MULTIPLE LANGUAGE SIGNAGE IN COMPUTATIONAL LINGUISTIC LANDSCAPE OF PRACTICES

Dr. Deepesh Kumar Thakur
Assistant Professor II (English), School of Liberal Arts & Management-Humanities,
DIT University, Dehradun, Dehradun, Uttarakhand-248009 (India)
|Mob: + 91-8527740419 |Email: deepesh1november@gmail.com
https://www.google.com/site/deepeshkumarthakur

Drawing on multiple measures of language ideology, this paper examines the language ideologies of two third grade teachers tasked with implementing a dual language bilingual education (DLBE) program to explore the relationship between teachers' language ideologies and local language policy. After situating the classrooms within their respective broader language ideological contexts, the language ideologies of each teacher are presented followed by a discussion of its relationship to classroom-level language policy. Each teacher espoused both hegemonic and counter hegemonic language ideologies, which was reflected in classroom language practices. The cases illuminate the ideological struggle of each teacher within their own contexts, including how different levels of language policy (i.e. district, program, school) shaped or constrained teacher agency. While both teachers constructed pluralist classroom spaces for students to draw on their full linguistic repertoires, each classroom was simultaneously embedded within a transitional language ideology and influenced by the monoglossic ideologies of standardized assessments.

In Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) programmes, students learn content subjects through a second/foreign language, and they encounter difficulties when trying to master the academic language involved. Grounded on systemic functional linguistics, genre-based pedagogy emphasizes contextualized language use, thereby serving as a potential pedagogical framework for CLIL teachers to incorporate language scaffolding in content subject lessons. This study aims to investigate how genre-based pedagogy can be implemented to facilitate students' learning of content knowledge and academic literacy. One Integrated Humanities teacher implemented genre-based pedagogy with her Grade 8 students in an English-medium school in Hong Kong. Comparing the essays before and after the intervention, the students produced better argumentative essays in terms of logical development of ideas and use of academic language, which could be attributed to how the teacher incorporated language scaffolding in the lessons. These findings demonstrate the potential of genre-based pedagogy and illuminate effective CLIL pedagogy.

GENRE AND LANGUAGE LEARNING: A SOCIAL SEMIOTIC PERSPECTIVE

It introduces the genre-based literacy research undertaken over the past three decades by educators and functional linguists in Australia and their innovative contributions to literacy pedagogy and curriculum. It focuses on the concept of genre, its place within the model of language and context developed as systemic functional linguistics, and the implementation of this concept in learning to read and write. This approach to genre is illustrated with respect to the synthesis of a story genre built in steps through key choices for lexis, grammar, and discourse structure.

FULL PAPER

The influence of the native language on phonological preparation in spoken word production in a second language
Linguistics is the study of the human cognitive capacity for language. Linguists study the structure of language, to find what all languages have in common. When linguistics specialists study how language is used in communication, the goal is usually to find the parameters that can give us evidence about human cognition. Communications scholars study

the social aspects of communication, which includes language but also includes nonverbal communication, visual communication, rhetoric, journalism and media studies.

Our overall goal is to understand
how language is actually used,
when it is used effectively, and why.

For instance, how do particular text characteristics interact with a reader's cognitive architecture such that information is conveyed in a coherent, comprehensible way? How does language interact with people's emotional and motivational architecture so that it effectively moves or persuades them?

Three experiments investigated the phonological preparation unit in planning English spoken words, comparing English monolinguals, native Chinese and Japanese-speakers who spoke English as their second language. All three groups named pictures in English, and the names could share either the same initial phoneme, mora, or syllable, or had no systematic commonality. A phoneme preparation effect was shown among English monolinguals but not between the two bilingual groups, suggesting that the phoneme is the phonological preparation unit for English monolinguals, but not for the two bilingual groups. All three groups showed mora and syllable preparation effects, but further analysis and a follow-up experiment suggested that Chinese-English bilinguals might treat morae as open syllables. English monolinguals showed similar phoneme and mora preparation effect sizes, possibly because of flexibility. Together, the selection of phonological preparation could be flexible, influenced by both the nature of the target language and speakers' language experiences.

GENRE AND LANGUAGE LEARNING: A SOCIAL SEMIOTIC PERSPECTIVE

This closing article puts the articles of the special issue in the wider perspective of the burgeoning field of linguistic landscape studies. It provides a summary of several earlier studies. More in particular the article focuses on contributions based on research in educational settings or schoolscapes in general. It continues with studies of environmental print as learning materials, the use of linguistic landscape materials for the study of English as a foreign language as well as the ways in which students and teachers have participated in research projects of the linguistic landscape inside and outside of the classroom. In the reflections about the use of linguistic landscapes for learning it is shown that the articles in the Special Issue take the investigation further, among others by focusing on multilingualism and multimodality. The studies demonstrate its potential for studies of schoolscapes as well as pedagogical tools, but also for critical reflection and awareness rising.

ANALYSIS

Before the 20th century, linguists analysed language on a diachronic plane, which was historical in focus. This meant that they would compare linguistic features and try to analyse language from the point of view of how it had changed between then and later. However, with Saussurean linguistics in the 20th century, the focus shifted to a more synchronic approach, where the study was more geared towards analysis and comparison between different language variations, which existed at the same given point of time.

METHODOLOGY

Linguistics is primarily descriptive. Linguists describe and explain features of language without making subjective judgments on whether a particular feature or usage is "good" or "bad". This is analogous to practice in other sciences: a zoologist studies the animal kingdom without making subjective judgments on whether a particular species is "better" or "worse" than another is. Prescription, on the other hand, is an attempt to promote particular linguistic usages over others, often favouring a particular dialect or "acrolect". This may have the aim of establishing a linguistic standard, which can aid communication over large geographical areas. It may also, however, be an attempt by speakers of one language or dialect to exert influence over speakers of other languages or dialects (see Linguistic imperialism). An extreme version of prescriptivism can be found among censors, who attempt to eradicate words and structures that they consider destructive to society. Prescription, however, may be practised appropriately in the teaching of language, like in ELT, where certain fundamental grammatical rules and lexical terms need to be introduced to a second-language speaker who is attempting to acquire the language.

APPROACHES

One major debate in linguistics concerns the very nature of language and how it should be understood. Some linguists hypothesize that there is a module in the human brain that allows people to undertake linguistic behaviour, which is part of the formalist approach. This "universal grammar" is considered to guide children when they learn language and to constrain what sentences are considered grammatical in any human language. Proponents of this view, which is predominant in those schools of linguistics that are based on the generative theory of Noam Chomsky, do not necessarily consider that language evolved for communication in particular. They consider instead that it has more to do with the process of structuring human thought (see also formal grammar).

STRUCTURE

Linguistic structures are pairings of meaning and form. Any particular pairing of meaning and form is a Saussurean sign. For instance, the meaning "cat" is represented worldwide with a wide variety of different sound patterns (in oral

languages), movements of the hands and face (in sign languages), and written symbols (in written languages). Linguistic patterns have proven their importance for the knowledge engineering field especially with the ever-increasing amount of available data.

Linguists focusing on structure attempt to understand the rules regarding language use those native speakers know (not always consciously). All linguistic structures can be broken down into component parts that are combined according to (sub) conscious rules, over multiple levels of analysis. For instance, consider the structure of the word "tenth" on two different levels of analysis. On the level of internal word structure (known as morphology), the word "tenth" is made up of one linguistic form indicating a number and another form indicating ordinarily. The rule governing the combination of these forms ensures that the ordinarily marker "th" follows the number "ten." On the level of sound structure (known as phonology), structural analysis shows that the "n" sound in "tenth" is made differently from the "n" sound in "ten" spoken alone. Although most speakers of English are consciously aware of the rules governing internal structure of the word pieces of "tenth", they are less often aware of the rule governing its sound structure. Linguists focused on structure find and analyze rules such as these, which govern how native speakers use language.

Linguistics has many sub-fields concerned with particular aspects of linguistic structure. The theory that elucidates on these, as propounded by Noam Chomsky, is known as generative theory or universal grammar. These sub-fields range from those focused primarily on form to those focused primarily on meaning. They also run the gamut of level of analysis of language, from individual sounds, to words, to phrases, up to cultural discourse.

CONCLUSION

The objective of describing languages is often to uncover cultural knowledge about communities. The use of anthropological methods of investigation on linguistic sources leads to the discovery of certain cultural traits among a speech community through its linguistic features. It is also widely used as a tool in language documentation, with an endeavour to curate endangered languages. However, now, linguistic inquiry uses the anthropological method to understand cognitive, historical, sociolinguistic and historical processes that languages undergo as they change and evolve, as well as general anthropological inquiry uses the linguistic method to excavate into culture. In all aspects, anthropological inquiry usually uncovers the different variations and relativities that underlie the usage of language.

REFERENCES

1. Aiestaran, J., Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2010). Multilingual cityscapes: Perceptions and preferencesof the inhabitants of Donostia-San Sebastián. In E. Shohamy, E. Ben-Rafael, & M.
2. Barni (Eds.), Linguistic landscape in the city (pp. 219–234).
3. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.Backhaus, P. (2006). Multilingualism in Tokyo – A look into the linguistic landscape. InternationalJournal of Multilingualism, 3, 52–66.
4. Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2006). Linguistic landscape and minority languages. International Journalof Multilingualism, 3, 67–80.
5. Dagenais, D., Moore, D., Sabatier, C., Lamarre, P., & Armand, F. (2009). Linguistic landscape andlanguage awareness. In E. Shohamy & D. Gorter (Eds.), Linguistic landscape: Expanding thescenery (pp. 253–269). New York: Routledge.
6. Gorter, D. (Ed.). (2006). Linguistic landscape: A new approach to multilingualism. Clevedon:Multilingual Matters. [First as issue of International Journal of Multilingualism3 (1)]
7. Huebner, T. (2006). Bangkok's linguistic landscapes: Environmental print, code mixing, andlanguage change. International Journal of Multilingualism, 3, 31–51.
8. Jaworski, A., & Thurlow, C. (Eds.). (2010). Semiotic landscapes: Language, image, space.London: Continuum.
9. Kasanga, L. A. (2012). Mapping the linguistic landscape of a commercial neighbourhood in CentralPhnom Penh. Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 33(5), 1–15.
10. Landry, R., & Bourhis, R. Y. (1997). Linguistic landscape and ethnolinguistic vitality: An empiricalstudy. Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 16, 23–49.
11. Mitchell, T. D. (2010). 'A Latino community takes hold': Reproducing semiotic landscapes inmedia discourse. In A. Jaworski & C. Thurlow (Eds.), Semiotic landscapes: Language, image,space (pp. 168–186). London: Continuum
12. Pavlenko, A. (2010). Linguistic landscape of Kyiv, Ukraine: A diachronic study. In E. Shohamy, E.Ben-Rafael, & M. Barni (Eds.), Linguistic landscape in the city (pp. 133–150). Bristol, UK: 12. Rowley: Newbury House.Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. W. (2003). Discourse in place: Language in the material world. New York: Routledge. 13. Taylor-Leech, K. J. (2012). Language choice as an index of identity: Linguistic landscape in Dili, Timor-Leste. International Journal of Multilingualism, 9, 15–34.

Dr. Deepesh Kumar Thakur
Assistant Professor II (English), School of Liberal Arts & Management,
DIT University, Dehradun, Dehradun, Uttarakhand-248009 (India)

|Mob: + 91-8527740419 |Email: deepesh1november@gmail.com

Dr. Deepesh Kr. Thakur, faculty of English in DIT University, Dehradun, having PhD., MA in English -Linguistics, MBA(Finance) & DCA from BRA Bihar University, Muzaffarpur (Bihar), native of a village-Kansi, Darbhanga (Bihar), having thirteen years of rich experience in teaching-supervising the Ph.D., PG & UG students in University & corporate sector, NSN Ltd. India, Visiting Faculty in LIMT, Faridabad, administrative position held in World College of Technology & Management (WCTM), Gurgaon, as a Coordinator of Applied Science, Book Authored, 'English Language for Professional & Technical Education', Germany, books of B.Ed. & M.Ed., presented forty research papers presented-published in International & National Conference proceedings, published a dozen of papers in reputed Journals & Twelve chapters' in edited books. Editing International Journal, *'Mirrorview'* (USA-Germany) & IJER (India) & Magazine-WCTM Pulse, research interests in English Language Teaching, English Literature, Linguistics, Translation Studies, Indian English Writing, Diasporic Literature, Management, Maithili,Sanskrit,Hindi, Nepali & Bengali.