Teaching about Language to Diverse Populations

Abstract

In this paper, we describe a program that we developed at The Ohio State University’s Department of Linguistics that is geared towards foreign language learners. The goal is to teach students about language, rather than about linguistics. The program has been implemented as a freshman university course (Basics of Language for Language Learners), a summer institute for high school students interested in language (Summer Linguistics Institute for Youth Scholars), and an institute for high school teachers of foreign languages (Linguistics Institute for Language Teachers). The fundamental philosophy of the program is that we focus on describing how language works, not on linguistic theory, even though our theoretical perspectives guide the materials we use, how we talk about them, and what we think students should know. In this article, we outline the reasons for developing the program, its general content, details about the course and institutes, as well as some of the challenges associated with offering them.

1. History

In 2002, the Department of Linguistics at The Ohio State University (OSU) was facing a challenge shared by many departments in the humanities: undergraduate enrollments were low, research funding was scarce, and the university was moving to a ‘responsibility-based’ budgeting system. There was a serious danger that if we did not do something, our department could be in danger of losing funding, most likely in the form
of reduced graduate support. Without graduate support, most of which goes to teaching assistantships, it would be more difficult to attract the best graduate students, which would have had negative consequences for the graduate program.

Our first step was to invite Prof. Gregory Ward of Northwestern University to advise us on his experience with addressing these issues. Ward pointed out the following hard truths: (i) departmental budgets are roughly correlated (and in some universities, highly correlated) with departmental ‘productivity’; (ii) departmental ‘productivity’ is measured in basically 2 ways: (1) research income, and (2) enrollment; (iii) departments that do well in both 1 and 2, such as Psychology, are likely to enjoy strong budgetary support; departments that do well in 1, such as Physics, or 2, such as English, are almost as likely to enjoy strong budgetary support. (It probably doesn't hurt that these departments are typically part of the ‘academic core’ of a research university.) However, departments that do not generate significant research income, and maintain historically low enrollments, are likely to face ongoing budgetary challenges. Most linguistics departments fall into this last category.

We clearly had to find ways to boost our undergraduate enrollments. One of the strategies that we settled on was to increase the links of our undergraduate offerings in linguistics to the university’s general education curriculum. Doing this would not only add to the overall enrollment numbers, it would interest more students in linguistics, potentially direct more students to our higher level courses, and perhaps even contribute to growing the major.
The department already offered an Introduction to Linguistics (Ling 201), which in the past had been extremely successful, drawing as many as 2000 students per year. This course was built around the highly regarded *Language Files* (Bergmann et al. 2007), which had begun as a collection of notes in the 1970s, and evolved into a comprehensive introductory textbook.

The enrollments in Ling 201 had declined precipitously in the 1990s, due to a change in the university’s definition of ‘breadth’ in general education. In earlier years, students were required to take a certain number of courses at the 200 level. The revision of the general education curriculum replaced this requirement with a set of options defined in terms of content. While Ling 201 satisfied one of these options, there were many that it did not satisfy, and the competition with other courses for students was fierce.

We concluded that it was not going to be possible to reposition Ling 201 so that it could draw a larger enrollment in terms of the breadth requirements for general education. At the same time, we recognized that the subject matter of introductory linguistics is somewhat technical and problem-oriented. Students have to master such things as distinctive features, phrase structure trees, and articulatory phonetics. They have to solve syntax, morphology, and phonology problems that are essentially watered down versions of what linguists do professionally. While many people are intrigued by the mysteries of linguistic structure and want to understand better how language works (and of course, we count ourselves in this group), there are vastly more who are not interested in the
mysteries of linguistic structure, have no interest in understanding how linguists think about linguistic structure, and do not want to burden themselves with mastering technical tools that are specific to this structure.

However, we know from personal experience that everyone, or almost everyone, is interested in language. This is true particularly in the university. Students have to deal with language all of the time because they have to write papers and exams. They are encountering people from different parts of the country and from around the world who speak English differently, and many who speak different languages. And, crucially, most students have to satisfy a foreign language requirement. So they are constantly confronted with the problem of understanding how language works, at least to some extent, whether they are conscious of this or not.

The population of foreign language learners constitutes almost 100% of OSU’s undergraduate population. With the foregoing in mind, we decided to create a new course that would appeal to and draw from this population. The course would be offered at the very lowest level, and would satisfy as many breadth requirements as possible. It would be taught in large lectures. And it would focus on understanding how language works from the point of view of someone trying to learn a language, not someone who was trying to construct a linguistic description of the language. The course would focus on the ‘basics of language for language learners’.
There have been four outcomes of the process described here. The first is the creation of the course Ling 170, Basics of Language for Language Learners. The second is a textbook with the same title (Culicover and Hume 2010), which we wrote for the course. Having created the course and written the book, we realized that we had the essential structure and materials for bringing an understanding of how language works to populations outside of the university. This led to the third outcome, the Summer Linguistic Institute for Youth Scholars (SLIYS), directed towards high school students, and the fourth, the Linguistic Institute for Language Teachers (LILT), directed towards high school language teachers. All of these programs share essentially the same content, which we summarize in the next section. Following that discussion, we provide a brief overview of each of the programs.

2. General content

The fundamental philosophy of our general program is to focus on describing how language works, not on linguistic theory. Our theoretical perspectives guide the materials we use, how we talk about them, and what we think students should know. However, since we think that an understanding of linguistic theory is not crucial for understanding of the basic workings of language, we avoid theoretical issues as much as possible.

The program presents the challenge of understanding how language works from the perspective of the language learner. The material begins with an introduction to language learning and then is divided into three modules: sounding like a native speaker, thinking like a native speaker, and acting like a native speaker. Since we use the same
organization for the text, for the course, for the summer program, and for the teacher institute, we summarize the topics covered in *Basics of Language for Language Learners* (Culicover and Hume 2010) as common background for the discussion to follow.

2.1 Introduction to language learning

We have found that it is particularly useful for second language learners and foreign language teachers to have some insight into how language learning works. Building on this insight, they are able to understand both the similarities and differences between the way that a child acquires language and the way that an adult does. Consequently, the first part of *Basics of Language for Language Learners* summarizes the main characteristics of first language acquisition and relates these to the benefits and challenges of second language learning. While children make mistakes, they are presented with an overwhelming amount of redundant information about how the language is supposed to be used, and they therefore have a very good basis for correcting their mistakes. In contrast, the second language learner has very limited input. The first language learner has a very strong motivation to learn the language, which may be biological in part and social in part. While the first language learner approaches any language from the same perspective, the second language learner inevitably has strong perceptual and other biases that enter into the learning task. The second language learner also has advantages such as being able to consciously structure the learning environment, talk about learning challenges, and identify ways to solve them.
The introductory material also focuses on what it means to learn another language from the perspective of mastering a complex skill; we refer to this as *braintraining*. We demonstrate that language learning is like learning to juggle or play a musical instrument. All involve the active, ongoing, coordinated involvement of the mind, and require control of movement, coordination, sequencing, precision, and the rapidity that comes with automatic action. We point to the neurological benefits of practicing, whether it is repetition of the fundamentals of playing soccer, or those of speaking or listening to a new language. With this as a basis, we turn to the basics of language.

### 2.2 Sounding like a native speaker

Module 1 is concerned with the sounds of language. The emphasis is on speech production and how learners can take advantage of what they already know to speak another language. There is no discussion of distinctive features or phonological rules; rather, the focus is on controlling the articulatory apparatus in order to achieve certain phonetic goals. The main vehicle for motivating this focus is the ‘foreign accent’, since this allows students to get in touch with their intuitions that speakers of other languages who are speaking English sound different from native English speakers. By investigating the impact that speakers’ native language phonology has on their production and perception of other languages, students are better able to understand how they can sound (and hear) more like a native speaker of another language.

We begin with the observation that languages can have different sound inventories. Foreign accents arise when speakers modify their speech in such a way as to make an
unfamiliar sound or sequence more consistent with those in their native language. Students become aware of different strategies that people use to deal with unfamiliar elements, all described in non-technical language, e.g., inserting a sound, omitting a sound, modifying a sound, etc. For example, we use the observation that in Greek-accented English a speaker may pronounce 'seat' and 'sheet' as [sit] to illustrate the use of the more familiar [s] in both cases because Greek lacks [ʃ]. This is followed by a discussion of how to produce consonants and vowels, and how to create new sounds based on the articulations that students are already familiar with from English. For example, the front, rounded vowel of French and many other languages can be made by pronouncing the English sound [i] with lips protruded. Exercises help students enhance their understanding of the correspondences between articulations and sounds. Next, we focus on ‘putting sounds together’, that is, phonotactics. Students become familiar with phonotactic regularities in English and how these differ from those in other languages.

With the foregoing as background, we then turn to common pronunciation errors that speakers of English tend to make when speaking another language. These errors involve, among others, aspirating voiceless consonants, pronouncing dental consonants as alveolars, reducing vowels, flapping /t/ and /d/, and diphthongizing vowels. Just as we used accents of non-native English speakers to provide insight into the speaker's native sound system, we use English pronunciation of words in other languages as a window into the English sound system, e.g., an English-accented pronunciation of Greek [poðilato] 'bicycle' as [pəðilətə] is used to illustrate vowel reduction, flapping, and diphthongization, none of which occur in Greek.
2.3 Thinking like a native speaker

Module 2 is concerned with the structure of sentences and in particular, how this structure is used to convey meaning. We emphasize a cross-linguistic perspective, by comparing how different languages do the same work using different grammatical devices. We do not introduce phrase structure rules, phrase markers, transformations, constraints, and other formal devices from syntactic theory. Rather, we rely on students' intuitions about phrases and word order to highlight some basic comparisons. This is rather straightforward, since all students have some exposure to a language other than English that does at least some things differently. For example, in our discussion of adjectival modification, we begin with the English form (*the happy dog*) and then show how the same function is carried out in various ways in different languages, such as French (*un chien enorme*, literally: a dog huge), Swedish (*den hungriga mus-en*, literally: the hungry mouse-the), and Bulgarian (*zeleni-te lista*, literally: green-the leaves).

We extend the concept of the ‘foreign accent’ to syntactic form, showing what happens when the syntactic structures of one language are applied (incorrectly) to another language. An example is the sentence *You speak very well German*, which illustrates the application of typical German constituent order to English. The discussion of such cases helps us bring out students’ intuitions about what the rules of English are, and illustrates the fact that the rules of other languages are different. We also highlight the distinction between syntactic form (e.g., declarative, imperative, interrogative) and communicative function (e.g., statement, request, question) and other aspects of interpretation. Sentences
have form, they have literal content, they have communicative function, and by virtue of our knowledge of pragmatics, they have force. The discussion of syntax introduces the notion of ‘structure’ as the way in which a sentence or a phrase is organized into parts, how the parts are grouped together, and how they are ordered with respect to one another. It also develops the notion of linguistic categories as a useful way of talking about the details of structure.

We next focus on nouns and noun phrases, and how nouns play a role in the structure of sentences. We cover agreement, and the kinds of properties that typically enter into agreement relations, e.g., number and gender. The difference between biological and grammatical gender is highlighted. Swahili noun classes are introduced in order to show that noun classification may be more complex than the familiar two- or three-gender systems that students are most familiar with, and that such classification is in many respects highly arbitrary. Adjectives and relative clauses are also discussed.

This is followed by an examination of verbs and verb phrases. The particular emphasis is on how the meaning of the sentence is centered on the verb and the semantic roles governed by the verb. Along the way, the distinction is drawn between semantic roles like agent, patient, and instrument, on the one hand, and grammatical functions, such as subject and object, on the other. These topics are discussed cross-linguistically, so that students are able to see how languages use the different formal devices to express the same meaning functions. Other topics that are discussed are the active/passive relation, how languages refer to time and aspect, how they mark truth value, the English auxiliary
(which poses particular problems for English-speaking learners of a second language), and the major types of sentences.

2.4 Acting like a native speaker

Module 3 deals with the relationship between language and culture, focusing on how language is used in social interactions. We begin by highlighting the fact that it is not possible to be a competent speaker of another language simply by learning its sounds and grammar. One has to understand the culture, the social meaning conveyed by using a particular form, e.g., *please give me* versus *gimme*, the distinctions between language varieties of the same language, the social implications of being a speaker of a particular variety, attitudes that prevail in a culture regarding language variety and language use, and the role of gesture.

An examination of politeness and swearing across cultures is used to exemplify many of the points introduced in module 3. We focus on strategies used to express politeness in English, and how these differ from those used in other cultures. We conclude with a topic that students tend to have a considerable amount of fun with: how swearing, insults, and taboos are inextricably linked to one’s culture and thus can vary from society to society.

We now turn to an overview of the three programs in which these ideas have been implemented.
3. The programs

3.1. LING 170, Basics of Language for Language Learners

The course is aimed at freshmen with an interest in language learning. The instructional goal, as outlined above, is to provide students with information about language that could help them become better learners of another language. A further goal is to expose students to the study abroad programs and language courses offered at OSU. To this end, every other week or so, a representative from one of the language programs (including American Sign Language) or the study abroad programs typically gives a brief presentation in class about the program. This has turned out to be not only an excellent way for students to learn about programs on campus, but also an effective tool for strengthening relations among the Department of Linguistics and other units at the university.

The means of delivering the course content has been guided by two main considerations: (a) to make the material engaging to first year students, and (b) to enable the course to be taught by different instructors without requiring them to start from scratch in preparing the materials. Taking these objectives into account, a series of PowerPoint presentations has been created. Videos, sound clips, and other resources are embedded to effectively illustrate course topics, e.g., differences among accents, the ways that culture is expressed in language. The course is designed so that it can have a fairly substantial enrollment (approximately 80) but, at the same time, be managed by a single faculty member without the aid of a teaching assistant. Since grading typically consumes the largest portion of an
instructor's time in a freshman course, we made the decision to have all testing done by means of on-line quizzes. While this method of testing no doubt has disadvantages, we have found it beneficial for this course since it not only saves the instructor time, it also means that testing can be done outside of class time (e.g., over the weekend), leaving more in-class time to cover the material. Using the university's course management program, we designed a series of bi-weekly tests that involved multiple-choice and true-false questions that would be graded automatically. In latter versions of the course, some short answer questions were also incorporated that the instructor would grade. Over the years, a database of quiz questions has been developed allowing instructors to select from a range of possible questions. Several features of the quiz management system are used to minimize the risk of cheating, e.g. the order of questions is randomized, students are allowed one attempt at answering each question, and while students can take the test anytime during a 48-hour window, the amount of time they get to complete the test is limited. Student evaluations have indicated that most students like this method of testing primarily because they can complete the quizzes on their own time.

Attracting students was obviously important for the course to be successful. This was achieved in two main ways. First, we positioned the course in such a way that it would fall under several general education content categories, thus making it advantageous for students to take it. These categories included Social Sciences, Diversity Experiences, and International Issues. Second, we advertised the course widely. Prior to the first offering of the course, contact was made with linguists and advisors in language departments, as well as with university undergraduate advisors in order to inform them about the course.
Advisors were provided with information sheets regarding the course and asked to encourage students to enroll in the course. We also opted to advertise the course in university buses, an inexpensive and effective way of getting the word out.

Many of the original goals of offering the course have been met. Class enrollment has grown to over 80 students per offering, giving it the highest enrollment per offering in the department. Student evaluations of the course are consistently positive. As instructors, we find it to be a fun and lively course to teach; part of the reason for this is because we are able to offer a non-technical and practical introduction to language that draws both on our knowledge as linguists, as well as on the challenges and successes that we ourselves have had as language learners.

---

1 Class size for undergraduate courses in our department has traditionally been limited to a maximum of 45 for faculty-taught courses required for the linguistics major, and 25-35 for general education courses, typically taught by graduate students.
3.2. Summer Linguistic Institute for Youth Scholars (SLIYS)

After we had gotten Ling 170 up and running and had written the book for the course, we realized that the materials that we had were appropriate for a much wider audience than just university undergraduates. At the same time, there was a need to find new ways to provide funding for graduate students over the summer since teaching and research assistantships are limited. In addition, greater emphasis was being placed on departments at our university to be involved in outreach to the local community.

These factors led to the creation of the Summer Linguistic Institute for Youth Scholars (SLIYS, pronounced as 'slice'), a weeklong summer program taught by our PhD students. The first SLIYS was offered in 2009 and it has been running every summer since. As with Ling 170, it was decided for a number of reasons that the target group of participants would be high school students interested in language learning. First, the Ling 170 materials had already been developed and could be easily adapted for high school

The two programs that we discuss here in §3.2 and §3.3 focus on connecting linguistics to the community, by presenting the basic concepts of the field to middle- and high-school teachers and students. These programs are thus related both in spirit and content to efforts at a number of other universities, including Walt Wolfram’s extensive curricular work in North Carolina, and Kristin Denham and Anne Lobeck’s in Washington state, and several programs reported on previously in Language and Linguistics Compass (e.g., Stewart and Kuhlemann Cárdenez 2010, Ginsberg, Honda, and O’Neill 2011, and Clark and Trousdale 2012, among others. (Thanks to an anonymous reviewer for bringing these programs to our attention.) We note also the very popular annual Linguistics Olympiad.
students. Second, as with Ling 170, we felt that high school students, especially those interested in learning languages, would benefit from exposure to linguistics. Third, if we were able to get information about the program to high school language teachers, we felt that they were likely to let their students know about it.

The program is modeled after other summer programs in sports and math offered at OSU and runs from 9 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday. The material covered in the program is similar to that in Ling 170 though interspersed with games and other activities that relate to the subject matter, e.g., scavenger hunts, bingo. During the first year, the weeklong program was aimed at commuters; in the second year, participants could commute or stay in dorms; and during the third year, only a resident option was advertised. Allowing for both commuter and resident participants proved to be most successful; both local and non-local students were able to participate and, given that the tuition for commuters was about half that for residents, local students who were unable to afford the higher fee could attend as commuters.

The summer program is organized by a departmental SLIYS committee made up of interested graduate students, a Linguistics Department staff person, and the Department chair. The staff member oversees all aspects of the program and works with graduate students to advertise the program, make meal and housing arrangements for participants, be in touch with parents and participants, etc. The Department chair's main responsibilities are to create a budget model and act as a resource person for the committee. The graduate students are key to the success of the program, not only because
of their involvement in organizing the program, but also because they are the ‘camp instructors’ that the high schoolers hang out with and learn from. In general, two graduate students serve as instructors (based on a group size of 25) and are with the students during the day. A second group of graduate students organizes evening activities for the participants. Other graduate students are responsible for staying overnight in the dorms. Payment for graduate students is determined by how many hours they work during the session(s) and the nature of their responsibilities; instructors receive the largest amount.

Getting the word out about the program has obviously been crucial. Advertising strategies have involved sending letters and flyers to school principals and language teachers, posting ads on Facebook, and advertising in on-line university and language association newsletters. Of these methods, the majority of participants report that they learned about the program through their language teachers; thus, letting teachers know about the program is critical. However, the best advertisement comes from the excitement generated by SLIYS alumni who go on to tell their friends about the program and talk about it on Facebook. (Several have also ended up coming to OSU and majoring in linguistics.) Indeed, student evaluations have been nothing but outstanding, thus providing strong motivation for continuing to offer the program.

There are nonetheless also challenges involved. Perhaps the most difficult is offering the program at a cost that is low enough to be within the reach of as many potential participants as possible, but at the same time high enough to be able to pay graduate students adequately. Each year, high school students contact us who are eager to
participate but unable to pay the full tuition. Our philosophy has been to admit students even if they cannot pay for it; in fact, on the application we instruct students to contact us if their families are not able to afford the tuition. At that point, the staff coordinator generally contacts the parents to get a sense of what, if anything, they can contribute. This results in ‘scholarships’ being offered to some applicants; that is, they pay reduced fees or nothing at all.

3.3. **Linguistic Institute for Language Teachers (LILT)**

Another institute emerged as an outgrowth of SLIYS: the Linguistic Institute for Language Teachers (LILT). While advertising for the first offering of SLIYS, several high school language teachers asked if they could attend the program themselves. Although they were teachers of language, they were not as familiar with the workings of language (as linguists think about the matter) as they wanted to be. The two of us decided to offer a one-week linguistics institute for language teachers that would cover the essential ideas incorporated into Ling 170 and our book, *Basics of Language for Language Learners*. Our hope was that LILT would help language teachers achieve new perspectives, based on their own practice, about teaching language.

The audience for LILT was teachers of foreign languages and of ESL. In many respects, this population is the most rewarding one to teach the program to. They are for the most part very experienced teachers who have a good understanding of the types of challenges that second language learners of ‘their’ languages face in the classroom. They have developed strategies for dealing with problems, but they are always looking for new ways to teach and engage students. However, what they do not have, in general, is an analytical
perspective on the structure of the language that their students speak natively and how it compares to the structure of the language that they are teaching.

Our goals for LILT were not only to present to this audience the materials outlined above, but also to engage them in applying these ideas to their own practice. We did not want to lecture to them, but rather to involve them in a collaborative exploration of the kinds of problems that second language learners face, and the kinds of solutions that teachers, armed with some understanding of the linguistic concepts, might come up with to address these problems.

A typical schedule for the five-day LILT is provided in Figure 1. Notice that substantial time is set aside for the participants (including us two lecturers) to break out into small groups in order to focus on problems in specific languages and possible solutions to these problems.

Our overall evaluation of LILT is that it was very successful. The teachers were extremely engaged with the material and eager to incorporate some of their ideas into their classrooms. Experiencing their enthusiasm also made the program rewarding for us as instructors.
There were nonetheless administrative and financial obstacles we had to deal with. While teachers were keen on participating in the program, it was important for LILT to be affordable and for it to count towards their professional development requirements. Most teachers wanted to receive course credit for completing the institute. During its first offering, we were able to offer the program through our university’s continuing education program. The fees for teachers were relatively low and their principals accepted the credits towards professional development. Unfortunately, continuing education credits are worth about one-third of graduate credits, meaning that the teachers would have to do more professional service hours to make up the difference. Consequently, for practical reasons, participating in the program was not attractive to all teachers. A problem with offering the program for graduate credits, however, is that they are significantly more expensive, so it would cost more for the teachers to enroll in the program. Our solution during the second year was to apply for a grant from the Ohio Humanities Council which enabled us to cover the LILT tuition of 25 teachers. There were more inquiries from teachers interested in the program than there were available funds, suggesting that there is definitely interest in such a program. The program was successfully offered that year for graduate credit through the College of Education at OSU. LILT has not been offered since 2010 primarily because we are now at different institutions.

4. Conclusion

From our involvement in the programs described above, it has become even more evident to us that there is considerable interest on the part of language learners and teachers in learning about language. We are particularly gratified with the success of the
undergraduate course on which our overall approach was founded – it currently enrolls about 250 students per year, and has contributed to growing OSU’s linguistics major to more than 150 students. Further, most participants emerged from the programs with both an enhanced appreciation for the complexity of language and some practical tools to help them deal with this complexity in the context of language learning. From our perspective, reaching out to this constituency has been rewarding on a multitude of levels. Indeed, we would gladly devote energy to building these programs, if time and other commitments permitted. We believe that efforts such as ours that make the study of language accessible at a very basic level through community outreach and general education undergraduate courses contribute in essential ways to the ongoing health and stability of a linguistics program.
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**Figure 1. Typical schedule for Linguistic Institute for Language Teachers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Day 1</th>
<th>Day 2</th>
<th>Day 3</th>
<th>Day 4</th>
<th>Day 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9-11</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; vs. 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; language learning; braintraining</td>
<td>Foreign accents. Speech production: vowels</td>
<td>Form and meaning in language, I</td>
<td>Interaction of language and culture</td>
<td>Brainstorming session: How can what we have talked about be adapted for the classroom?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>Your experiences: Challenges facing adult learners</td>
<td>Vowel pronunciation errors</td>
<td>Common grammatical errors</td>
<td>Challenges facing your students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-1</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>Speech perception &amp; language processing</td>
<td>Consonants, phonotactics: production and common errors</td>
<td>Intonation in English and other languages</td>
<td>Form and meaning in language, II</td>
<td>Brainstorming session: Where do we go from here?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>Open discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homework</td>
<td>Read: <em>Sounding like a native speaker</em>. Think about the kinds of pronunciation errors that your students make.</td>
<td>Read: <em>Thinking like a native speaker</em>. Think about the kinds of grammatical errors that your students make, e.g. word order, verb forms.</td>
<td>Read: <em>Acting like a native speaker</em>. How does the linguistic expression of culture in ‘your’ language differ from English?</td>
<td>Think about how what we have talked about can be adapted for your classroom.</td>
<td>Farewells</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>