices of the data.

**Jargonizing and Abstracting Strategies:**

Allan and Burridge (1991) have developed X-phemism as a combination of the two words: euphemism and dysphemism. Euphemism is “a polite word or expression that you use instead of a more direct one to avoid shocking or upsetting someone” (*Longman*, 2000). Dysphemism, on the other hand, is “an expression with connotations that are offensive either about the denotatum or to the audience, or both, and it is substituted for a neutral or euphemistic expression for just that reason” (Allan & Burridge 1991, p.26). For example, one can say “Abu Nidal is a freedom fighter” or “Abu Nidal is a terrorist” (p.26). The word “terrorist” is “a dysphemism because the term terrorist has unfavorable connotations” (p.26).

Jargon and abstraction are types of X-phemism (see appendix 7). The types analyzed in this study are part of what I called “pragma-semantic types” (for more information, see AL-Harbi, 2009) because their definition and subcategories are very much context-dependent. In other words, the same type may have different meanings and functions in different contexts. These types are as follows:

**Jargon** is language that can be understood by those who belong to the same group or community. It has double functions: euphemistic function for in-groupers and dysphemistic function for out-groupers (Allan and Burridge, 1991, p. 3). This wide term covers some other subtypes such as slogan, technical words, gobbledygook, cliché, and idioms. However, this study is limited to the first type: technical terms, because it is the most dominating one in the data whereas the other types are less frequent.

*Technical Terms*

**Technical terms** are terms that belong to certain in-groupers to facilitate their communication. On the other hand, they hinder communication with out-groupers (10). For example, “intelligence” stands for “spies.”
Abstraction

Abstraction is “a strategy of simplification of detail, wherein formerly concrete details are left ambiguous, vague, or undefined; thus speaking of things in the abstract demands that the listener have an intuitive or common background with the speaker, if the speaker expects to be understood” (“Abstract,” n.d.). It concentrates on general ideas rather than on the specific manifestation of these ideas. Abstract words such as “it” or “thing” may not have a preceding definite referent. In addition, they can be general unspecified words such as “politics,” “free world,” and “justice” which encompass a wide range of meanings in a variety of contexts. Abstraction is divided into neutral, i.e., empty words, and emotive words that are loaded with positive or negative feelings. This study is concerned with emotive words.

Emotive Words

Emotive Words (loaded language) are “words or phrases which have strong emotional overtones or connotations and which evoke strongly positive (or negative) reactions far beyond the specific meaning of the word which is listed in the dictionary” (“Loaded term”, n.d.). Such a language carries with it a heavy emotional charge that “unfairly frames words into limited or biased contexts. The words you choose should clarify the truth of a situation, not misdirect your audience by unfairly describing or biasing the audience’s interpretations” (“Loaded term,” n.d.). Such a language aims at getting people to react emotionally. For instance, politicians often use language that is more emotive rather than factual and neutral to play on people’s emotions. In this study, emotive words are divided into sneer words and purr words.

Sneer words.

Sneer words are loaded emotive words with negative meanings and connotation such as “criminal,” “dictator,” and “terrorist.”

Purr words

Purr words are the opposite of sneer words as they are loaded emotive words with positive meanings and connotation such as “freedom,” “justice,” “strong,” and “united.”

Presupposition

Since X-phemism is more a part of pragmatics, there will be a focus on a pragmatic theory, i.e., Grice’s CP and their resultant implicatures, which are helpful tools in uncovering meanings, and the presuppositions. Presuppositions have informative uses (Karttunnen 1974, Stalnaker 1974): i.e. when an
utterance has a presuppositions inducer, the presupposition may not be a shared belief by the interlocutor; it could be new information that the hearer may accommodate and add to his background information (qtd. in Sbisà, 1999, par. 1). The present study focuses on the ideological implication of presupposition and its role in persuading people into believing in the entailed truth that should be taken for granted without reasoning.

**Denotation and Connotation**

Moreover, some semantic aspects, which are enforced by the data, will be discussed for the purpose of focusing on politicians’ use of words to achieve some political ideologies. Connotation and denotation are often described in terms of levels of meaning (Chandler, par. 10). “Meaning can be broken down into sense and reference. The theory of connotation and denotation is a theory of two aspects of meaning of a word. Denotation refers to the literal and dictionary meaning of the word. Yet, beyond the literal meaning of a word, there is a particular connotative meaning. Connotation is “used to refer to the socio-cultural and ‘personal’ associations (ideological, emotional etc.) of the sign” (Chandler, par.2). However, these semantic notions will not form a part of the eclectic analytical model of this study; they will be only used when needed.

**Data and Methodology**

The relatively new corpus contains six press conferences, selected randomly, by English-speaking politicians. The selected conferences are given in the appendices. They are selected from officially recognized sources. They cover the September 11 attacks on the WTC and the wars initiated by the slogan “War on Terror.” The conferences cover a three-year period, from 2001 until 2004. This period is chosen because it abounds in political changes and events. Moreover, it witnessed the start of two wars: in Afghanistan and Iraq, which were initiated by the slogan “War on Terror”. The selected conferences discuss three main topics: the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, the “War on Terror,” and the military interventions in Afghanistan and Iraq. In the press conferences, political figures usually act coercively by setting the agenda, choosing the topics, positioning the relation between the self and others, and presenting the truth in their own way in which the hearers have to accept them to process the speech (Chilton and Schaffner, 1997, p.212).

The first conference is held by US President George Bush; the second conference is held by Secretary of Defense Donald H. Rumsfeld; the third conference is held by President Bush, British Prime Minister Blair, President Aznar, and Prime Minister Barroso; the fourth conference is held by Secretary-
General Kofi Annan; the fifth conference is held by Secretary Powell; the sixth conference is held by President Bush and Prime Minister Tony Blair,

This study will adopt a quantitative and a qualitative method to determine the frequency of the presence of the types of jargon and abstraction and the prevalence of one type over the other. Such analysis will help assess and value the role of these types and evaluate their effectiveness with respect to the supposed political goals of the speakers. It will also help in revealing the attitude and the ideology of the speaker as well as the role of X-phemism.

The Analysis

The analysis attempts to cite the most important examples in the selected conference, whether they are euphemistic or dysphemistic and analyze them in terms of the Cooperative maxims and their arising implicatures and presuppositions. It is worth mentioning that the reporters’ comments and questions are not analyzed unless they have something to do with the violation of Grice’s CP or the analysis thereof. The following section analyses Jargon and its sub-division category: technical terms.

Jargon

Jargon “relates to a specific activity, profession, or group. It develops as a kind of shorthand, to express ideas that are frequently discussed between members of a group, and also to distinguish those belonging to a group from those who are not” (“Jargon”, n.d.).

Technical Terms

Technical terms are one type of jargon that have the same double-function of facilitating communication with in-groupers (euphemistic function) on one hand and hindering communication with out-groupers (dysphemistic function) on the other hand (Allan and Burridge, 1991, p.10). The table below shows the percentage and the frequency of occurrence of technical terms based on the percentage of the jargon used in each conference in the analyzed data:
One of the most important dysphemized words used in the data is “regime.” It refers to a certain government, the Iraqi government, including its ideology and policy:

(1a) Bush: “we are showing the compassion of America by delivering food and medicine to the Afghan people who are, themselves, the victims of a repressive regime” (Appendix 1)

(1b) Bush: “On this very day 15 years ago, Saddam Hussein launched a chemical weapons attack on the Iraqi village of Halabja. With a single order the Iraqi regime killed thousands of men and women and children, without mercy or without shame.” (Appendix 3)

(1c) Aznar: “We are committed on a day-to-day fight against new threats, such as terrorism, weapons of mass destruction, and tyrannic regimes that do not comply with international law.” (Appendix 3)

(1d) Blair: “But the truth is that without a credible ultimatum authorizing force in the event of noncompliance, then more discussion is just more delay, with Saddam remaining armed with weapons of mass destruction and continuing a brutal, murderous regime in Iraq.” (Appendix 3)

(1e) Powell: “But they are serving in a good cause to give the Iraqi people peace and freedom, and what is not there anymore is a horrible, dictatorial, filthy regime that did develop weapons of mass destruction, that used them against people, a regime that filled mass graves . . . If it wasn't for these insurgent activities and this continuing resistance on the part of old regime elements or terrorists.” (Appendix 5)

> [a hateful meaning and a sense of dictatorship]

>> [There is a repressive regime]

“Regime,” as a dysphemistic technical word, is used to replace the more euphemistic term “government.” Both “regime,” and “government” denote the same institution; yet, the latter carries a positive social attitude towards this kind of institution. “Regime,” on the other hand, has some negative...
political connotations associated with dictatorship, tyranny, and coercive ideologies, at least from a US/American point of view. It is used by President Bush to refer to Afghanistan. Noticeably, the word “regime” is collocated by the negative adjective “repressive,” which helps intensify the sense of danger of the other supporters and the importance of removing them.

The term “guerrilla” is another dysphemistic technical word that was used in the press conference on the September attack to intensify sense of the danger America and the world are facing:

(2) Bush: “We learned some very important lessons in Vietnam. Perhaps the most important lesson that I learned is that you cannot fight a guerrilla war with conventional forces” (Appendix 1)

[the attacks are irrational because civilians are their targets]

[there is a guerrilla war]

When President Bush says that “you cannot fight a guerrilla war with conventional forces,” he presupposes that America is already engaged in “a guerrilla war.” Also, he presupposes that there are people who have started the war already. There is someone else to blame; there is an enemy. “Guerrilla” means “a member of an unofficial fighting group which attacks the enemy in small groups unexpectedly” (Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, 1978). The speaker implies conversationally that civilians are their main goal because the attacks are irrational.

President Bush uses synonyms in two different senses to refer to two different ideas. He uses “adjust” once as a technical word and once as a non-technical word in order to avoid mentioning some hateful words, e.g., “war preparation”:

(5) Bush: “All of us in government have to adjust our way of thinking about the new war. The military is going to have to adjust” (Appendix 1)

[He is not willing to mention anything about the war preparation]

[the present state of affairs is not suitable for the danger; the army's present condition is not suitable either]

The term “adjust” is mentioned twice here to presuppose that things are not suitable: the present state of affairs is not suitable for the danger and the army's present condition is not suitable either. Hence, President Bush violates the Maxim of Manner by being unclear and intentionally ambiguous. On a deeper level of meaning, the speaker implicates that he is not willing to mention explicitly anything about war preparations. In this extract, President Bush asks his people and the military to “adjust” their way of thinking about “the new war.” What does he mean by “adjust” in both cases? The first “adjust” refers to a very abstract concept which means “to change slightly, esp. in order to make suitable for
particular job or new conditions” (Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, 1978). The second “adjust,” as defined in a dictionary for military terms, is a technical military word which means “An order to the observer or spotter to initiate an adjustment on a designated target” (“DOD Dictionary”, n.d.).

In addition, soldiers from different countries are euphemized by using technical words in order to give a sense of consensus and world support:

(6a) Bush: “Some coalition members will feel more comfortable doing certain things than other coalition members will.” (Appendix 1)

(6b) Rumsfeld: “Coalition forces are making important contributions as well . . . I have mentioned on several occasions the remarkable contributions that are being made by the United States Army Civil Affairs teams, as well as by our coalition partners.” (Appendix 2)

(6c) Bush: “To achieve this vision, we will work closely with the international community, including the United Nations and our coalition partners” (Appendix 3)

(6d) Bush: “other coalition friends are showing great personal courage . . . But coalition forces will remain in Iraq to help the new government succeed” (Appendix 6)

(6e) Blair: “I pay wholehearted tribute to the American and British troops and troops from all the different coalition countries . . . They will try and kill coalition troops” (Appendix 6)

> [to intensify and rationalize their unity]

>> [unity and union of different political parties]

“Coalition” presupposes there is a union of different political parties. It violates the Maxim of Manner by being unclear and unspecific. Politicians use such a term to implicate unity and strength. Different politicians use the word “coalition” to refer to soldiers. It is a euphemistic technical word that has the connotations of loyalty, unity, and strength. “Coalition countries” has the denotation of those countries which supply those at war with military assistance. “Coalition” is a military term which means “An ad hoc arrangement between two or more nations for common action” (“DOD Dictionary”, n.d.). Ad hoc “is a Latin phrase which means “for this purpose.” It generally signifies a solution that has been designed for a specific problem, is non-generalizable, and cannot be adapted to other purposes” (“Ad hoc”, n.d.). The term “coalition” collocates with “partners” and “friends” to add more solidarity and strength. These two positive words i.e. partners and friends” intensify unity and strength.
By the same token, there are other euphemistic technical words that are used to refer to President Bush’s supporters:

(7a) Bush: “Our staunch friends, Great Britain, our neighbors Canada and Mexico, our NATO allies, our allies in Asia, Russia and nations from... I want to assure the American people, in particular our allies who are interested in our position in the Middle East” (Appendix 1)

(7c) Rumsfeld: “So yes, we do worry about cruise missiles, as we do ballistic missiles, terrorism and cyberattacks and any way that another entity or -- state or a non-state entity can attack the United States or our friends or allies.” (Appendix 2)

(7d) Aznar: “So I would like to invite our friends, our allies, to leave aside any circumstantial differences and to work together seriously for that commitment of democracy, freedom and peace” (Appendix 3)

(7e) Blair: “President Aznar was just saying to you a moment ago on the transatlantic alliance is, I think, very important... I think it is a tragedy when we don't. And that transatlantic alliance is strong” (Appendix 3)

(7f) Powell: “We've used our alliances in such an important set of ways, whether it's working with our NATO allies to expand the NATO alliance, whether it's working with the EU as they expand the European Union” (Appendix 5)

(7g) Bush: “It's a wonderful feeling to have a strong ally in believing in the power of free societies and liberty” (Appendix 6)

+> [to intensify and rationalize their unity. Establish a friendly connotation between the two parties]

>> [unity and union of different political parties]

“Allies” presupposes unity and union of different political parties. “Allies” refers to the US and British forces. Thus, such a friendly connotation of “allies” helps American and British in War on Terror as well as it did in the Second World War (terminology and euphemism at war coverage). Alliance/ally refers to “the relationship that results from a formal agreement (e.g., treaty) between two or more nations for broad, long-term objectives that further the common interests of the members” (“DOD Dictionary”, n.d.). The term “allies” is collocated with the possessive pronoun “our” to intensify unity and loyalty.

Also, the word “spies” is euphemized by using the technical term “intelligence” to hide its unfavorable meaning when it is used to refer to President Bush’s supporters:

(8a) Bush: “and nations from every continent on the Earth have offered help of one kind or another -- from military assistance to intelligence information, to crack down on terrorists' financial networks.” (Appendix 1)
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(8b) Powell: “there is, I think, a solid case that has been made to many governments by their intelligence agencies, and that has been the consistent view of UN inspectors and of the United States intelligence community, that this was a danger we had to worry about . . . The intelligence community is confident of the material they gave me; I was representing them.” (Appendix 5)

+> [avoiding mentioning spies]

>> [There is intelligence information]

“Intelligence” implicates that the speaker does not want to mention the word “spies,” thus, using a euphemistic word to hide its hateful meaning. “Spies” and “intelligence” share the same denotative meaning, which is that of collecting information secretly about the opponents, but differ in their connotative meaning. That is, ‘Spies’ has a more negative hostile social attitude which is lacking in “intelligence.”

On the other hand, when “intelligence” belongs to Taliban and its party, it is dysphemized by using some negative technical terms:

(9a) Bush: “We are aggressively pursuing the agents of terror around the world . . . we have frozen more than $24 million in al Qaeda or Taliban assets . . . We are in the process of rounding up al Qaeda members around the world. There are al Qaeda organizations in, roughly, 68 countries. And over 200 have now been apprehended. And every time I talk to a world leader, I urge them to continue finding the al Qaeda representatives and bring them to justice . . . We received knowledge that perhaps an al Qaeda operative was prepared to use a crop duster to spray a biological weapon or a chemical weapon on American people . . . we're looking for al Qaeda cells around the world. When we find an al Qaeda cell operating, we will urge the host country to bring them to justice” (Appendix 1)

(9g) Bush: “We have ruined terrorist training camps, disrupted their communications, weakened the Taliban military, and destroyed most of their air defenses . . . I've talked to many countries that are interested in making sure that the post-operations Afghanistan is one that is stable, and one that doesn't become yet again a haven for terrorist criminals . . . Our focus is on Afghanistan, and the terrorist network hiding in Afghanistan” (Appendix 1)

(9k) Bush: “The FBI, as you know, spent a lot of manpower and time chasing -- spies in a post-Cold War era. They were still chasing spies. Nothing wrong with that, except we have a new enemy” (Appendix 1)

(9l) Rumsfeld: “If we are to ensure that terrorist networks do not return to take over Afghanistan once again” (Appendix 2)

(9m) Bush: “We're going to have to cooperate to cut the money of the terrorists, and the ability for nations, dictators who have weapons of mass destruction to provide training and perhaps weapons to terrorist organizations” (Appendix 3)
(9o) Powell: “And so we see considerable progress in Afghanistan, but we are not unmindful of the dangers that still lurk there with respect to old Taliban elements, and we are working closely with our Pakistani friends to get them to use all of their assets and resources. My presentation on the 5th of February when I talked to this issue made it clear that we had seen some links and connections to terrorist organizations over time. Now the number of incidences have gone down, but there is still a potential where any one terrorist organization, on any day of the week.” (Appendix 5)

(9q) Bush: “Since our two countries shared the loss of September the 11th, 2001, we've joined in a global manhunt for terrorist killers. We've removed the terrorist camps of Afghanistan and the brutal government that sheltered them.” (Appendix 6)

++ [Taliban and Al Qaeda are not civilized to intensify the bad of the Other]

>> [There are agents of terror/Al Qaeda or Taliban assets/Al Qaeda organization/Al Qaeda cells/terrorist organizations/terrorist network/terror network/and spies and new enemies]

The technical terms in bold presuppose that there are agents of terror. Technical terms such as “intelligence,” and “intelligence information,” are used to refer to President Bush’s supporters; on the other hand, terms such as “spies,” “agents,” “assets,” “cells,” “network,” “organization,” or “al Qaeda or Taliban assets,” which are technical abstract words, are used to refer to the other party. The denotation of the technical word “asset,” which is a CIA term, is “a foreign spy.” It may also have the connotation that those terrorists are very valuable for Taliban.

Weapons are also euphemized by using a technical term to mask its unfavorable meanings:

(11) Bush: “Nations from every continent on the Earth have offered help of one kind or another -- from military assistance to intelligence information” (Appendix 1)

+++ [to avoid mentioning armies and weapons]

++ [there are different assistances; there will be military use (war)]

“Military assistance” presupposes that there will be a different kind of assistance. It implicates that the speaker is reluctant to give words that may carry negative attitudes. It substitutes for the word “weapons,” which has a negative connotation. Clearly, “assistance” means to help and support. Its connotative meaning gives rise to positive meanings and feelings such as cooperation and support.

On the other hand, the weapons used by the “enemies” are always dysphemized. “Weapons of Mass Destruction” is the most dysphemistic technical phrase in this war and the main motive behind the Second Gulf War:
(12a) Bush: “After all, he gassed his own people. We know he’s been developing weapons of mass destruction.” (Appendix 1)

(12b) Bush: “The dictator of Iraq and his weapons of mass destruction are a threat to the security of free nations . . . Saddam Hussein has a history of mass murder. He possesses the weapons of mass murder” (Appendix 3)

(12c) Powell: “what is not there anymore is a horrible, dictatorial, filthy regime that did develop weapons of mass destruction” (Appendix 5)

(12d) Blair: “it would difficult to conclude otherwise given that his was a regime that actually used chemical weapons, weapons of mass destruction against their own people” (Appendix 6)

>> [there is mass destruction out there to be fought against]

The use of the term “Weapons of Mass Destruction,” acronymized as WMD, seems to have varied over the last 50 years. Since the 9/11 attacks, it has become all encompassing and now includes any and every type of weapon capable of killing a large number of people (Mallon, 2003. par. 3).

As part of the “War on Terror;” President Bush announced on September 4, 2002 what is called “the Bush Doctrine;” that the United States will carry a pre-emptive military strike against any nation that provide terrorists with WMD. According, his supporters and the UN asked Saddam Hussein to stop developing nuclear weapons and to “disarm.”

(14a) Bush: “He agrees -- he agreed to disarm Iraq of these weapons as a condition for ending the Gulf War over a decade ago . . . the Iraqi regime will disarm itself, or the Iraqi regime will be disarmed by force. And the regime has not disarmed itself.” (Appendix 3)

(14b) Blair: “This was his final opportunity; he had to disarm unconditionally . . . But we are in the final stages, because, after 12 years of failing to disarm him, now is the time when we have to decide” (Appendix 3)

> [Saddam used to have weapons]

> [He is armed; he has weapons]

President Bush violates the Maxim of Quality because he lacks adequate evidence to support what he says. “Disarm” presupposes that they have arms and weapons, which is an implied accusation. The technical term “disarmament” refers to the following:

[T]he reduction or elimination by a nation of its weapons systems. The concept of disarmament is an ideal based on the view that weapons cause wars, and that the elimination of weapons will in itself remove the main causes of conflict . . . The act of disarmament is
seen as creating a new situation in which the potential for international conflict is eliminated. (“Disarmament”, n.d.)

Mazid (2003) points out that “to disarm Saddam” presupposes that he has arms and this will justify the war as being a response to a threat. Accordingly, the technical term “disarming” is a euphemism for demolishing and defeating Saddam and his regime. This technical term is also a form of an understatement because disarming implies leaving Saddam unarmed, but what President Bush did in Iraq is “a whole ‘regime’ vanishing under the US-led assault.” (pp. 54-55). The following table shows the frequency of occurrences of the most frequent technical terms used in the data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Technical Terms</th>
<th>Number of Recurrence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regime</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adjust</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coalition</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ally/allies/alliance</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intelligence</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Qaeda organization/network etc.</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons of Mass Destruction</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disarm/disarmament</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>124</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By and large, the analysis of technical terms has revealed that most of them are dysphemistic. Such conferences are directed to a popular audience, out-groupers; thus, using such technical words may hinder communication. The negative technical terms which refer to the other party are over-used, such as “al Qaeda organization,” “al Qaeda network,” etc. On the other hand, technical terms that refer to the “self” are rare. These technical terms aim at achieving two functions: intensifying the perception of danger American people are/will be exposed to, thus justifying the war, on one hand, and emphasizing the unity and loyalty of President Bush’s supporters, presenting them as the “good guys,” on the other hand.

**Abstraction**

Abstraction is one of the lexical strategies whereby any discourse can be constructed in general rather than specific lexical items. It is a strategy of simplifying the details and treating the concrete details
ambiguously and vaguely. It concentrates on general ideas rather than the specific manifestation of these ideas. It can be in the form of indefinite reference such as “it” or “thing,” or it can be general words such as “politics,” “free world,” and “justice.” Abstraction can be neutral or emotive. However, to my knowledge, no attempts have been done to analyze it linguistically.

**Emotive (Loaded Words)**

Emotive words or loaded words in general are “words or phrases which have strong emotional overtones or connotations and which evoke strongly positive (or negative) reactions far beyond the specific meaning of the word which is listed in the dictionary” (“Loaded language”, n.d.). Describing the writing or speech of someone as being a loaded language “implies an accusation of demagoguery or of pandering to the audience” (“Loaded language”, n.d.). Emotive words are divided into sneer and purr words.

**Sneer words.**

Sneer words or snarl words according to Rank (1984) are emotive words that carry negative attitudes and have the ability to distort, corrupt, twist, and misrepresent facts. The most important emotive negative word in the War on Terror is “terror” and its derivations i.e. “terrorism,” “terrorists,” “terrorize,” etc. Chomsky (2006) says “Terror” is “a term that rightly arouses strong emotions and deep concerns. The primary concern should, naturally, be to take measures to alleviate the threat, which has been severe in the past, and will be even more so in the future” (p.1). President Bush and many other political leaders use this double-faced word to justify the war on Iraq and Afghanistan. Chomsky (2006) admits that it is difficult and pointless to look for a specific definition for this word, yet one “should seek enough clarity at least to distinguish terror from two notions that lie uneasily at its borders: aggression and legitimate resistance” (p.1).
Table 5:3 Sneer Words in the Sample Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conference Abstraction</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Al Qaeda” is “the name given to an international Islamic fundamentalist campaign comprised of independent and collaborative cells that all profess the same cause of reducing outside influence upon Islamic affairs” (“Al-Qaeda”, n.d.). “Al Qaeda” itself is a very vague negative word that many people can be accused of being a member of. For example, it is a name that may include reference to all Arabs. It has a political connotation associated with dictatorship ideology from an American point of view.

(1a) Bush: “We have frozen more than $24 million in al Qaeda or Taliban assets . . . We received knowledge that perhaps an al Qaeda operative was prepared to use a crop duster to spray a biological weapon or a chemical weapon on American people” (Appendix 1)

(1b) Rumsfeld: “I have said for some time that there are al Qaeda in Iraq . . . I have said repeatedly that there are al Qaeda in Iraq . . . there are al Qaeda in a number of locations in Iraq” (Appendix 2)

++ [they have evidence to the existence of Al Qaeda in Iraq and elsewhere]

>> [There is al Qaeda]

This umbrella word, “al Qaeda,” generates the implicature that the U.S. government includes in its long list of “enemies” any country that opposes the American foreign policy. This war is not against Bin Laden or Saddam only, but against any group or country that will fit into U.S. government’s definition of “terrorists.”

In talking about the “Other,” President Bush often resorts to dysphemism to negatively portray them as “terrorists” and intensify their negativity. He states that the goals of those terrorists are:

(2a) Bush: “We cannot let the terrorists achieve the objective of frightening our nation to the point where we don’t -- where we don't conduct business . . . Their intention was not only to kill and maim and destroy. Their intention was to frighten to the point where our nation would not act . . . After all, on our TV screens the other day, we saw the evil one threatening -- calling for more destruction and death in America” (Appendix 1)

++ [they are evil]

>> [we are in danger]
All these dysphemistic words which are declared to be the terrorists’ goals implicate conversationally that these terrorists are evil. The data also contains different sneer words which refer to “terrorists” to disfigure and distort their image:

(3a) Blair: “Saddam remaining armed with weapons of mass destruction and continuing a brutal, murderous regime in Iraq” (Appendix 3)

(3b) Aznar: “tyrannic regimes that do not comply with international law” (Appendix 3)

(3c) Powell: “we see terrorists being brought to justice, and we know that there is still an enemy out there that would do us ill, would do us damage, and we’ll be going after that enemy . . . what is not there anymore is a horrible, dictatorial, filthy regime” (Appendix 5)

(3d) BUSH: “What we're seeing in Iraq is an attempted power grab by extremists and terrorists. They will fail. The extremists will fail because our coalition will not allow Iraq's future to be stolen by a violent few . . . Since our two countries shared the loss of September the 11th, 2001, we've joined in a global manhunt for terrorist killers” (Appendix 6)

(3e) Blair: “sympathizers of Saddam Hussein, outside terrorists, religious fanatics” (Appendix 6)

(3f) Blair: “There will be religious fanatics, outside terrorists, former Saddam people who will come together and they will kill innocent civilians” (Appendix 6)

++ [intensifying their violent acts]

>>> [there is knowledge and evidence; there are murderous/enemy/killers extremists and terrorists in Iraq. There is a power vacuum in Iraq so that power can be grabbed by terrorists]

It is widely believed that in war, it is popular to call each other names, e.g., “extremists” and “terrorists” which are used to substitute “Al Qaeda” members and Iraqi insurgents. President Bush attacks those people who are regarded by some others as defending themselves and their country describing them as “terrorists” and “extremists.” Furthermore, Rank (1984) considers using dysphemistic sneer words as part of politicians’ ad hominem arguments (p. 65). An ad hominem attack is one of the logical fallacies because the attack or the argument is directed against the person himself and his personality: “personality is not logically related to the truth or falsity of what a person says” (Rank, 1984, p. 65). Having no evidence, President Bush attacks Bin Laden himself and his personality:

(3) Bush: “He forced a country to accept his radical thoughts” (Appendix1)

++ [Bin Laden has thoughts that are abnormal and illegitimate]

>>> [He has destructive ideas]
Moreover, President Bush attacks Saddam using the following dysphemistic words:

(5a) Bush: “The leader of Iraq is an evil man . . . He gassed his own people . . . he was soundly tounced in Gulf War” (Appendix 1)

(5b) Bush: “The dictator of Iraq . . . He is a danger to his neighbours. He is a sponsor of terrorism. He is an obstacle to progress in the Middle East . . . He has been the cruel, cruel oppressor of the Iraqi people . . . The Iraqi regime killed thousands of men and women and children . . . Saddam Hussein has proven he is capable of any crime” (Appendix 3)

(5c) Annan: “a vicious, repressive dictatorship” (Appendix 4)

(5d) Blair: “Saddam Hussein and his family, was a merciless tyranny that brutalized the country” (Appendix 6)

Bush uses sneer words – name-calling - to attack Saddam’s personality intensifying his bad qualities in order to justify the war on Iraq.

By the same token, President Bush and other politicians use sneer words – name calling - to describe (or attack) Saddam’s personality intensifying his bad qualities in order to justify the “War on Iraq.” Attacking Saddam leads President Bush again to fall into ad hominem arguments, too:

(6a) Bush: “that Mr. Arafat is trying to control the radical elements within the Palestinian Authority.” (Appendix 1)

(6b) Powell: “If it wasn’t for these insurgent activities and this continuing resistance on the part of old regime elements or terrorists . . . And so we see considerable progress in Afghanistan, but we are not unmindful of the dangers that still lurk there with respect to old Taliban elements” (Appendix2)

The word “element” dehumanizes and depersonalizes those terrorists by downplaying their human qualities. In addition, President Bush and his supproters have to go “after that enemy’/‘murderous” (Appendix 6). What they are doing is just “going after that enemy.” Van Dijk (2005) explains that:

[A]ttitudes about terrorists attacks may feature a script-like structure, with terrorists as main actors, associated with a number of prototypical attributes (cruel, radical, fundamentalists, etc.), using violent means (e.g., bombs) to kill innocent civilians as their
victims, and so on. Such attitudes are gradually acquired by generalization and abstraction. (p.371)

President Bush reminds the American people of the 9/11 attacks every time he needs to raise fear and horror and evoke sad memories they experienced then. It violates the Maxim of Manner by being too brief. Actually, “9/11” has become a dysphemistic word that is able to raise fear and horror in America and the whole world. Also, there are other words used to refer to 9/11 such as:

(5a) Bush: “This week, 56 Islamic nations issued a statement strongly condemning the savage acts of terror . . . . We're angry at the evil that was done to us, yet patient and just in our response . . . . One month after great suffering and sorrow, America is strong and determined and generous . . . We're fighting evil. And these murderers have hijacked a great religion in order to justify their evil deeds. And we cannot let it stand” (Appendix1)

* [intensify bad and danger and legitimize war]

* [there is terror/evil/suffering/sorrow]

In these examples, President Bush uses the following words: “the evil,” “their evil deeds,” and “the savage act of terror” to refer to the attacks of 9/11. Lakoff (2001b) explains that the use of “evil,” according to conservatives, is “a palpable thing, a force in the world” (par. 20). One should be morally strong in order to be able to stand against such evil, or else one will lose. Actually, weakness is one kind of evil. “Evil is inherent, an essential trait, that determines how you will act in the world” (Lakoff, 2001b, par. 20). Only evil people can do evil deeds. On the other hand, good is the enemy of evil. U.S. administration could represent to the world that “Good is our essential nature and what we do in the battle against evil is good. Good and evil are locked in a battle, which is conceptualised metaphorically as a physical fight in which the stronger wins” (Lakoff, 2001b, par. 20). Good against evil is shown as being the most important battle. Thus, any collateral damages can easily be justified. “Indeed, performing lesser evils in the name of good is justified” (Lakoff, 2001b, par. 20).

**Table 5:4 Most Frequent Sneer words in the Sample Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sneer Words</th>
<th>Number of Occurrence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>terrorists</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>terrorism</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>terror</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Qaeda</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>87</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Purr words.

Purr words are loaded emotive words that carry emotions and attitudes. Although they are abstract, they can clarify the speaker’s attitude and point of view of the world. The table below shows the percentage and the frequency of occurrence of the second type of emotive words, purr words, in the analyzed data based on the total of abstraction used in each conference:

**Table 5: Purr Words in the Sample Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conference no.</th>
<th>Abstraction</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purr Words</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

President Bush’s supporters is euphemized by using some abstract purr words that have no specific meaning. The following examples are some of the purr words used by politicians in the “War on Terror”:

(1a) Bush: “All is strong and united on the diplomatic front... America is strong and determined and generous... this time of testing has revealed the true character of the American people... our nation is united, we are strong, we're compassionate... to use the resources of this great nation, a freedom-loving nation, a compassionate nation, a nation that understands values of life... our nation so strong... our willingness to tolerate people of different faiths, different opinions, different colors within the fabric of our society...” (Appendix 1)

(1b) Bush: “We'll push as quickly as possible for an Iraqi interim authority to draw upon the talents of Iraq's people to rebuild their nation. We're committed to the goal of a unified Iraq, with democratic institutions of which members of all ethnic and religious groups are treated with dignity and respect.” (Appendix 3)

(1c) Bush: “the great thing about our two countries is we believe in the power of free societies.” (Appendix 6)

++ [intensify the good and downplay the bad]

>> [America is good]

To legitimize his supporters, President Bush uses abstract purr words. He uses purr words such as “united,” “strong,” “determined,” “true character,” etc. According to President Bush, what his forces are doing in Afghanistan is “their duty.” All the previous words are purr words which have nothing to
do with his war against terrorism in, a way, violating the maxim of Relation. All these purr words can stimulate people's feelings and emotions, yet they have nothing to do with the reality of the “War on Terror.” The underlying political ideology of these euphemistic words is to the good of his supporters in order to get the support of his people.

By the same token, the responses of the US administration to the 9/11 attacks are euphemised emotively to intensify the good of America and the American people. President Bush says:

(2) Bush: “Before September 11th, my administration was planning an initiative called Communities of Character. It was designed to help parents develop good character in our children, and to strengthen a spirit of citizenship and service in our communities. The acts of September 11th have prompted that initiative to occur on its own, in ways far greater than I could have ever imagined. We've shown great love for our country, and great tolerance and respect for all our countrymen” (Appendix 1)

+> [intensify the good and downplay the bad]

>> [America is good]

President Bush uses emotive purr words such as “good character,” “a spirit of citizenship and service,” “great love for our country, and great tolerance and respect for all our countrymen,” “compassionate,” “united,” and “strong,” in order to intensify the good of his supporters and stimulate his people’s feelings to support his decision.

The “War in Iraq” is glorified by using some purr words. Prime Minister Blair describes what they are doing there in a glorifying way presupposing that they have a commitment and a word to keep:

(3) Blair: “we make a pledge to the people of Iraq” (Appendix 3)

+> [the importance of going to war]

>> [commitment]

Prime Minister Blair claims that they have “a pledge.” “The word pledge is used as a synonym for oath [or A solemn], a formal and binding engagement [or promise to do or refrain from doing something” (“Pledge”, n.d.). This word intensifies their loyalty and shows that they are fighting for a noble goal. It is associated with responsibility and honour. Its connotative meaning is that of a sign of good faith and word of honour. Undoubtedly, people hate to break one’s word or pledge because it implies that this person is untrustworthy and irresponsible.

Similarly, politicians use other purr words to intensify the good of their party and legitimize the actions they are taking:
(4) Blair: “we will protect Iraq's territorial integrity . . . we will support representative government that unites Iraq on the democratic basis of human rights and the rule of law; that we will help Iraq rebuild . . . we will do everything we can to minimize the suffering of the Iraqi people” (Appendix 3)

[+] [intensify the good/the importance of war]

[>] [Iraq is in danger/ Iraq is in need of support/ it is destroyed and need someone to build it again/Iraqi people are suffering]

Describing their policy in the Middle East, Prime Minister Blair highlights their good by using some other purr words such as “protect,” “support,” “rebuild,” “democratic,” and “human rights,” to intensify the good of President Bush’s supporters. These purr words also presuppose that they are the “good guys” whose intention is to help, support, and rebuild, thus he could achieve positive “self”-representation.

Lexical choices with positive connotation are used to describe the “us”-group and its qualities. Such choices of purr words reveal the nature of the politicians’ worldview and ideology:

(5a) Rumsfeld: “We have values to defend: we have values of human rights; we have been concerned about gross and systematic violations of human rights” (Appendix 2)

(5b) Annan: “we have to help the Afghan people build the infrastructure that will allow them to achieve true self-government and self-reliance” (Appendix 4)

(5c) Powell: “The President has led now, for almost three years, a foreign policy based on values and principles -- democracy, dignity of the individual, human rights, economic freedom and openness of trading systems -- and we remain committed to those principles and values . . . to expand economic opportunity to all nations in the world, for the purpose of generating wealth and opportunity for prosperity for the peoples of the world, and pressing for freedom and openness” (Appendix 5)

[+] [war is legitimate because their goals are to defend, expand and protect freedom, peace and human rights, presupposing that these are really their goals]

[>] [we are good]

Words such as “values,” “principles,” “democracy,” “dignity,” “human rights,” and “economic freedom” are purr abstract words that have no established fixed meaning. Yet, all of them share the same connotation, which is of civilization, security, and freedom. They are used giving no detail of how they are going to achieve what President Bush says they will do. Actually, words such as “peace,” “economic opportunity,” “wealth,” “prosperity,” “freedom,” “openness,” and “human rights,” have nothing explicit to do with the ‘War on Terror.” However, these terms imply an underlying ideology that is expressed by using and emphasizing freedom and its associated term, “democracy,”
which one cannot enjoy, unless one fights “terror.” “Democracy” is used to have strong negative connotations. It is used to have the same negative connotation of the word “demagoguery,” which is used today. Now, the word “democracy” has strong positive connotations being connected with the Western world: i.e., Europe and the United States. Today, the word “democratic” means “good” automatically, on the other hand, anything “anti-democratic” is “bad” (“Loaded Language”, n.d.).

The group of the nations of the world fighting Iraq is given a purr name to give it a positive meaning and highlight the good of President Bush’s supporters. It is called, according to Powell “greater cooperation”:

(6) Powell: “We’ve seen greater cooperation between the nations of the world… And so we see considerable progress in Afghanistan” (Appendix 5)

Progress ➔ [the situation now is different from and better than what it used to be]

➔ [good development]

To show there is a strong solidarity among nations, Powell describes what is happening in Afghanistan as “greater cooperation” and what they are doing there as a “considerable progress” (Appendix 5). According to Powell, in order to achieve their noble purpose, i.e., diplomacy, it will take time and “dedication”:

(7) Powell: “Diplomacy doesn't happen overnight. It takes time. It takes dedication.” (Appendix 5)

➔ [American have to sacrifice to achieve noble goals]

➔ [they need time]

Powell implicates that American people will have to sacrifice to achieve that noble purpose. Obviously, “diplomacy” is one of the most puzzling words in politics because it has become one of the synonyms of doublespeak and euphemism. “During the build up to war, however, ‘diplomacy’ became the process through which the United States attempted to pressure other nations into supporting the war” (Stauber and Rampton, 2003, p. 10).
Table 5:6 The Most Frequent Purr Words in the Sample Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purr Words</th>
<th>Number of Recurrence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>united</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strong</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>determined</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duty</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rebuild</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>support</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>protect</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>progress</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>123</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Concluding Remarks

Ideology may affect the production of discourse directly. When there is a clash of interest, i.e., when events are interpreted differently, the structures of ideologies may "suggest that such representations are often articulated along an us versus them dimension, in which speakers of one group will generally tend to present themselves or their own group in positive terms, and other groups in negative terms." (Van Dijk, 1997, p.1). Najem and Collet (2005) claims, “to achieve positive ‘self’ or ‘us’-presentation and negative ‘other’ or ‘them’-presentation, the political actor can make a number of choices on the semantic, syntactic and lexical levels of language” (p.7). However, lexical choices with positive connotations are used to describe the in-group and its qualities whereas lexical choices with negative connotations are used to evoke the out-group and its supposed shortcomings and faults (Najem & Collet, 2005, p.7). As Chilton (2004) states, these antonymous lexical sets are usually made up of “moral value vocabulary,” i.e., words that establish a dichotomy between a moral self versus an immoral other.

This study explores the ideology implied in the War on Terror discourse to provide cues of how to view the “self” and the “other” from the viewpoint of the politicians of the data. At the lexis level, the “self” and the “other” are associated with positive/negative words respectively. The War on Terror discourse is full of loaded words, i.e., purr and sneer words. Hence, describing one’s speech as being loaded language implies an accusation of exercising illegitimate power, demagoguery, or of manipulating the audience.

After the attack on the World Trade Center (WTC), political discourse has undergone essential changes. It has become more self-oriented and a mere representation of the “self” and the “other”--a battlefield in its own-- to achieve the politicians’ goal of persuasion. Collet and Najem (2005) stated that
politicians after September 11 are using what is called “legitimizing language,” i.e., “language that will positively represent the favored worldwide or the approved approach to a social, economic or global phenomena as well as those who support this view or approach” (p. 5) and its counterpart “delegitimizing language” which “negatively depicts the opposing worldview or approach as well as those who hold these different opinions and values” (p. 6). Briefly, political language has become the “language of right and wrong,” as the U.S. President (2002) describes it.

Jargon and abstraction aim at beautifying the self-representation and destroying the other-representation. Generally, jargonizing and abstracting strategies are loaded and charged words with both positive and negative associations, feelings, and emotional suggestions. On the one hand, words with positive connotation usually make people feel good, on the other, words with negative connotations make people feel bad, and thus they react negatively. As Hoffmann (2005) claims:

These terms, on both ends of the spectrum, are usually on a fairly high order of abstraction. They might even represent higher order ideals, which are difficult to define and vary from user to user. Specifics and operational definitions are usually lacking. You have to work to bring these terms down to lower levels of abstractions by asking, "What do you mean?" (p.1)

It is hard to debate or to disagree with realities formulated by these rather abstract terms. Hoffmann (2005) considers them as being one of the examples of “affective language, designed to appeal to emotions, which often can be very effective in swaying public opinion and manipulating thinking and feeling” (p.2). U.S. President and other politicians use such terms leaving the solid “details to the insiders, and use snarl and purr words to spin their ideas and sway public opinion” (Hoffmann, 2005, p.2).

These lexical choices perform at least five functions: (a) reproduce illegitimate power relations between the “self” and the “other” by making the “other” the agent of oppression and terrorism; (b) they delegitimize the “other,” their action using negative words and without hinting the reasons for their actions; (c) they legitimize the action of the “self”; (d) they show the war as a reaction and a response shifting blame to the “other“self”; (e) they are used to manipulate the public to believe what politicians state as facts regarding the War on Terror; and (f) they establish “a dichotomy” between the “self” and the “other”; such a division creates an artificial gap between the “self” and the “other.” These functions may explain how political discourse after 9/11 has become more self-oriented and a mere representation of the “self” and the “other” after 9/11, a battlefield in its own.
This same research and future research could be studied examining different techniques of X-phemizing, e.g., syntactic types (see, appendix 7). In addition, future research on political discourse may be examined from different approaches, for example the cognitive approach (Van Dijk 2000b, Lakoff 2003, 2004). A cognitive analysis of discourse could help reveal ideology and manipulation in the same time. It is vital to study political speeches in general and the ones that are held during the war on terror in particular, such as 7/7 London Suicide Bombers, applying the cognitive approach to examine how discourse may frame events as well as the minds of the audience to think in a certain way.

The current study conducted on political discourse, yet X-phemism in general, and jargon and abstraction in particular, is widely used in different genres. It is a rhetorical device widely used in different discourses in daily life. In any discourse, it should have an effective role in manipulating the mind, covering and softening the truth, and befogging the thoughts. Examining X-phemism helps to analyze the emotional overtones, socio-cultural values, and ideological aspects of the lexical choices and the effect of such linguistic tools in persuading and manipulating the audience. Further studies on X-phemism in different discourse should be conducted, and the use of plain language should be encouraged to understand each other and to mean what one says. This study summaries three functions of jargon and abstraction:

In sum, CDA helps in showing the power the politicians exercise over their audience. Politicians are powerful; they set the agenda, choose the topic, answer the questions they want, give short or long, related and unrelated answers without being questioned, and they may ignore some questions.

Appendices

<www.johnstonsarchive.net/terrorism/bush911e.html>

(2) Secretary of Defense Donald H. Rumsfeld on Tuesday, Aug. 20, 2002.  

(3) Press Availability with President Bush, Prime Minister Blair, President Aznar, and Prime Minister Barroso - the Azores, Portugal on Monday, 17 March, 2003.

(5) Secretary Powell's Press Conference. January 8, 2004
http://www.state.gov/secretary/former/powell/remarks/28008.htm

(6) Bush, Blair Discuss Sharon Plan; Future of Iraq in Press Conference in Rose Garden on April, 16, 2004.
(7) Types of X-phemism developed for the purpose of this study.

**X-PHEMISM**

**EUPHEMISM**

**DYSPEHISM**

1. Phonological Types
   1.1. Remodelling
      1.1.1. Mispronunciation
      1.1.2. Rhyming Slang
      1.1.3. Back-slang
      1.1.4. Replacement
      1.1.5. Foreign Terms
   2.1. Word devices Formation
      2.1.1. Abbreviation
      2.1.2. Acronymy
      2.1.3. Clipping
      2.1.4. Derivation
      2.1.5. Onomatopoeia

2. Morphological Types
   2.1. Word devices Formation
      2.1.1. Abbreviation
      2.1.2. Acronymy
      2.1.3. Clipping
      2.1.4. Derivation
      2.1.5. Onomatopoeia

3. Pragmatic-Semantic Types
   3.1. Jargon
      3.1.1. Technical Terms
      3.1.2. Slogan
      3.1.3. Cliché
      3.1.4. Gobbledygook
   3.2. Abstraction
      3.2.1. Neutral
      3.2.2. Emotive
      3.2.2.1. Sneer Words
      3.2.2.2. Purr Words
      3.2.3. Antonym
   3.3. Pompous Style
      3.3.1. Indirection & Circumlocution
      3.3.2. Description of Word
   3.4. Figurative Language (Symbolic Substations)
      3.4.1. Metaphor
      3.4.2. Overstatement
      3.4.3. Understatement
      3.4.4. synecdoche
      3.4.4.1. One-for-One
      3.4.4.2. General-for-Specific
      3.4.4.3. Part-for-whole
   3.5. Semantic Innovation
      3.5.1. Compound
      3.5.2. Particularization
      3.5.3. Implication
   3.6. Omission

4. Syntactic Types
   4.1. Grammatical Tools
      4.1.1. Pronouns
      4.1.2. Proposition
      4.2. Grammatical Structure
      4.2.1. Transitivity/passivization
      4.2.2. Nominalization
      4.2.3. Multiple Negative
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Abstract

A long-lived question in characterizing the nature of sentence construction persistently challenged and still unresolved is whether it is possible to detach the knowledge of lexicon from syntax. Since early eighties, various models of the lexicon-syntax interface have been proposed, meaning that a wide range of the contemporary theories of lexicon and syntax have been preoccupied with the issue. Meanwhile, one cannot abstain from proceeding back and forth along the structuralist continuum stretching from one extreme to another, one dwelling on the lexicon-syntax interface within the generativist linguistics domain highlighting Government-Binding, and principles and parameters all stressing on the fact that the characteristics of the lexical items project onto the syntax of the sentence (Cook & Newson, 1996), and
the other persisting with the disintegration of the two elements. The latter assumption adheres to a pure structuralist hypothesis with little or no emphasis on the lexical items as the essential building blocks of language formation and the former progresses along the same lines as Bolinger's (1975) claim that "There is a vast amount of grammatical detail still to be dug out of lexicon- so much that by the time we are through there may be little point in talking about grammar and lexicon as if they were two different things" (p. 299), with an emphasis on the integration of lexicon and syntax.

In accordance with these assumptions, the present study is framed to formulate a competitive analysis of these two structuralist theories against data from the subjects' verbal accounts in the form of task performance in order to evaluate the claims put forth by these theories as to the nature of the lexicon-syntax integration or insulation. So the paper sets out the aim of providing the following question with an empirically-based suitable answer regarding how lexical information is deployed in syntactic structure in real-time linguistic events: Does sentence construction take place with an emphasis on separation of the knowledge of lexicon and grammar or integration of the two? On this ground, a number of 18 senior English major students studying in the English department of Shiraz University participated in the study. The analyzed data show consistency with an integration-based claim supporting the view that lexicon must be an active component of the grammar

**Key Words**: lexicon, syntax, lexicon-syntax interface, subcategorization, Projection Principle

**Foreword**

A number of competing speculative ideas concerning language, especially L2, have been couched in terms of the nature and structure of sentence construction reinforced more or less by empirical data. Will these constant efforts made, however, provide one with an incontrovertible last-word answer to the question concerning the real nature of L2?

By the same token, there still exists a variety of hypotheses as to the nature of lexicon-syntax interface not the least of them (this sentence sounds a little strange) the assertions earmarked by a caliber of structuralists. Proceeding along a structuralist continuum, one will encounter the extremes of the assumptions, one dwelling on the separation of the two integral elements of language, namely, grammar and lexicon and the opposite front advocating Chomsky's insistence on the cruciality of lexical items in
close association with syntax of the sentence through attaching importance to lexicon and their projection properties.

At the same time, it cannot be taken for granted that the history of linguistics has witnessed an often almost penchant for attending to phonology and syntax whereas lexicon has not received much of the attention of the theorists and language teachers alike (Harley, 1995). This follows the fact that structural linguists initially contended that language was primarily syntax-based and that meaning could be dispensed with. This theoretical view asserted that language could break down into so many little pieces such as vocabulary and grammar. There were no doubts as to whether language could be treated in this way without devastating its essence. Structuralists, not the least among them Harris, believed that the underlying structures which organize units and rules into meaningful systems are generated by the human mind itself, and not by sense perception. As such, the mind is itself a structuring mechanism which looks through units and files them according to rules. This is important because it means that for structuralists the order that we perceive the language is not inherent in the world but is a product of our minds (Tyson, 1999). The linearity assumption is of importance for structuralists because it shows that language operates as a linear sequence, and that all the elements of a particular sequence form a chain. Since language is linear, it forms a chain by which one unit is linked to the next. A system, according to a Saussure's assumption, operates based on the relations between the units. For the same fact cited, one could claim that word order governs meaning, hence a clash of meaning between "The cat jumped into the river", and "The river jumped into the cat".

In consequence of the Bloomfieldian assumptions, the meaning of a linguistic form is defined as the situation in which the speaker utters it and the response it calls forth in the hearer. They evidently ignore "the association of meaning with linguistic utterances" (Bloomfield, 1933, p. 153). These limited and limiting notions with their negative impact on other areas including language teaching have received a hitherto series of severe attacks. On the other hand, some dedicated structuralists of the era have followed in the same meaning-less linguistic analysis direction with Harris (1951) featuring as a most prominent linguist of the time whose assumptions according to Oller (1979) have extensively contributed to and rivalled those of his student Chomsky.

Chomsky moved beyond a pure structuralist approach to grammar. Descriptive tendencies in grammar can be recognized as a convention correlating some words in the language with types of situations (Olshewsky, 1969). A simple example of this is the knowledge of where specific words belong
in a sentence, such as where the noun, verb, and adjective within a sentence belong. Using the
descriptive tendencies it becomes a bit clear, and actually, only takes the ability to talk to be able to
figure it out. Structural grammarians see parts of speech as often identifiable through their position in
sentences (Glauner, 2000).

Since the late 1950's, structural grammar has been challenged by transformational grammar
(Liles, 1972). This new theory also consisted of very new ideas. The generative grammar was, in the
first place, concerned with overcoming the inadequacies of certain theories of phrase structure modelled
partly on procedures of constituent analysis in structural linguistics and partly on formal systems devised
for the study of formal languages (Chomsky, 1980). The procedures and results of structural grammar
have been absorbed into transformational grammar where they appear in base component (especially the
branching rules) (Cattell, 1969). Many of the transformational grammarians believe that meaning is an
integral part of linguistic description and that it is impossible to analyze a sentence apart from the
underlying meaning associated with it (Liles, 1972). The structuralist assumptions about meaning
persisted through the Chomskyan revolution and into the early 1970s. In fact, it persists even today in
teaching methods and standardized instruments for assessing language skills of a wide variety of sorts.

The appreciation of the concern for the meaning underlying a sentence formation grew when
there was an increasing awareness of the complexity associated with lexical items. It turns out that
lexical knowledge is more basic to the overall knowledge of a given language than previously thought
(Willis, 1990). The latest trends in linguistics as laid down through Chomskyan Universal grammar
(Cook & Newson, 1996) stresses on the importance of lexicon as the building blocks of any language, as
well as the integration of lexicon and syntax. Chomsky asserts, in what he calls the Projection Principle,
that the properties of lexical items project onto the syntax of the sentence, meaning that speakers know
what the words in their language mean, how they sound and how they may be used in sentences. The
cruciality of this principle is that it emphasizes the lexical items of the mental lexicon, implying
important notions, including that lexical items are the representatives of syntactic rules or restrictions and
that syntax observes subcategorization properties of each lexical item. To justify these claims, one has to
illuminate a variety of information incorporated within the lexicon scheme, ranging from the
subcategorization information to the argument structure and thematic information. The verb 'eat' for
instance demands a two-place argument structure and the thematic roles written into the verb's thematic
grid must be 'projected' onto the syntax (Cook & Newson, 1996). The importance of lexical items is to
the extent that they draw upon their syntactic and semantic properties to determine the 'word order' of a language as well (Shapiro, 1997).

Universal grammar's emphasis on the apparently inseparable nature of the lexico-syntax interface stems from the reality associated with the important role of the universal principles and varying parameters, constituting the core grammar of languages. In addition to the core grammar, which is genetically pre-determined, the child and/or second language learner acquires a massive set of vocabulary items, each with its own pronunciation, meaning and syntactic restrictions. "So a large part of language acquisition is a matter of determining, from the presented data, the elements of the lexicon and their properties" (Chomsky, 1986, p.8). Also the Lexical Learning Hypothesis (Wexler & Manzini, 1987) claims that parameters, and not principles, belong to lexical entries. "It reduces all language acquisition to learning of lexical properties. Meanwhile, rules are considered as artefacts of interaction between the principles and the lexicon; rather than existing in their own right (Cook & Newson, 1996, p. 120)."

In this model, proposed as a T-model (looking like an upside down T) by Chomsky and Lasnik in 1977, grammar is supposed to consist of several generative devices, each capable of characterizing a numerous number of structures and their associated terminal strings. Within this system, which includes the basic grammatical features of the Government and Binding, as suggested in the Post-Standard-Theory, the D-structure does not represent the semantic component of the syntax. This structure is the level at which the properties of the sentence obscured in the S-structure (a bridge connecting sounds to meanings) are stated. In this model, also, lexicon comes to take the larger role; and the theory of X-bar syntax is replaced with phrase structure rules (Karimi, 1997). The lexicon is part of the interface system functioning to combine the several independent components, syntax and semantics, together. Lexical items usually have a function in both the syntax and the semantics, so that the semantic value of each lexical item that features in an expression is represented in the semantic component and its syntactic value represented in the syntactic component (Sadock, 2003). Also in this model, "X-bar syntax replaces large numbers of idiosyncratic rewrite rules with general principles; it captures properties of all phrases, not just those of a certain type; and it bases syntax on categories that tie in with the lexicon"( Cook & Newson, 1996, p.135 ).

Taking a closer look at the assumptions underlying Universal Grammar, one finds an intimate association between UG theories highlighting the amicable relationship between lexicon and syntax. A full knowledge of Binding theory in the speaker's mind, for example, incorporates the interaction of
syntactic and lexical knowledge. Syntax and vocabulary should be taken as not distinct but interwoven domains; abstract principles relate to actual lexical items. It furthermore drives home the fact that the theory is not about isolated rules but integrated principles. Binding theory is not just concerned with words like 'himself', or with reflexives; it applies to many areas such as pronominals, nouns, and so on. Moreover, "binding demonstrates the interconnectedness of the theory" (Cook & Newson, 1996, p.67). Here is where Structure-dependency comes into play, e.g. as the speaker is in need of relating structural constituents in the sentence.

Contemplating the above contrasting assumptions, the researcher wishes to shed more light on the hitherto controversial issue of lexicon-syntax interface as to the separation or association of the two. In other words, the objective is to discover whether a projection-based assumption of the lexicon-syntax interface can offer a better account of sentence construction than a purely structuralist assumption. To this end, the present study is framed to evaluate the nature of this interface by answering the following question: Does sentence construction take place with an emphasis on the separation of the knowledge of lexicon and syntax or an integration of the two?

Method

Subjects

Senior English major students participated in this study. They were 18 identically chosen mixed gender groups whose ages ranged between 23 and 34. All were native speakers of the Persian language. Because of the time-consuming nature of the research using verbal report methodology, the sample size is necessarily small and, as in this case, the subjects are often chosen as much on the basis of convenience and availability on the researchers' assumption that these learners would be better capable of performing protocol techniques. The subjects were instructed to conduct their supporting think-aloud reports while dealing with sentence construction. In addition, they were asked to do a retrospective analysis of the processes they used.

Instrumentation

In order to involve the subjects in a sentence construction activity, they were provided with a cloze task which was derived from a pre-assigned reading passage (see Appendix 3), which is a short paragraph and can stand alone as a semantic unit. The cloze task contains only content words. These content words represent the underlying structure of sentences where no transformations have yet been
applied (Keyser & Postal, 1976). Content words which "are mainly nouns, verbs, prepositions and, adjectives" (Cook & Newson, 1996, p.48) have lexical meaning. The cloze task was exploited to probe the learners' internal states while performing think-aloud and retrospective procedures in order to detect the type of processes the testees took on while constructing a sentence. In other words, did they project the syntactic properties of the content words onto the surface structure of the sentence by first adhering to the lexical meaning of content words and go through the same processes, as Chomsky asserts, in constructing a sentence (Cook & Newson, 1996) or began with the traditionally affirmed syntactic rules?

**Procedures**

The study was conducted in the subject's regular English classes and administered in cooperation with their regular instructor, who had been informed of the administrative procedures but not of the nature of the project. Each subject received a packet which contained 1) an agreement sheet and a set of general directions written in the Persian language and read aloud by the instructor; 2) an introductory page containing a brief list of the word and morpheme types they were to be informed of; 3) the passage and cloze task; 4) a page on which the subjects were instructed on how they were supposed to recall; and 5) another page elaborating the processes they were to use later in retrospective sessions.

In order to familiarize the subjects with the situation of the study, including the use of tape recorders, they were instructed using some primary task-like problems, already pilot-tested with a group of eight subjects from another university and briefed on the type of procedures they were to follow, i.e., concurrent think-aloud and retrospective reports.

Care was taken furthermore to fully acquaint them with the different types of words and morphemes selected by two English instructors in the university. The researchers, later, did a sample sentence completion task on the board to give the subjects information as to how they were supposed to accomplish the test task by inserting appropriate function words, inflectional morphemes, etc.

The study was carried out in two stages: first, the subjects were instructed how to work on the task in three-member self-selected groups. Each member was required to think his/her thoughts aloud while working on the test task and provide his/her reasoning concerning a particular choice or refutation of others' choices and ideas. Each group was supposed to work on the cloze test producing a syntactically accurate and semantically meaningful text. These completed versions of the original text were then discussed separately in groups in a subsequent testing session. Members were asked (retrospectively) to
justify and explain their ideas including any disagreements they hand with a particular choice. They were not allowed to refer to the original text while dealing with the task.

**Data Collection and Data Analysis**

By asking the subjects to say out loud whatever went through their minds, the researchers hoped to get a more direct view of the mental processes the subjects were engaged in while performing the cloze task. To this end, the process began with a tape recording, containing essentially all the auditory events that occurred during the sessions. The collected data were then transcribed by the researchers and an EFL graduate student who possessed a noticeable fluency in the English language. The processed segments were then encoded into the terminology of the theoretical model. The researchers needed to compare the set of statements implied by a weaker hypothesis, pure Harrisian structuralism, with the statements implied by the competing generativist projection-based processes. In this study, analysis was limited to frequency counting of the encoded data. The data analyzed provided detailed descriptive reports concerning think-alouds and retrospections in terms of the frequency of engagement of the subjects in group discussions and whether these chats had been prompted with a content-based or function-based grammatical feature. The purpose was to discover features of more importance to test takers, i.e., to find out whether the students were mostly grammar- or lexicon-oriented, dealing in particular with tasks containing sentence construction. Other descriptive reports involved information on the justifications and reasoning the students were to present as to the preference of a particular grammatical feature. A particular choice might call for syntactic, semantic (content-based), textual or other explanations and justifications as to its adoption. The data incorporated within the tables in the Appendices 1 and 2 explicitly clarify the point under investigation. The following analyses are suggested based on a) think-aloud, and b) retrospective reports produced along with examples of the excerpts selected from the data:

**A) Think-alouds**

According to frequency counting, one can notice in Appendix 1 that the syntactic categories codified as LEX, WO, and VT, representing lexical items, word order and verb tense respectively enable the subjects to produce further discussions while articles, subject/verb agreement, passives and pronouns (ART., S/V AG., PASS. and PRO. correspondingly) seemed to be of lesser importance while the subjects were involved in sentence construction. Observe the following excerpts taken out of the transcriptions.
The follow-up explications will elaborate on the delicate procedures the subjects adopt so as to construct sentences.

**EXCERPT 1: ART.**

A: The mayor of Oakland will soon be able to …know…
B: Or…either
C: To know about all crime statistics…
A: Crime statistics is enough…ha?
C: Yes, it makes sense.

One can evidently observe, in this sample, that there is mutual agreement between A and C in generating a phrase void of an article. The evidence as such bears the following interpretations: a) determiners including articles carry little essential propositional meaning; b) meaning plays a crucial role in determining the phrase structure of the sentence; and c) the examples touch upon the X-bar theory claims that all types of phrases, including Noun phrases, share and require the two internal levels of structure, specifier and complement, the former representing X” together with the head of the phrase and the latter formulating X’ along with the head.

There were many instances, in the data, of cases where within the sentences constructed by subjects NPs were void of the specific article acting as the specifier of an NP. This, it appears, had no effect on the subjects' conception of the meaning of the sentences.

A merely list-based linear system of sentence construction can make no contribution to explicating such a process and falls evidently short of an adequate explication, although there were 10 cases where the subjects based their explanations on the traditional sense of the sentence construction. However, what kind of justification can one find as to the lack of determiners?

**EXCERPT 2: VT.**

A: I [think] we are going to use it as …as… can read…
B: Yes…can read…is better than others. This is related to future when we can …have ability to do something …for example to…to read the internet….
EXCERPT 3: S/V. AGR.

A: We start with Police …like… Police *do* identify…*does*?

B: We use *do* as I remember for emphasis

A: Ok, but I know that police is not countable and is plural. So, police *do* intensify the crimes.

Although the researchers were presented with no explicit allusions concerning the way through which the participants in the study displayed the inflectional aspects of subject/verb agreement and verb tense, they found a great deal of helpful data where such concerns were dealt with lexically. In other words, the participants justified the choice of the said functional aspects based on the content of the lexical entries which carry the concepts of tense and agreement as noticed in the above samples.

EXCERPT 4: PASS.

A- The first word in this sentence should be … The project of …

B- Crime statistics…no…putting the city crime statistics…

A- Yes…on the web…

B- Who put no promoted…the project…

C- Maybe governor of California

A- Ok. So, make it passive… the …a …project was promoted to put…

C- Statistics…

A- Crimes statistics on the web.

The rule stating how to produce passives is not just a matter of counting words in a linear sequence in the traditional sense (i.e., that the object in the active sentence moves to the beginning of the sentence to become the subject of the passive; that the active subject moves after the verb…and so on). According to Cook and Newson (1996), any movement requires the movement of a right element in the right phrase, one introduced as the major aspect of the principle of structure-dependency. In order to know which element of the sentence moves, one has to know its underlying structure captured by the propositional meaning.
**EXCERPT 5: Pro.**

A- We can …according the …the last sentence say … he is the former governor of California, yes? Can we say 'he was'?

B- Ok, he was the former

C- Yes exactly. In the text…the past sentence…the mayor of Oakland talks about he…so this is the …about the governor…also he is alive…so he is the former governor of California.

In this excerpt, the pronoun he is claimed by C to refer to the same entity articulated in the previous sentence, namely, the mayor of Oakland. This fact reminds one of the Chomskyan idea that pronominals such as he, expressed by C, "do not have antecedents that are nouns within the same clause" (Cook & Newson, 1996, p.63); in other words, this pronominal is free within the local domain or the clause to which it belongs (Cook & Newson, 1996). The mere discussion of pronouns dealing with the principles and parameters theory, integrating the Binding principle with the lexical entry, is conspicuous evidence for the idea of the lexicon-syntax interface.

**EXCERPT 6: WO.**

A-Yes, the former governor of California …project…promote…crime statistics.

B- This project …yes

C- The former governor of California…what?

B- You know…we can say the former governor of California promotes the project of crime statistics… I think…it makes sense because who promotes?...the governor…what?... the project

A- Yes… it has good sense…

As so explicitly manifested, the spoken thoughts verbalized ad lib go absolutely against a methodological analysis which regards no affiliation between the two integral elements of lexicon and syntax. The latter operates along the same lines as Travis's (1984) valid suggestion that the θ-making parameter specifies the word order of arguments in relation to their predicates.
EXCERPT 7: LEX.

A- we have…mayor…then verb…believe political ….

B- You are right because ‘believe’ is the verb and mayor …subject. Someone believes something. That one is ‘the mayor’ and the thing is …I think…..political pressure….will create….to create…no…

A- It is the ‘political pressure….. created to lead to…. good results’

C- According to what you say ‘political pressure’ is object of verb….

B- Of course it should be all that. . I mean …phrase ‘political pressure created to lead to good results’.

It is so unequivocally stated that V requires and expresses the meaning relationships between some entities known as subject and object in the traditional sense. The object is decided as the whole phrase ‘political pressure created to lead to good results'. Though there are no further details stated, it could be argued that the Projection Principle entails that sentence (1) cannot have the structure in (2).

(1) The mayor believes the political pressure created to lead to good results.

(2) The mayor believes [NP the political pressure created] [S to lead to good results].

The NP is the subject of the embedded sentence at the level of D-structure, so it has to be analyzed as its subject at all syntactic levels of representation, even though it has an objective case.

B) Retrospections

The remainder of the data were later analyzed for the justifications and explanations, if any, that the subjects offered as to first, the kind of grammatical features of the concern of the learners and second, the strategies and procedures taken by different groups to deal with and resolve such concerns. Based on the learner's overt statements or on the implications in such statements, a taxonomy of justifications was drawn up. The following examples from the transcripts illustrate these categories of justifications:

1. Syntactic: justifications which refer to rules or categories

EXCERPT 8: VT.

A: The mayor of Oakland will soon be able to…we use the future tense to show that…

B: Well, this is not happening just now
A: Yeah... 'will be able to' is in harmony with the verb 'can'... so we need future marker... will soon be able to know about all the crime statistics.

This exchange begins with A offering her version of the sentence. B continues by alluding to the rule that the present tense should not be used in place of a future tense. This exchange digresses and becomes a discussion about comparisons between verbs but returns to the need for the use of the future marker 'will'.

**EXCERPT 9: S/V. AGR.**

A: Let me explain... 'police do identify the crimes'. We said police is plural so we use plural verb 'do'.

In this excerpt, A justifies the choice of a better alternative, namely, 'plural' verb, alluding to the rule that a simple plural verb accompanies a plural noun.

**EXCERPT 10: ART.**

A: We say 'all the crime statistics' because these crimes happen in this city so they are definite... we use 'definite article'...

What is so perplexing as to the accomplishment of a retrospective task are the conscious efforts made on the part of the subjects to justify the choices, attending more to the superficial aspects or better still the fundamental categories of the sentence.

2- Semantic: appealing to semantics or meanings of words in the text

**EXCERPT 11: LEX.**

A: Now I explain... The mayor of Oakland ...of is used here to show possession... that Oakland possesses this mayor...

In this example, the application of the preposition of is justified on the basis of the semantic explication.

One problem with the characterization of a category like 'preposition' is that, according to Abney (1987), they are to some extent anomalous; that they seem "to straddle the line between functional and
thematic elements" (p.63). The only point to be discussed here is that the prepositions so unequivocally carry with them a lexical and not a grammatical meaning.

**EXCERPT 12: WO.**

A: 'Former governor of California' or 'California's former governor'?

B: Yeah, this governor belongs to California. So the two sentences are correct.

In this excerpt, A is unsure about the choice of the correct structure and expresses uncertainty. However, B shows his acceptance of both of the expressions justifying this preference on a semantic basis.

**3- Intuitive: statement which reflects sense of what sounds /seems right and what does not**

**EXCERPT 13: WO.**

A: That the police report…report…has powerful information about crimes. Does it make sense?

B: Well, I don't know the rule…I only know …sounds…nothing is missing…yes the structure…the order is correct…

The exchange begins with A making obvious efforts to reconstruct a sentence. At the same time, she expresses her uncertainty as to the grammaticality and meaningfulness of the sentence. B accepts this construction, but obviously finds it difficult to articulate the reason for it. Therefore, he resorts to his intuition that the construction sounds right.

**Discussion**

In the course of the last three decades, second language syntax has been looked at from different perspectives within the framework of the Chomkyan UG (Cook & Newson, 1996). The critical suggestion offered by any investigations including the present study following UG assumptions is that when one acquires L2 as a natural language, s/he is not required to learn the central areas of syntax
(Cook, 1998). Closely affiliated with the concerns of the structuralist as well as any studies seeking to explain the fundamental cornerstones of linguistic relations is the appropriate distinction of the nature of the lexicon-syntax interface.

Pursuing the same trends, the present study is concerned with whether and to what extent there exists a relationship between the lexico-semantic properties of the predicate and the syntactic frames in which they appear. Abstracting from details, we deal here with two types of hypotheses whose concerns we hope are touched upon by the subjects involved with the question under scrutiny: the so-called valency-based projectionist approach, according to which 'verbs' lexically specify the demonstration of their arguments versus the approach according to which the structures are formulated in the syntax rather than lexically-oriented.

Commensurate with this, some concurrent and retrospective protocol techniques were applied to investigate the above assertions. The arduous task of applying psycholinguistic data as a means of putting a variety of linguistic theories to the test, although not favoured by those reluctant to allow one's theory to become too indebted to facts from the corpus as to linguistic behaviour, has been followed in the present study. The codified frequency-driven data were used as indicators of the extent to which syntactic structure is determined or constrained by lexical choice. Despite the variety of interpretations the data admit, they clearly offer a lexicon-grammar unification which is more strongly restrained by lexical choices and that syntax is more often accommodated to the demands of some lexical items than vice versa (Schönefeld 2001). Contributing to the generativist claims of the lexical-syntax interface was the frequency of the encoded data, though those who are unable or unwilling to place data from protocols ahead of formal argumentation might find the discussion undesirable, especially when the findings advocate a lexically-governed link.

In accordance with this, the researchers achieved two crucial sets of data (see Appendices) regarding the frequency of the learners' concern as well as the retrospective justifications they brought forth as to their choice of a particular syntactic category. The procedures the subjects became engaged with produced highly correlating results so that the retrospective reports corroborated some of the discussions made during the think-aloud reports.

A rightful concern of researchers was that the testees were not thought to attend to all syntactic categories at the same time and to the same extent; a problem which has to do with the nature of the task they performed and the autonomous quality of conscious verbalizations. It would be more reasonable
then to enlist at least 5 times as many testees for generalizing numerous reports. Despite this, the results obtained contribute largely to the claims effected by a unitary account of government and binding theories regarding, in particular, the valency properties of the content words and sentence structure. These two points of concern lie at the crossroads of interaction between the nuts and bolts which are central in describing a language, for which there seems to exist no logical answer in a meaning-free word-by-word approach to, let us say, sentence construction.

Accordingly, the groups ventured beyond the single word and considered the entire sentence and the relationships between ideas in the text. What was perhaps more perplexing to the researchers were the justifications the students provided for their grammatical decisions. Such justifications and explanations tended to be offered only when disputes (e.g., repairs) arose or where confirmation requests were made. The findings seem to indicate that the subjects attempted to justify their decisions at a higher rate with respect to concurrent reports by appealing to grammatical rules and conventions they seemed to be consciously aware of and to have encountered in their rule-based course books, for instance, in resolving their choices of verb tense, subject/verb agreement and word order. This could somehow be related to the conscious efforts made by the subjects to resolve the disagreements which quite logically led to the frequent references to the conventions they were obviously aware of due to the nature of the educational policies and concerns as to what students in mostly lower education should be provided with. So the rate of appealing to the rules and analogies seemed higher in proportion to the same feature in the concurrent sessions. The logic behind this fact might have to do with Krashen's (1981) continuum of the acquisition/learning distinction where at the extreme left is the Chomskyan claim of unconscious acquisition of language.

There were cases where simple conversations evolved into complicated discussions about an alternative approach to sentence construction on the basis of testees' adherence to what Odlin (1994) calls intuition. These findings justify the assertions that correct intuitions reflect an evolving L2 system. As these intuitions are not straightforwardly expressed or owing to the learners' lack of L2 proficiency in many cases, they are not anticipated to appear in the learners' discussion, the testees might simply break it all up with 'I think…' (Swain & Lapkin, 1995). Sorace (1985), for example, offers the claim that it demands an ability of high order to verbalize rules and conventions. It is, however, the researchers' credo that any appeal to analogical conventions is to a great extent due to the simple fact that these students have become, to a lesser degree, educationally grammar-oriented, i.e., they rely on the grammatical
points and rules as far as knowledge of the language is concerned. Given the demographic differences among the individuals, this fact seems to be true especially for those whose knowledge of the English language, before entering university, happens not to exceed high school education, leading to a wrong attitude about what needs to be learned.

**Conclusion**

This protocol-oriented report has focused on the philosophic position underlying the conception of the association or segregation of lexicon and syntax, interpreted as meaning and form, within the domain of generativist structuralism. Hence the true challenge is to understand pure vs. projection-based structuralist perspectives located in a framework embodying the conflict between the two conceptions of linguistic science: the mediationalist view, which, according to Goldsmith (2005), regards the aim of linguistic research as discovering how natural languages associate form and meaning, and the distributionist view, looking at how discrete pieces of language (e.g., word and structure) connect with each other in a way that defines each individual language. Harris, in contrast to Chomsky, had no idea of how mediationalist conceptions could contribute to linguistics as the former's goal was to show that the only priority in a linguistic analysis should be defined in terms of the distribution of components because he believed that this is the only basis on which one could establish a comprehensive linguistic theory.

From early on, the distributionist view advocated that linguistics is not a science of internalized knowledge, as the people of the calibre of Chomsky alleged, but that of external events. This empiricist perspective evolved into other subfields of linguistics the last being a connectionist view of language and learning (see, e.g., MacWhinney, 1998) which is not committed to a mediationalist hypothesis either. The image emerging from Harris's view is one that regards a radical withdrawal of linguistics from psychology and biology. A radical move that will be a curse to quite a few leading theoreticians in linguistics from Ronald Langacker and George Lakoff to Ray Jackendoff and, of course, Noam Chomsky all of whom advocate an affiliation of linguistic structures with human cognitive structures. On the other side, Harris's determined view was to adhere to an autonomous science of linguistics not involved with the methodological and conclusive concerns of any other discipline as he regarded predictions as being outside the techniques and scope of descriptive linguistics (Goldsmith, 2001). Harris follows Sapir's classic observations about speaker intuitions which was the Chomskyan perspective on the relationship between semantics and syntax during the 1960s (Huck & Goldsmith, 1996): that meaning is not related to syntax, but that a thorough grammatical analysis will probably have much to offer to neighbouring
disciplines concerned with meaning and logic. Harris agrees with Carnap and Bloomfield and also with Bar-Hillel (1970), who suggest the importance of fuzzy semantics and the reconstruction of their fields on a purely structural basis. A well-known modern statement of a distribution-based idea of grammatical analysis stems from Maratsos and Chalkley (1980), who closely followed Bloomfield (1933) and Harris (1951). They suggest that children could sort words into grammatical categories by noting their co-occurrences with other morphemes and their privileging of occurrences in sentences. Thus, -ed follows the verb and the precedes the noun. They assert that children carry out such analyses even in the absence of supportive semantic evidence. Antagonistic psychologists, although deprived of the tools to develop what is or is not a suitable noun preceeder, can easily assert that "nouns" simply are not the most frequent article-followers, but that adjectives and adverbs are. That is why the computational linguists today struggle to develop traditional linguistic labelling regarding the categorization of words into patterns. Goldsmith (2005), like many others, criticizes Harris's E-view as being too meagre disregarding many linguistic facts.

With an eye to the previous weak philosophical standpoint unable to answer many pertinent questions, including the lexicon-syntax interface, the present study advocates Schönefeld's (2001) assertion that: no strict theory of the structure of the lexicon can afford to get along without at least some theory of the lexicon, in the same way as no serious theory of syntax can afford to overlook the lexicon. This assertion is based upon the simple fact that the lexicon, in most linguistic theories, provides the required material for formation of the syntactic and semantic structures. Upon embarking on an investigation of the opposing hypotheses, one finds a variety of ways in which a division of labour between lexicon as a storehouse of raw material and syntax is enunciated.

The results obtained from the findings in the present investigation, however, highlight a projection-based approach to the lexico-syntactic nature of L2 sentence construction with lexical items prevailing over syntax. This should not prevent one from being unafraid to build bridges between a purely distribution-based theory and one of generative grammar, as it could be fairly argued that the difference between the opposing views in this respect is more one of stress and degree than of kind. There is a continuous argument on the part of some fairly realistic linguists concerning a need for both descriptive and explanatory theories. On the grounds of the false contrast many linguists observe between description and theory, and because of the intense prestige associated with the concept of theory, many often disregard any efforts made by distribution-based basic linguistic theory as "merely"
descriptive. However, it should not be taken for granted that many are still enchanted by the ideas put forth by structuralism, including descriptive linguists, who, in the recent years, have displayed a tremendous penchant for allowing their mode of description to be affected by insights from typological studies. So in this way, descriptive theories can also manifest explanatory power as a welcome and complementary addition.

**Pedagogical Implications**

Many important developments have taken place within linguistics concerning grammatical theories like Government-Binding theory. Yet, in the applied linguistics literature there has hardly been any mention of them. Even a well-known teaching-oriented English grammar course book such as Headway (Soars & Soars, 1987) has little to do with grammar as seen by linguists, with the noticeable exception of the Cobuild English Course (Willis & Willis, 1987), and Rutherford (1987). Nor can it be said, according to Cook (1989a), that researchers concerned with second language learning have exploited contemporary grammar as a foundation, except for the research carried out within UG surveyed in Flynn (1988) and Cook (1988). For one thing, applied linguists disagree with mainstream linguistics, disregarding the fact that such grammars as UG might be useful to them in its own right. How can one ever justify such a neglect of modern linguistic theories and turn a blind eye to the important changes taken place in recent years known as I-language theories (see for example Chomsky, 1986). For decades, language teaching has concentrated on the E-language extreme rather than keeping a balance between I-language and E-language (Cook, 1989b). Overall, grammar is important for language teaching as an account of the processes involved in language production and comprehension. This affects teaching methodologies, course book writers and syllabuses. So there is a variety of grammar types which are found in the applied linguistics literature concerning language teaching ranging from a) structuralist applied grammar (including as an instance a *structural inventory* that goes in alphabetical order from "A/AN" to "zero article" or only substitution table) requiring a conscious knowledge of language (see for example, Rutherford, 1987, and Krashen, 1985), to b) prescriptive applied grammar which insists on a description of the structure of language as complete as possible, regarded by Stern (1983) as "the second major function of linguistics in language teaching" like the use of the Cobuild series (Willis & Willis, 1987), and to c) Universal Grammar.
The last has to do with the I-language approach regarding the knowledge of a language present in the mind of a learner. Any syllabus is concerned with such knowledge of principles (such as structure dependency), parameters (like the pro-drop) and the idiosyncratic properties of the learners' mental lexicon. Let us take the theta theory as an example of how UG could be applied to language teaching.

The semantic roles agent, patient, and goal, for instance, in a sentence such as *Mary sent the mail to John* projecting onto the syntax through the verb *send*, could be introduced into a syllabus and be attractive to teaching in several ways: it may make sense as an explanation to the students; it may be valid as a way of sequencing the introduction of syntax in the grammatical 'core' to the syllabus rather than using the structures of structuralist applied grammar; it may be an important component in language teaching (Cook, 1989a).

To sum up, any concept of grammar, even those marked as *not valid* by today's movement in linguistics, sharing many commonalities, which lie somewhere between the extremes of E-language and I-language approaches should be somehow taken seriously by the applied linguists. In fact, those who call themselves applied linguists have a duty to see that their concept of grammar takes account of sound and relevant current theories rather than superseded or irrelevant concepts (Cook, 1998).

---

**Appendix 1: Frequency of discussions prompted by syntactic categories in think-alouds**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syntactic categories</th>
<th>G 1</th>
<th>G 2</th>
<th>G 3</th>
<th>G 4</th>
<th>G 5</th>
<th>G 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VT.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/V AG.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASS.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WO.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRO.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEX.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: G=group; Pr.=projection-based; Pu.= pure structuralism; VT.=verb tense; ART.= article; S/V AG.=subject/verb agreement; PASS.=passive; WO.= word order; PRO.= pronoun; LEX.= lexical items*
Appendix 2: Frequency of retrospective exchanges on the justifications concerning categorical choices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syntactic categories</th>
<th>Syntactic (rule-based)</th>
<th>Semantic (content-based)</th>
<th>Intuitive</th>
<th>Other (textual, etc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VT.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/V AG.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASS.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WO.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRO.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEX.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 3

TEXT

Oakland Puts Crime Statistics Maps on the Internet

Police officers respond to a shooting near a store in a tough west Oakland neighbourhood. The kind of crime rarely reported by newspapers, or TV. But in a few days, neighbours can read all about it on the internet.

Jerry Brown, the mayor of Oakland, looks at the computer screen showing the Oakland crime statistics: "There's a lot of crime in that area, isn't it."

Jerry Brown, Oakland's mayor and California's former governor, promotes the quarter million dollar project that makes Oakland the first city in the country to put its crime statistics on the web.

Mayor Jerry Brown says, "Every neighbourhood precinct can be called up, and therefore the citizen knows what's happening as well as the police can identify a pattern of criminality on a daily basis, and then do something about, interrupt it, change it, stop it."

On the map a red star marks a homicide: a green star assault, the red circles armed robbery, and an orange circle child abuse. The purple triangles are car thefts.

Deborah Acosta is a neighbourhood activist who lives in Oakland: "if you highlight those incidents, right here, it will give you a case number. So this case happened in '99, and there is a case number 115843.

Another click provides the police report. Neighbourhood activist Deborah Acosta says its powerful information to battle crime." They realize, aha, this impacts me now, this impacts the value of my home, it impacts the willingness of people to move into my neighbourhood, and go to my local school. I guess I'd better do something."

That, says police Chief Richard Word, is what police want, "The information we now have is made available to them, so they essentially will become equal partners, and we can work with them. And then begin this process of problem solving, working closely together to solve some of the persistent neighbourhood problems that we are seeing."

Mayor Brown says putting neighbourhood crime information on the web its all about creating political pressure, and the neighbourhoods that learn how to use that pressure are likely to get results.
CLOZE TASK
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Abstract
Teachers play a key role in any curriculum implementation, as they determine whether or not curriculum innovation is successfully executed in the classroom as intended by policymakers. This paper explores factors affecting teachers’ implementation of English as a foreign language (EFL) curriculum as reported through a structured questionnaire by 248 EFL teachers in six universities from the north-western part of China. The findings of this study, through exploratory factor analyses and multiple regressions of the questionnaire data, revealed that six external and internal factors were significant predictors of teachers’ curriculum implementation. Among them, resource support, communicative language teaching, and teaching experience positively predicted these teachers’ curriculum implementation; grammar-translation method, English proficiency, and professional development needs, on the other hand, negatively predicted their curriculum implementation. The implications of this study point to the complex nature of curriculum implementation, and the multifaceted roles that teachers must play for successful implementation to occur within this EFL context in China.

Key Words: language teachers, external factors, internal factors, curriculum implementation, tertiary, China

1. Introduction
Curriculum implementation has been recognized as a very complex matter (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991; Snyder, Bolin, & Zumwalt, 1992). The complexity can be perceived mainly from stakeholders at different levels who may interpret the curriculum policies in a different manner than policymakers intend. First of all, policymakers’ planning, while done with good intentions, may not be sufficient to foresee potential reactions when the policies are translated in the local implementing institutions. For example, middle-level administrators, if not closely guided, may develop their own interpretation of the policies, and may encounter institutional or contextual constraints as well. Therefore, their efforts at implementing the policies may be thwarted when applied to actual operations.

The curriculum implementation is most likely confounded as well by resistance from teachers, the main stakeholders (Morris, 1985; Williams et al., 1994). Either the teachers deliberately do not implement the revised curriculum (Karavas-Doukas, 1995) or they appear to view innovation favourably, but for one reason or another, do not incorporate the curriculum changes into their classroom teaching
This non-implementation or semi-implementation of curriculum is prevalent in both English as a second language (ESL) and English as a foreign language (EFL) contexts.

In recent years there has been an increased interest in researching curriculum implementation in language education. Many studies have been undertaken on English as a second language curriculum implementation with the aim of improving teaching and learning, and on how to facilitate curriculum innovation in the ESL context (Markee, 1997; Stoller, 1994). However, only a few empirical studies have been conducted focusing on English as a foreign language curriculum implementation (Gorsuch, 2000; Karavas-Doukas, 1995; O’Sullivan, 2002). Studies of the mandatory national EFL curriculum at the tertiary level in the Chinese context are still relatively scarce and limited in scope (He, 1996; Li, 2001). The contextual difference between ESL and EFL can significantly affect teachers’ attitudes toward curriculum implementation. In ESL settings, the relative available resources, flexible teaching methods, different curriculum requirements and students’ expectations enable ESL teachers to have more autonomy in carrying out the curriculum. However, in EFL settings, the factors of the more hierarchical educational systems, high expectations from students, and the immense pressure to help students pass high-stakes exams tend to alter the curriculum in classroom practice (Jin & Yang, 2006; Wang & Han, 2002). Therefore, the current study examined the revised tertiary EFL curriculum through the lenses of teachers to uncover the factors affecting implementation within the Chinese context, using a questionnaire survey. For the purposes of this study, the phrase “implementing the curriculum” refers to teachers’ activities toward achieving the overall goals specified in the teaching syllabus. The study aimed to address the following two research questions:

1. What are the external and internal factors perceived by teachers with regard to the college English curriculum implementation?
2. What are the relationships between the external and internal factors and teachers’ curriculum implementation?

2. The Research Context
This study was conducted in China and focused on the tertiary level, where two types of English language education curriculum co-exist: one for English-major students and the other for non-English-major students (Wang, 2001). Language education for English majors centers on developing students’ language proficiency to an advanced/sophisticated level; relatively small numbers of university students
are enrolled in such a program. Language education for non-English majors involving millions of students is called “College English” and refers to the English language instruction in both four-year universities and three-year colleges. Non-English-major students in a variety of disciplines such as arts, sciences, engineering, management, law, and medical science constitute the larger portion of tertiary-level students studying English. In 2006, approximately 5.4 million students were enrolled in such English instruction at 1,867 universities and colleges in China (http://www.edu.cn).

For these university non-English majors, a study of college English in accordance with the College English Teaching Syllabus (College English Syllabus Revision Team, 1986, 1999) for two years is mandatory. Students take a total of 280 teaching hours of English in two years (about 70 hours each term, 5 to 6 hours each week) in order to meet the basic requirements of the Syllabus. To evaluate the learning of English, after the first two years of English study, students are assessed using a nationwide, standardized English proficiency test called the College English Test Band 4 (CET-4). For those students who pass the CET-4, the College English Test Band 6 (CET-6) can be taken after an additional year of study. The mandated CET-4 focuses on testing students’ language proficiency in listening, reading, and writing. Most of the test items are in a multiple-choice format.

The 1999 College English Teaching Syllabus is a functional-notional syllabus which organized the content of the language teaching around both functions and notions (Krahnke, 1987). It is also stated in this syllabus that the central goal of College English is “to develop in students a relatively high level of competence in reading, and an intermediate level of competence in listening, speaking, writing, and translating so that students can communicate in English” (College English Syllabus Revision Team, 1999, p. 1). Although this syllabus lays great emphasis on the development of students’ communicative competence, the corresponding nationwide CET is not broadly evaluative of this desired competence (Wang & Han, 2002). As the majority of college English students only take the compulsory CET-4 which does not include a speaking component, and as there are also strong pressures on teachers with regard to their teaching assessments by universities, department heads, and students based on their students’ performance in the CET, it seems that the washback effect could exert a certain negative mitigating effect on the teachers implementing the curriculum (see Wang, 2006).

College English teachers are usually assigned two classes each term and teach 10 to 12 teaching periods each week. Each teaching period is about 50 minutes, and there are about 50 students in each class. Every EFL teacher conducts lessons on all the components in the college English course such as reading, writing, listening, and speaking. As most universities attach great importance to their students’
passing the CET-4, college English teachers often feel that the results of the CET-4 to some extent also indicate the quality of their classroom teaching (Han, Dai, & Yang, 2004). Consequently, teachers feel great pressure in meeting both the requirements of the institutions and the needs of their students. This study was conducted with these college English teachers as subjects and within the context of EFL teaching for non-English majors.

3. Factors Affecting Teachers’ Curriculum Implementation

Researchers are cognisant that teachers are the most important players in the process of curriculum implementation, and that they do not always do as told nor do they always act to maximize curriculum objectives (Cohen & Ball, 1990; McLaughlin, 1987). Moreover, teachers have been diagnosed as resistant to change or just simply lazy (McLaughlin, 1987; Smit, 2005), as evidenced by their ignoring or subverting curriculum innovations. Spillane et al. (2002), however, looked at their situation in a different light, explaining that this is because teachers often lack the capacity—the knowledge, skills, personnel, and other resources—necessary to work in ways that are consistent with the policy. Spillane et al. warned that even if teachers understand the policymakers’ intentions, they still may not have the necessary skills and the human and material resources to accomplish what they perceive the policy to be asking of them. From this point of view, teachers as grass-roots implementers may not necessarily be unwilling to implement the curricular policies; rather, they simply may not know how to implement them.

A review of the literature in both general education and language education has shown that there are various factors affecting teachers’ curriculum implementation. Two primary sets of factors discussed in the research literature potentially affect teachers’ curriculum implementation: external and internal factors. The following review focuses on the factors most relevant to the present study.

3.1 External Factors

The term “external” refers to factors that stem from outside the classroom such as sociocultural, political, or administrative, that teachers have little or no control over. A review of the literature reveals that external testing and resource support (human, financial, and material) are the most influential factors (Alderson & Wall, 1993; Everard, Morris, & Wilson, 2004).
3.1.1 Testing
High-stakes tests and examinations exert considerable impact on what and how teaching and learning are conducted in the classroom (Alderson & Wall, 1993; Cheng & Watanabe with Curtis, 2004). This “washback” effect, as claimed by Alderson and Wall (1993), leads teachers to “teaching to the test, with an undesirable narrowing of the curriculum” (p. 118), which is a situation well documented in the College English context (Jin, 2007; Qi, 2005). Chapman and Snyder (2000) also observed that teachers tend to teach what is tested. More often than not, utilizing tests as a catalyst for change may not necessarily bring about fundamental changes or the improvement in teaching methods to be expected from teachers in a revised curriculum (Cheng, 1998).

3.1.2 Resource support
Everard, Morris, and Wilson (2004) classified three resources: material, financial, and human, as the most essential, and empirical studies have also demonstrated the importance of these three resources. Carless (1999) reported that material support can help minimize the extra workload associated with innovation on EFL teachers, and particularly, teaching materials provide vital support for untrained and inexperienced teachers who have weak subject knowledge. O’Sullivan (2002) attributed the difficulty in successful implementation of the English syllabus in Namibia to limited financial resources, reflected in terms of space, materials, and small classes. Likewise, in Greece, South Korea, and Egypt, Karavas-Doukas (1995), Li (1998), and Gahin and Myhill (2001) all found that more funding was needed to obtain materials such as resource books or photocopies to assist teachers in preparing and presenting teaching materials in line with communicative language teaching principles.

3.2 Internal Factors
Internal factors refer to factors which stem from the teachers themselves. They include teachers’ beliefs, attitudes, knowledge, understanding of and involvement/participation in curriculum innovation. The following review focuses on such factors as teachers’ professional development needs, their teaching experience, and language proficiency.

3.2.1 Professional development
Ongoing teacher education and professional development are considered essential in curriculum innovation (Richards, 1998; Richards & Farrell, 2005). However, empirical studies have demonstrated
both the positive and negative contributions of these factors (Gahin & Myhill, 2001; Peacock, 2001). Fullan and Pomfret (1977) found that teachers who received in-service training had a higher degree of implementation than those who did not. Gahin and Myhill (2001) also found that teachers who attended training courses on the communicative approach (CA) were significantly more likely to make use of authentic materials consonant with CA. Similarly, Bailey (1992) found through surveys and interviews that teachers after training did change, but that this change process was “slow, gradual, incomplete, partial, ongoing, evolutionary” (p. 276).

However, Young and Lee (1987) found that teachers who attended the in-service training revealed only a slight change in their attitude by the end of the course, but the change was too small to be statistically significant. In his longitudinal study examining changes in teachers’ beliefs about second language learning, Peacock (2001) found that no significant changes were present regarding some mistaken conceptions in pre-service ESL teachers after their three years of study in the program. He (1996) explored the implementation of the College English Teaching Syllabus within the Chinese context and found that the apprenticeship-like teacher training system in China failed to do much toward changing either teachers’ perceptions or their instructional behaviours in the classroom.

3.2.2 Teaching experience and language proficiency
Richards (2001) reported that among the factors affecting teachers that he researched, teaching experience was found to be one of the central elements in the successful implementation of curriculum innovation. Richards and Farrell (2005) argued that compared with novice language teachers, more experienced teachers possess a richer knowledge base and deeper understanding of their students and student learning, thereby being more capable to solve instructional problems, and thus more likely to carry out the curriculum. However, Gahin and Myhill (2001) found that experienced teachers and their less experienced counterparts in the EFL context of Egypt were different in their attitudes towards communicative language teaching. Experienced teachers tended to hold least favourable attitudes toward the newer, more communicative approach. Less experienced teachers, on the other hand, preferred instructional strategies consonant with the communicative approaches, such as valuing fluency over accuracy, using collaborative activities and audio-visual materials, and avoiding use of the mother tongue in class. However, there is no guarantee whether holding a positive attitude indicates a tendency toward positive action in curriculum implementation. With regard to language proficiency, researchers such as Beretta (1990), Li (1998), and Gahin and Myhill (2001) all pointed out that teachers’ inadequate
command of English turn out to be the most common roadblock to implementing the revised curriculum, particularly in EFL contexts where the majority of language teachers are non-native speakers of English.

With regard to the reviewed literature, it must be noted that the factors identified are mainly discussed separately (single factors). However, the current research examines the combined impact of the external and internal factors on teachers of English within the Chinese tertiary context. In order to identify whether these factors are applied in the Chinese EFL context, an operational model integrating both the external and internal factors pertinent to Chinese tertiary EFL education was created and built into a survey instrument to explore and either confirm or refute what other researchers have found. A detailed discussion about the survey instrument will be discussed in the methodology section.

4. Methodology

4.1 Participants
EFL teachers from six universities in one north-western city in Mainland China were invited to participate in the survey study. There are between 60 to 100 EFL teachers, on average, in each respective institution. Of a total number of about 450 EFL teachers contacted, 248 teachers responded to the survey, of whom 193 were female (78%) and 55 male (22%). Their ages ranged from 22 to 59 with 83% being under 40 years old. Their educational qualifications were as follows: 137 participants (56%) with B.A.s, 20 (8%) with Advanced Teacher Training Certificates, and 89 (36%) with Master's degrees. As far as their teaching experience was concerned, 98 participants (40%) had been teaching for one to four years, 52 participants (21%) for five to nine years, another 52 for 10 to 14 years, 23 participants (9%) for 15 to 19 years, and 21 (9%) for over 20 years. More than half of the participants had large classes of over 50 students.

4.2 Instruments
The questionnaire employed in the current study was designed and developed while drawing from Karavas-Doukas (1996), Gorsuch (2000), and Cheng and Wang (2004). It consisted of four parts, with a total of 64 items after the pilot testing. Section A (14 items) and B (30 items) respectively included statements about the external and internal factors affecting teachers’ curriculum implementation. All the items were designed on a five-point Likert scale, where 5 = “strongly agree,” 4 = “agree,” 3 = “neutral,” 2 = “disagree,” and 1 = “strongly disagree.” Section C (14 items) included statements about teachers’
curriculum implementation activities, which were intended to measure what teachers actually did in their classroom, i.e., the degree of their curriculum implementation specified in the teaching syllabus. Each statement was designed to reflect teachers’ attitudes regarding the principles of the 1999 College English Teaching Syllabus (College English Syllabus Revision Team, 1999) under which the EFL teachers worked. All the items in section C were designed on a five-point Likert scale with statements C1 to C9 focusing on degree of agreement or disagreement and statements C10 to C14 on frequency, where 5 = “always,” 4 = “often,” 3 = “sometimes,” 2 = “seldom,” and 1 = “never.” Section D (6 items) included questions about the participants themselves. This section consisted of: (1) demographic information, including teachers’ gender, age, educational qualifications, and teaching experience; and (2) current teaching situations, including the number of teaching periods per week, and average class sizes. Since all participants were teachers of English, the questionnaire was issued in English, with some key words and phrases translated into Chinese.

Based on the reviewed literature, an operational model was created, and subsequently vetted through a focus group discussion\(^3\) to identify potential constructs and themes, to examine the proposed external and internal factors, and to explore whether the factors discussed in the literature were perceived as actually relevant to Chinese EFL teachers. Through such discussions, survey items were then designed. In the end, pilot testing of the survey instrument (see Wang, 2006) resulted in the revision of some items, as well as the addition or deletion of items based on the initial exploratory factor analyses, multiple regression analyses, and the participants’ comments.

### 4.3 Data Collection and Analysis

For ethics purposes, signed approval letters from the department heads of each of the six participating universities were first obtained. The letter of information, the consent form, and the questionnaire were then distributed to the participants when they attended a series of in-service teacher training seminars\(^4\). Altogether, 248 valid questionnaires were obtained. After receiving the completed questionnaires, all quantifiable data were coded and entered into a computer file employing SPSS 12.0 version. We used dummy coding to show participants’ gender, and entered ordinal scales in terms of participants’ educational qualifications. We also entered the continuous data from the participants in terms of age, years of teaching, teaching hours, and class sizes.

Descriptive statistics for all 64 questionnaire items, including mean, median, mode, standard deviation, range, minimum, maximum, skewness, and kurtosis were examined to understand the overall
pattern of the teachers’ responses. To address the first research question—“What are the external and internal factors perceived by teachers with regard to the college English curriculum implementation?”, three steps in the overall analyses were carried out. First, exploratory factor analysis was employed to identify EFL teachers’ perceptions, initially regarding the external factors (Section A) and then the internal factors (Section B) which potentially impact their curriculum implementation (Section C). Specifically, principal components analysis (PCA) with varimax rotation was conducted. Since there was no particular number of factors pre-determined for the questionnaire, the criterion was set based upon the conventional principle of accepting eigenvalues of one or greater than one for retaining and interpreting factors (Borden & Abbott, 1988). Through the resultant factor solution from PCA, items that were loaded onto a factor were examined and each factor was subsequently labelled. Then, employing Cronbach’s alpha, the reliability coefficient of the external and internal factors was calculated to assess the level of internal consistency.

Secondly, the mean, the standard deviation, and the internal consistency of each factor scale were calculated respectively under the external and internal constructs to demonstrate the pattern of each teacher’s perceptions. Then interscale zero-order correlations within each respective construct were examined to reveal the intercorrelations among the dimensions of the constructs as a result of the factor analysis.

Thirdly, EFL teachers’ implementation activity scores (Section C) were calculated from their responses to the 14 statements in this section. The response values for each statement from each participant were added and then each participant was given an implementation score to indicate his or her fidelity to the implementation of the college English curriculum in the classroom. It was anticipated that a high score on the scale would imply more fidelity to the curriculum implementation and that a low score would suggest low fidelity.

To address the second research question—“What are the relationships between the external and internal factors and teachers’ curriculum implementation?”, two sets of multiple regression analyses using the “enter” method were conducted (Rawlings, Pantula, & Dickey, 1998) on the whole sample of 248 teachers to explore the relationship between curriculum implementation and the external and internal factors potentially affecting teachers. This exploration was intended to discover which factor(s) as an independent variable(s) appeared to have a significant effect on the dependent variable—i.e., teachers’ curriculum implementation activities in the classroom. In reporting regression results, the standard of }
.05 was used to determine the significance level, and $R$, $R^2$, unstandardized coefficients $B$, standardized coefficients Beta ($\beta$), $t$-value, and significance level were reported.

5. Results

5.1 Factor Analysis

Factor analysis was performed on the external and internal factors separately, using the orthogonal rotation (varimax). The cut-off point was set on a criterion of a minimum .30 factor loading (Kline, 1994) for both solutions. In terms of the external factors, a five-factor solution was decided upon based on the scree diagram and the eigenvalues greater than one. These five factors accounted for 60.63% of the total variance in the variables. As shown in Table 1, these five factors were labelled as: teachers’ evaluation (F1), teaching conditions (F2), testing (F3), textbooks (F4), and resource support (F5).

In terms of the internal factors, an eight-solution was decided upon, as this solution demonstrated the most interpretable and meaningful solution after two, three, four, five, six, and then seven solutions had been administered separately. The total variance accounted for by the eight-solution was 59.76%. As shown in Table 2, these eight factors were defined as: teaching experience (F1), knowledge and understanding of the syllabus (F2), professional development needs (F3), communicative language teaching (F4), professional development activities (F5), grammar-translation method (F6), English proficiency (F7), and language learning background (F8).
Table 1. Results of Factor Analysis for the External Factors (N = 248)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>Factor 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A4. Students’ test scores on teaching performance evaluation</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5. Students’ evaluation</td>
<td>.685</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6. Colleagues’ evaluation</td>
<td>.716</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7. Department’s evaluation</td>
<td>.715</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A12. Students’ English abilities</td>
<td>.676</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A13. Class size</td>
<td>.806</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A14. Workloads</td>
<td>.757</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1. Test affects teaching</td>
<td>.741</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2. Test affects learning</td>
<td>.837</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3. Doing simulated tests</td>
<td>.548</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A8. Textbooks affect what to teach</td>
<td>.837</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9. Textbooks affect how to teach</td>
<td>.822</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10. Access to teaching resources</td>
<td></td>
<td>.831</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A11. Access to audio-visual resources</td>
<td></td>
<td>.802</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eigenvalues</td>
<td>2.839</td>
<td>1.865</td>
<td>1.445</td>
<td>1.278</td>
<td>1.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of the total variance accounted for</td>
<td>20.276</td>
<td>13.320</td>
<td>10.321</td>
<td>9.131</td>
<td>7.578</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Results of Factor Analysis for the Internal Factors (N = 248)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>Factor 5</th>
<th>Factor 6</th>
<th>Factor 7</th>
<th>Factor 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B22. Experience helps teaching</td>
<td>.798</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B23. Teaching improves with more experience</td>
<td>.840</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B24. Teaching exchanges with more experience</td>
<td>.784</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1. Syllabus is based on F/N concept</td>
<td></td>
<td>.416</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2. Skill requirements in the Syllabus</td>
<td></td>
<td>.322</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3. Objectives of the Syllabus</td>
<td></td>
<td>.674</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4. Clarity of the Syllabus</td>
<td></td>
<td>.596</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5. Practicality of the Syllabus</td>
<td></td>
<td>.725</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6. Understanding what to teach in the Syllabus</td>
<td></td>
<td>.588</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7. Understanding how to teach in the Syllabus</td>
<td></td>
<td>.683</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B11. Teacher training improves teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.314</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B12. Improving language teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.790</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B13. Working on a graduate degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.774</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B14. Learning communicative language teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.749</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B15. Learning computer-assisted teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.570</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B16. Communicative language teaching is useful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.768</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B17. Comfortable with CLT method</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.789</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B18. Using CLT method in teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.641</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B28. Provided with a mentor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.755</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B29. Observing colleagues’ teaching for PD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.773</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B30. Attending workshops for PD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.706</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8. Grammar-translation is useful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.829</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B9. Language learning influence on teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.626</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B10. Comfortable with GT method</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.773</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B26. Speaking ability influences teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.803</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B27. Language proficiency influences teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.806</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19. Taught by grammar-translation method</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B20. Taught by communicative language teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B21. Taught by GT and CLT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eigenvalues</td>
<td>5.082</td>
<td>2.530</td>
<td>2.273</td>
<td>2.106</td>
<td>1.680</td>
<td>1.537</td>
<td>1.375</td>
<td>1.344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of the total variance accounted for</td>
<td>16.940</td>
<td>8.432</td>
<td>7.578</td>
<td>7.022</td>
<td>5.602</td>
<td>5.122</td>
<td>4.582</td>
<td>4.482</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2 Descriptive Statistics at the Factor Scale Level

5.2.1 The external factors

As shown in Table 3, the means of these five factor scales ranged from 6.86 to 14.96 and the standard deviations from 1.51 to 2.69. The internal consistency for each scale was as follows: Factor 1, *teachers’ evaluation*, Factor 2, *teaching conditions*, and Factor 4, *textbooks* had a moderate level of internal consistency, with reliability coefficients, Cronbach’s alpha equalling 0.68, 0.63, and 0.68 respectively. Factor 3, *testing*, and Factor 5, *resource support*, had a relatively low level of internal consistency, with reliability coefficients being 0.57 and 0.52 respectively.

Under the presumptions of orthogonal rotation, the five factors in the external construct are assumed to be statistically independent. However, despite the presumptions, one zero-order correlation turned out to be significant. *Teachers’ evaluation* was positively correlated with *textbooks* with a correlation coefficient equalling .400 ($p < .05$, 2-tailed) while the rest of the factors were not highly correlated with each other.

Table 3. Scale Means, Standard Deviations, Internal Consistency, and Zero-order Correlations for the External Factors (N = 248)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>No. of Items</th>
<th>Scale Mean</th>
<th>Scale SD</th>
<th>Internal Consistency</th>
<th>Zero-order Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.96</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>1.62*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.77</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.162*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.52</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.120 .170*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.400* .150* .078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.86</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>-.070 .097 .106 -.048</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* F1 = teachers’ evaluation, F2 = teaching conditions, F3 = testing, F4 = textbooks, and F5 = resource support.

* $p < .05$.

5.2.2 The internal factors

As shown in Table 4, the means of these eight factor scales were from 8.62 to 24.43 and the standard deviation from 1.29 to 4.01. The internal consistency for each scale was as follows: Factor 1, *teaching experience*, Factor 2, *knowledge and understanding of the syllabus*, Factor 3, *professional development needs*, Factor 4, *communicative language teaching*, and Factor 7, *English proficiency* had a high level of internal consistency, with reliability coefficients, Cronbach’s alpha equalling 0.825, 0.736, 0.700, 0.749,
and 0.754 respectively. Factor 5, *professional development activities*, and Factor 6, *grammar-translation method*, had a moderate level of internal consistency, with reliability coefficients equalling 0.681 and 0.677 respectively. Factor 8, *language learning background*, had a relatively low level of internal consistency, with reliability coefficients being 0.498.

These eight factors were, however, not highly correlated. The highest correlations were as follows. *Teaching experience* was positively linked to *knowledge and understanding of the syllabus* ($r = .345, p < .05, 2$-tailed). *Professional development needs* was positively correlated with *communicative language teaching*, ($r = .283, p < .05, 2$-tailed); *communicative language teaching* was positively correlated with *teachers’ English proficiency* ($r = .276, p < .05, 2$-tailed). The zero-order correlation results confirmed the assumption that the eight scales of the internal factors were not highly correlated with each other. Correlation results from both external and internal factors were expected to be low, as Tabachnick and Fidell (2001) claim that if correlations between independent variables are greater than 0.70, it is likely to cause a high degree of multicolinearity, thus problematic in multiple regression analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors No. of Variables</th>
<th>Scale Mean Scale SD Internal Consistency</th>
<th>Zero-order Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1 3</td>
<td>12.59 1.95</td>
<td>.825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2 7</td>
<td>24.43 4.01</td>
<td>.736 .345*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3 5</td>
<td>20.95 2.81</td>
<td>.700 .235* .228*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4 3</td>
<td>11.61 2.18</td>
<td>.749 .240* .174* .283*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F5 3</td>
<td>9.65 2.87</td>
<td>.681 -.004 .084 .254* .221*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F6 3</td>
<td>10.21 2.29</td>
<td>.677 .083 .091 .195* -.077 .077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F7 2</td>
<td>8.62 1.29</td>
<td>.754 .201* .158* .223* .276* .042 .073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F8 3</td>
<td>9.14 2.20</td>
<td>.498 .086 .135* .070 .131* .148* -.096 -.005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* F1 = teaching experience, F2 = knowledge and understanding of the syllabus, F3 = professional development needs, F4 = communicative language teaching, F5 = professional development activities, F6 = grammar-translation method, F7 = English proficiency, and F8 = language learning background.

* p < .05.

### 5.3 Regression Analyses

Regression analysis was first performed between teachers’ classroom curriculum implementation scores as the dependent variable and the five external factors as the independent variables to examine which factors had more effect on teachers’ fidelity to curriculum implementation. The results indicated that only one of the five independent variables, *resource support* (see Table 5) in the external factors, was the significant predictor ($\beta = .186, p = .003$) which contributed to teachers’ curriculum implementation.
activities in the classroom. In addition, resource support positively predicted teachers’ curriculum implementation. However, the $R^2$ value was very low, only .072, which means that resource support explained 7.2% of the total variance in teachers’ curriculum implementation ($F = 3.783, p < .05$). In other words, 92.8% of the variance in curriculum implementation was left unaccounted for. This result did not reveal a strong relationship and, therefore, did not predict much in terms of teachers’ curriculum implementation.

Table 5. Regression Analysis for the External Factors Predicting Curriculum Implementation (N = 248)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1a (teachers’ evaluation)</td>
<td>-.221</td>
<td>-.125</td>
<td>-1.835</td>
<td>.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2a (teaching conditions)</td>
<td>-.253</td>
<td>-.095</td>
<td>-1.489</td>
<td>.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3a (testing)</td>
<td>-.271</td>
<td>-.086</td>
<td>-1.362</td>
<td>.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4a (textbooks)</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F5a (resource support)</td>
<td>.487</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>2.966*</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * $p < .05$.

Regression analysis was then performed, using teachers’ classroom curriculum implementation scores as the dependent variable and the eight internal factors as the independent variables. The results indicated that five of the eight independent variables in the internal factors (see Table 6) contributed to the significant prediction of teachers’ curriculum implementation activities in the classroom. Communicative language teaching ($β = .223, p = .001$), grammar-translation method ($β = -.179, p = .004$), teaching experience ($β = .186, p = .005$), English proficiency ($β = -.163, p = .011$), and professional development needs ($β = -.154, p = .022$) were the most significant predictors. As well, 15.7% of the total variance in teachers’ classroom curriculum implementation ($F = 5.566, p < .05$) was accounted for by these five predictors. Among them, communicative language teaching and teaching experience positively predicted teachers’ curriculum implementation. Grammar-translation method, English proficiency, and professional development needs negatively predicted teachers’ curriculum implementation. This result indicates that the internal factors have more predictive power than the external factors. Among the internal factors, teaching methods contribute more than teachers’ teaching experience, their English proficiency, and their professional development needs.
Table 6. Regression Analysis for the Internal Factors Predicting Curriculum Implementation (N = 248)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1b (teaching experience)</td>
<td>.451</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>2.817*</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2b (knowledge/understanding of syllabus)</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.716</td>
<td>.475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3b (professional development needs)</td>
<td>-.260</td>
<td>-.154</td>
<td>-2.311*</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4b (communicative language teaching)</td>
<td>.486</td>
<td>.223</td>
<td>3.351*</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F5b (professional development activities)</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>1.372</td>
<td>.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F6b (grammar-translation method)</td>
<td>-.369</td>
<td>-.179</td>
<td>-2.888*</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F7b (English proficiency)</td>
<td>-.600</td>
<td>-.163</td>
<td>-2.576*</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F8b (language learning background)</td>
<td>-.037</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>-.279</td>
<td>.780</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *p* < .05.

6. Discussion

6.1 The External Factors

Through a questionnaire survey conducted with a group of 248 Chinese tertiary EFL teachers from six universities in China as subjects, this study found that resource support of the external factors positively predicted teachers’ curriculum implementation activities in the classroom, albeit not to a high degree, explaining only 7.2% of the total variance in teachers’ curriculum implementation. This does tend to indicate, however, that the more resources teachers have, then the more faithfully/willingly teachers will commit to the implementation. Such a result corroborates the studies conducted in other EFL countries (Gahin & Myhill, 2001; Karavas-Doukas, 1995; O’Sullivan, 2002), which found that material, finance, and human resource support was indispensable in obtaining successful implementation of curriculum innovations. Li (1998) particularly mentioned that a lack of human resource support had undermined South Korean teachers’ efforts toward conducting communicative language teaching (CLT) activities, primarily because these teachers had failed to receive expert advice on how to apply CLT in classrooms.

In the Chinese context, for many years, human resource support for teachers tended to be the most seriously deficient of the various resources. Wang (1999) disappointingly found out that “there are simply not many teacher training programs available [particularly] to those who teach non-English majors because such teaching has long been considered secondary in importance [when compared with English-major teaching]” (p. 49). Large class sizes, limited authentic materials, and ill-equipped classrooms were

The Linguistics Journal – Special Edition

Page 151
symptomatic of the inadequacy of resource support in college English teaching and learning in China (Wang, 2001; Wang & Han, 2002). In the current study, 89% of the teachers who responded to the questionnaire claimed that the size of their classes directly influenced their teaching. Moreover, in the six participating universities, support mechanisms that related to the implementation of the college English curriculum tended to be seriously lacking. For example, only 38% of the teachers who responded to the questionnaire said that they were given mentors from their department to support their teaching. While 61% of the teachers admitted that they had observed their colleagues’ teaching, less than half of the teachers (i.e., 48%) stated that they had attended workshops for teacher professional development purposes. In sum, the majority of Chinese EFL teachers we surveyed perceived resource support as the key factor affecting their implementation of the college English curriculum.

6.2 The Internal Factors
Among the internal factors, teaching methods, teaching experience, language proficiency, and professional development needs were significant with regard to teachers’ curriculum implementation.

6.2.1 Teaching methods
This study showed that communicative language teaching (CLT) and grammar-translation method (GTM) were the most significant predictors of these teachers’ curriculum implementation activities in the classroom. Seventy-seven percent of the teachers who responded to the questionnaire indicated that CLT was useful in helping their students communicate in English, while 50% of the teachers indicated the importance of GTM. Likewise, 68% of the teachers expressed comfort with the CLT method, compared with only 27% of the teachers who felt comfortable with GTM. Interestingly, 59% of the teachers confessed that they actually used the CLT method in their classroom teaching. These results seem to suggest that these teachers preferred CLT to GTM. Further classroom observations conducted in the two classes confirmed what Gatbonton and Gu (1994), Karavas-Doukas (1996), and Li (1998) found in their studies: that teachers in EFL contexts such as China, Greece, and South Korea followed an eclectic approach, using both traditional (local) and communicative (foreign) approaches in classrooms.

Multiple regression analysis indicated that CLT had positive effects while GTM had negative effects on teachers’ curriculum implementation activities in classrooms. This suggests that the more the teachers used CLT, the more faithful they would be in implementing the curriculum; the more they used GTM, the less faithful they would be. Such results in fact turned out to be in accord with the underlying
rationale pertaining to the College English Teaching Syllabus (College English Syllabus Revision Team, 1999), which emphasizes communicative language teaching. As has been seen, over half of the teachers in the survey reported actually having employed CLT, conducting communicative activities such as role-playing, group or pair work in their instruction. However, those who failed to do so but adopted grammar-translation method in teaching practices tended to show less fidelity to implementation.

Very few empirical studies have directly corroborated the findings of this study; i.e., that CLT and GTM were significant factors in predicting teachers’ implementation endeavours. Yet, the findings of the current study, to a large extent, did resonate strongly with what had been previously discussed in the literature regarding the debate on communicative language teaching approach and grammar teaching in both ESL and EFL contexts. Larsen-Freeman (1986), Richards and Rodgers (1986), and Savignon (1990) all maintain that communicative language teaching is characterized by focusing on communicative functions, a learner-centered approach, and use of authentic materials, and that CLT is of paramount significance in developing students’ proficiency in communication. However, despite the wide adoption of CLT in ESL settings, researchers found through their empirical studies that the application of CLT in EFL contexts proved to be extremely problematic. For example, EFL teachers at primary, secondary, and tertiary levels resisted CLT in their classroom teaching in the EFL contexts of Greece (Karavas-Doukas, 1995), Japan (Gorsuch, 2000), Egypt (Gahin & Myhill, 2001), South Korea (Li, 1998), and Namibia (O’Sullivan, 2002). Teachers either rejected CLT completely, or paid lip service while deviating considerably from the principles of the communicative approach in their classroom practices. Particularly in the EFL context of China where the educational system is still examination-oriented, the phenomenon of “deaf and dumb English” is still rampant (Ng & Tang, 1997; Wang, 2001), and the focus on transmission learning is ingrained (Watkins & Biggs, 1999), researchers recommended that a better model would be the integration of traditional grammar instruction with communicative approaches (Rao, 1996; Wang, 2001). The recommended integration included various forms, such as using tasks for grammar practices (Ellis, 1995) and explicit and implicit focus on form (Fotos, 1998). Such a combination was believed to be more appropriate in EFL countries and would eventually promote the development of students’ communicative ability. Such a combination was further supported by the study finding.
6.2.2 Teaching experience and language proficiency

The multiple regression results also revealed that teaching experience had a positive effect toward teachers’ implementation of the curriculum. In other words, the longer teachers have been teaching the college English course, the more likely they would be to implement the curriculum. Such a finding seems to corroborate Richards and Farrell (2005) who found that experienced teachers were more capable and willing to carry out the curriculum than novice teachers.

What is also apparently unique in this study is the observed negative effect of English proficiency in predicting teachers’ implementation based on the regression analysis result. This finding suggests that the higher language proficiency that teachers have, the less likely they are to implement the curriculum. In China, teachers with higher language proficiency tended to be those younger or less experienced teachers, as this group started to learn English at a younger age, whereas the older or more experienced teachers learned English later in their lives (Wang & Han, 2002). According to the Ministry of Education officials (Zhang, 2003), the majority of young and novice teachers, just graduated from university and equipped with better English proficiency and a higher education level, do not tend to faithfully implement the curriculum proposed by the policymakers. This is believed to be because they were not familiar with the college English curriculum and lacked pedagogical training in teaching. The lack of pedagogical training of teachers in Chinese English teacher education is one of the biggest obstacles to curriculum implementation (Cheng, Ren, & Wang, 2003; Wu, 2001) and an area that begs further research.

6.2.3 Professional development needs

A clear majority of the teachers in this study (86%) expressed their desire to improve their language teaching through professional development: about 80% of the teachers wanted to work on a graduate degree, approximately 90% wanted to learn communicative language teaching, and 91% wanted to learn computer-assisted teaching. However, teachers’ responses seemed contradictory, in that only 62% of the teachers stated that they believed that in-service teacher training actually improved their classroom teaching. On the one hand, they expressed enthusiasm in participating in teacher development programs, but on the other hand expressed doubts about the usefulness of such programs. More surprisingly, the multiple regression results revealed that professional development needs predicted teachers’ curriculum implementation activities in the classroom negatively. Such results, however, corroborate the literature reviewed: some teacher training has had a positive effect (Fullan & Pomfret, 1977; Gahin & Myhill,
2001) and other teacher training has had a negative effect (He, 1996; Peacock, 2001). In other words, the more training these teachers had received, the less likely they would be to have implemented the intended curriculum as postulated by the college English teaching syllabus.

The above results are very likely due to the nature of the professional development programs in the tertiary context of China. For example, in China, professional development programs are widely believed to be the same as teacher education programs, whereas in reality the former focus on gaining knowledge and pedagogy, and the latter focus on teachers obtaining a graduate degree (Han, 2003). Since academic promotion and evaluation is more closely associated with degree programs (i.e., Master’s or Ph.D. degrees) than it is with the professional development programs focusing on teaching and learning, there is little incentive for teachers to attend these professional development workshops or seminars that do not count much toward promotion, thus devaluing the importance of the pedagogy essential for most EFL teachers. Therefore, it may be assumed that many teachers may not have believed that graduate degree programs were useful in helping facilitate their classroom activities, although they indicated that they were interested in attending them.

7. Limitations and Directions for Future Research

This study is one of the first large data-set research studies conducted within the Chinese EFL context. There are certain limitations in the study. Although the questionnaire employed to elicit information about factors affecting teachers’ curriculum implementation was designed based on information gleaned from the existing literature and the feedback of EFL teachers obtained through the focus group discussions, multiple regression analyses revealed that the significant effect of the contributing factors was weak, with only 7% of one external factor and 15% of the four internal factors accounting for the total observed variance in the implementation of the curriculum. These factors, although significant predictors, explain only a small proportion of teachers’ implementation activities. This suggests that other factors may not have been taken into account when the questionnaire was designed. Therefore, future research of this nature should be expanded to include a wider range of variables in the questionnaire. Specifically, questionnaire items with wider parameters are needed for the external and internal constructs to uncover the complexity and full scope of factors potentially influencing teachers. These dimensions may include teachers’ philosophies of teaching, the influence of colleagues, economic factors such as income, teachers’ social status, and teachers’ personal concerns and worries, all of which may exert a certain impact on teachers’ implementation. These factors may not be easily perceived
individually, and may be embedded in the wider range of factors affecting teachers’ implementation efforts.

Moreover, this study focused on one city as the research site, with the participants therefore being more homogeneous than heterogeneous, and this may constrain generalizations of the results with regard to other contexts. After all, China is a large country with over 1,800 universities located in a variety of physical, cultural, and social environments. Regional differences in terms of student population, teaching capacity, and resource support will introduce different contributing factors which in turn affect teachers’ curriculum implementation in those settings. Therefore, future research is needed through larger-scale surveys which would have an increased sample size, either including more than one city and more universities or using random sampling procedures.

8. Implications and Conclusions
The findings in this study did not fully support the reviewed literature, wherein external factors (e.g., testing) and internal factors (e.g., teachers’ beliefs, attitudes, knowledge, and understanding, as well as teachers’ involvement and participation in the innovation) are considered to be important factors affecting implementation. Although we constructed our survey instrument with the above sets of factors in mind, neither of these factor sets appeared to contribute significantly toward the prediction of teachers’ curriculum implementation within the Chinese EFL context. Instead, in this study, the factors of resource support, teaching methods, teaching experience, language proficiency, and professional development needs were found to be more significant. This finding may illustrate unique characteristics of teachers working within the Chinese EFL context under our study.

This research studied teachers in the context of primary implementers, as they are the most important players in curriculum implementation, and as they determine whether or not curriculum innovation is executed in the classroom as was intended by policymakers (Carless, 1999; Clandinin & Connelly, 1992). From this investigation of how college English curriculum is implemented in the tertiary context of China as seen through the lenses of teachers, this study provides empirical and methodological lessons to be learned for any future research conducted within the field of language curriculum implementation in other ESL and EFL contexts. The findings of this study have implications for both large-scale curriculum implementation as well as for small-class implementation (e.g., even in small private language schools), and should therefore be of interest in a wide range of contexts. As language curricula share commonalities in practice, these research findings have added to our pool of knowledge regarding
the potential factors affecting teachers’ curriculum implementation and of the complex reality of classroom teaching.

Notes

1. In order to investigate the complicated issue of the implementation of the English as a foreign language curriculum, we explored the issue from the perspectives of three groups of stakeholders. Interviews with national policymakers from syllabus, textbook, and testing teams were conducted to examine the intended curriculum, while interviews with the heads of the college English department were conducted to look at the administrators’ perceptions, and questionnaire surveys were administered to EFL teachers to scrutinize teachers’ perceptions, which was reported in this paper. Other data collection methods such as teacher interviews and classroom observations were also employed with two teachers to see how they interpreted the national and institutional policies and how they implemented those policies in their classrooms. All the data collected from these sources were triangulated and analyzed to gain a more complete picture of the issues, and findings were reported in different scholarly papers. The current study only focused on the questionnaire survey results.

2. We recognize the heterogeneous situation of the College English teaching and learning across the vast geographical regions of China. The context information we provided in this section is related to the context under this study.

3. The focus group discussion with six Chinese EFL teachers was conducted on January 16, 2004 (see Wang, 2006).

4. A series of seminars were conducted by the first author on “How to conduct research on English as a second/foreign language” and “What English are we teaching?: From curriculum development to classroom teaching” from May-August 2004.

5. By teachers’ evaluation, we refer to the evaluations conducted to judge teachers’ performance from students, colleagues, directors, and deans in the college English department.

6. Due to the space limitation, the results of classroom observations cannot be reported here. For details of these observations, refer to Wang (2006).
Appendix: Questionnaire Survey for the Main Study

Chinese EFL Teachers’ Perceptions

of the College English Curriculum and its Implementation

Instruction:

This questionnaire survey is designed for Chinese EFL teachers who teach in a university. The purpose aims to explore your perceptions of the official 1999 College English Syllabus (大学英语教学大纲) and its implementation (实施) in your classroom.

There are four sections in this survey, section A to section D. They ask about external and internal factors on your curriculum implementation (课程实施), ask about your curriculum implementation activities in the classroom, and ask information about you.

For each statement, please circle only one number (5, 4, 3, 2, or 1) that best represents your thinking at this time in relation to College English Curriculum. For example, if you circle a 5, it means that you strongly agree with the statement. If you circle a 1, it means that you strongly disagree with the statement. It will take you 25-30 minutes to complete the questionnaire. There is no correct or best response to the statements. Please answer them based on your thinking at this time, not on what you think the researcher might expect.

Please indicate the degree to which you agree with each of the statements in the following sections by circling the following response scale:

5 = Strongly Agree (SA)
4 = Agree (A)
3 = Neutral (N) (Neither agree nor disagree)
2 = Disagree (D)
1 = Strongly Disagree (SD)
### Section A

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1. The College English Test influences my teaching.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2. The College English Test influences my students’ learning.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3. My students do simulated tests (模拟题) before the College English Test to prepare for it.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4. My students’ College English Test scores influence my teaching performance evaluation by my department.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5. My students evaluate me anonymously (匿名地).</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6. My colleagues (同事) in the department evaluate me.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7. The teaching and research committee in my department evaluates me.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A8. The textbooks that I am told to use by my department head influence what I teach.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9. The textbooks that I am told to use by my department head influence how I teach.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10. I have access to English teaching resources.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A11. I have audio-visual resources to use in my language classes.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A12. My students’ English abilities influence my teaching.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A13. The size of my classes influences my teaching.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A14. My workload (工作量) influences my teaching.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section B

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1. The College English Syllabus is based on functional-notional (功能/意念) concept.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2. The College English Syllabus aims to develop in students a high level of competence in reading and an intermediate competence in listening, speaking, writing, and translating.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3. The College English Syllabus aims to develop students to communicate in English.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4. I feel that the College English Syllabus is a clearly written document.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5. I feel that the College English Syllabus is practical.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6. I understand what I am expected to teach under the guidance of the College English Syllabus.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7. I understand how I am expected to teach under the guidance of the College English Syllabus.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8. Grammar-translation method (语法翻译法) is useful as it helps</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B9. The way I learned English as a student influences the way I teach English.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B10. I feel comfortable with the grammar-translation method.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B11. In-service teacher training (在职培训) improves my classroom teaching.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B12. I would like to improve my language teaching through professional development (职业发展).</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B13. I would like to improve my language teaching through working on a graduate degree.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B14. I would like to learn more about communicative language teaching.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B15. I would like to learn more about computer-assisted teaching.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B16. Communicative language teaching method (交际法) is useful as it helps my students to communicate in English.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B17. I feel comfortable with communicative language teaching method.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B18. I use communicative language teaching method in my classroom teaching.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19. I was taught by the grammar-translation method.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B20. I was taught by the communicative language teaching method.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B21. I was taught by a combination of grammar-translation method and communicative language teaching method.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B22. My teaching experience helps me in my teaching.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B23. My teaching improves as I gain more experience from my classroom instruction.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B24. My teaching changes as I gain more experience from my classroom instruction.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B25. Functional/notional syllabus to me means teaching English with a focus on improving students’ communicative ability.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B26. My level of English-speaking ability influences my teaching.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B27. My overall language proficiency influences my teaching.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B28. I am provided with a mentor (指导老师) from my department to help my teaching.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B29. I observe my colleagues’ classroom teaching for my professional development.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B30. I attend workshops (培训班) for my professional development.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section C</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1. I spend four hours each week teaching Reading Course including Intensive and Extensive for each class within six teaching hours.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2. The limited teaching hours make it difficult for me to ask my students to practice their spoken English in the classroom.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3. My students have opportunity to improve their subject-based English (专业英语) after passing CET-4/6.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4. My workload and class size make it difficult for me to mark my students’ journal writings in English on a weekly basis.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5. My role as an English teacher in the language classroom is to transmit knowledge to my students through explaining texts and giving examples.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6. I find it hard to develop my students’ listening and speaking abilities to the extent that they can communicate with native speakers.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7. Group work or pair work activities in the classroom have little or no use because it is very hard for me to monitor my students’ performance and prevent them from using Chinese.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C8. It is difficult for my students to learn subject-based English because of inadequate resources such as unavailable teachers and textbooks.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C9. The limited teaching hours make it hard for me to get my students involved in group work or pair work activities in the classroom.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C10. I ask my students to do translation exercises from English to Chinese or from Chinese to English.</td>
<td>always</td>
<td>often</td>
<td>sometimes</td>
<td>seldom</td>
<td>never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C11. I ask my students to do reading practice to improve their reading speed and accuracy in comprehension.</td>
<td>always</td>
<td>often</td>
<td>sometimes</td>
<td>seldom</td>
<td>never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C12. I encourage my students to be responsible and self-disciplined (自律), which allow them to develop their full potential in their language learning.</td>
<td>always</td>
<td>often</td>
<td>sometimes</td>
<td>seldom</td>
<td>never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C13. I conduct my classroom teaching in English instead of in Chinese.</td>
<td>always</td>
<td>often</td>
<td>sometimes</td>
<td>seldom</td>
<td>never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C14. I organize listening and speaking activities in my classroom teaching.</td>
<td>always</td>
<td>often</td>
<td>sometimes</td>
<td>seldom</td>
<td>never</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section D (Please put a tick [✓] to your answer to D1 and D3 and write your answer to D2, D4, D5, and D6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1. Your gender:</td>
<td>[ ] Female [ ] Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2. What is your age by June 30, 2004?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3. What is your highest educational qualification (最高学历)?</td>
<td>[ ] B.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ] Advanced /Assistant Teacher Training Certificate (高级教师/助教进修班)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ] M.A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ] M.Ed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ] Ph.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4. How many years have you been teaching English?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5. How many class hours per week are you required to teach English in your university?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6. How many students on average are there in your class?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

End of the questionnaire.
Thank you very much for your help.
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