
Language Change and Foreign Language Teaching

Douglas J. Lightfoot, University of Alabama

Introduction

Language change deals with the way language elements and language systems develop. It has been a central concept in second language acquisition. Selinker is generally recognized as the main proponent for the term interlanguage, for example, and characterizes it as "...a separate linguistic system based on the observable output which results from a learner's attempted production of a T[arget] L[anguage] norm (1972, p. 214)." Larsen-Freeman and Long state that interlanguage may be "...thought of as a continuum between L1 and L2 along which all learners traverse. At any point along the continuum, the learner's language is systematic, i.e. rule-governed, and common to all learners..." (1991, p. 60). Though systematic, however, interlanguage is acknowledged by researchers as characterized by a greater degree of variability than are target language norms. This dynamic, evolving nature of interlanguage allows us to classify it as a type of language change. In fact, virtually all natural language is in an ongoing process of change. We likewise recognize that the study of native speaker language varieties over longer periods of time (diachronic or historical linguistics) is another area of language change research.

Taking both interlanguage and historical linguistic phenomena as language change, we can hypothesize that certain linguistic principles likely hold true for both. Based on that assumption, we examine principles of language change as they relate to four incorrect ideas dealing with language learning and teaching. The four misconceptions may or may not confront certain instructors. In either case, they are useful gateways into discussion on commonalities of language change in applied linguistics and historical linguistics. Discussion then follows on the possible implications for professional training and instructed language learning.

The four misconceptions center around (1) the amount of exposure required in acquisition, (2) variation of forms to be expected, (3) guessing at meanings and forms, and (4) the systematic nature of language. Each misconception is one which I myself have had to consciously guard against in classroom teaching, and discussion of teaching observations with over 40 foreign language instructors indicates

"...virtually all natural language is in an ongoing process of change."

Douglas Lightfoot (Ph.D., UCLA) is Assistant Professor of German and French Linguistics at the University of Alabama. He has taught German language at the community college and university levels, and currently also teaches linguistics. His research interests are historical and applied linguistics. Publications include work in Germanic linguistics.

“...we examine principles of language change as they relate to four incorrect ideas dealing with language learning and teaching.”

that a number of them also consider these issues. The literature on language learning and teaching likewise discusses these and related misconceptions, as noted in the following section.

Providing additional perspectives to address pitfalls in the language classroom can hopefully further instructors' understanding of interlanguage and language change, regardless of whether an instructor actually shares any of the misconceptions presented.

Tenets from Historical Linguistics to Support Applied Linguistics

The following section notes common instructor beliefs, discusses related knowledge from applied linguistics, and offers supportive notions from historical linguistics. Historical information should lend further weight to knowledge in applied linguistics, rather than supplant it. The professional literature addresses the following four misconceptions to varying degrees. Schulz (1991) raises the issue of time and exposure required to acquire a language (p. 24), Larsen-Freeman and Long (1991) comment on instructors' vexation over the variable forms their students produce (p. 82), Brown (1989) writes about learners' willingness to guess in the foreign language (pp. 17-19), and VanPatten (2003) seeks to generally clarify the systematic nature of a learner's developing language, partly by way of answering teachers' questions on a variety of topics (pp. 9-24, 77-101).

“Once Taught a Rule, the Learner is Responsible for Knowing It”

Though many educators are taught that development of the linguistic system is a relatively slow process, an instructor may associate “imperfect” language produced by learners with failure or laziness. Some learners may well work less than they should at language learning, but even industrious learners display flaws in their production. Interestingly, the notion also exists that language can be directly and instantly transmitted from instructor to learner, as if a pitcher of water were to fill a glass (Lee & VanPatten, 2003). The instructor's desire to believe in this transmission appears to exist in spite of the overwhelming evidence against it. Corder (1967) points out the value of making errors as a part of learning, and we know that it takes the typical native speaker roughly at least five years to be able to produce some of the more complex structures of the first language grammatical system (Mitchell & Myles, 2004, p. 34). The cognitive approach distinguishes between knowing *that* (declarative knowledge) and knowing *how* (procedural knowledge). Through repeated exposures and tries at whatever the task may be, the learner is said to

“Though many educators are taught that development of the linguistic system is a relatively slow process, an instructor may associate ‘imperfect’ language produced by learners with failure or laziness.”

acquire procedural knowledge after having acquired declarative knowledge. Interlanguage theory and stages of development also indicate time intervals and steps between receiving input and successfully producing that same type of language. All of this applied linguistic knowledge refutes the belief that a learner should spring immediately to appropriate usage of some linguistic structure after having been “taught” it. Schulz (1991) put it well when she wrote over a decade ago: “Our teaching and testing practices have to reflect the fact that ‘covering’ and ‘teaching’ are not synonymous with learning, acquiring, or mastering” (p. 24). Yet still the misconception survives, as some instructors appear confounded by the errors of their students even after they hear the correct form from the instructor.

“Recognizing that such historical linguistic development is often gradual can make understanding of slow language development in the individual perhaps easier to grasp.”

One of the main principles involved here is *frequency*. The term refers to the number of times a certain type of language appears, either from somewhere in the environment or the learner. Those who would expect quick acquisition are not allowing for the role played by frequency (of input and output), where a higher frequency of exposure to input and a higher frequency of production tend to facilitate acquisition. Frequency is terminologically close to the well-known concept of recycling.

Frequency has long been held to be a general aspect of language change (Joseph & Janda, 2003). In historical linguistics, a higher frequency (i.e., a form that appears often) tends to yield a lasting structure. Consider why it is the case that complicated, irregular paradigms can endure, such as for the verb *to be* in a number of languages, to give one example. This verb is often suppletive in nature, i.e., its various forms derive historically not from a single root, but from multiple sources. English *is* comes from the reconstructed Proto Indo-European root **es-*, the form *are* from **er-*, and *be* harkens from the root **bheuə-*.¹ Language users have retained this complex paradigm because it is so often utilized and ingrained within the linguistic psyche, i.e., it has an extremely high frequency of use. On the other hand, paradigms that enjoy little use easily fall by the wayside. Consider the somewhat archaic *-m* suffix which some English speakers have abandoned from their interrogative pronoun paradigm. Fewer and fewer speakers using *whom* in fewer instances yields a lower frequency and a sort of snowball effect toward archaism. The “who” paradigm is thereby regularized and trimmed down in a process that has been ongoing for over a century (in reality it is part of a larger drift away from case systems over the last two millennia).

Recognizing that such historical linguistic development is often gradual can make understanding of slow language development in the individual perhaps easier to grasp. If language change from a historical perspective can take a relatively long time to play out, then maybe language change from an individual learner’s perspective is also likely to take a relatively long time. Furthermore, recognizing the historical role of high frequency to preserve certain language forms may help one to remember that high frequency has an important role in the language change of the learner. A learner requires

more exposures to the language form than simply an initial, explicit explanation.

As in all of these examples, there is no claim here that frequency's historical importance proves its importance at the individual learner level, also. Instead, at this point the similarities are noted to highlight the common importance for language change in general.

“Once a Learner Uses a Form Correctly, Usage Should Remain that Way”

Similar to the first misconception, the idea that the initial production of a form is indicative of future usage is patently untrue. Second language acquisition studies inform us that learning is often a “two steps forward, one step back” proposition, and learners with limited linguistic resources constantly face situations in which they communicate some type of message in an alternative or somehow formally imperfect manner, sometimes with the assistance of non-linguistic devices, even after having displayed correct usage.

Givón (1979) proposed pragmatic and syntactic modes of expression, the former displaying less formal grammar and relying on context to express meaning, and the latter utilizing more formal grammar. Thus in Dittmar's (1984) code switching example between German and Spanish we have:

**Ich morgen a España²*

I tomorrow to Spain

'I am going to Spain tomorrow (p. 243).'

The speaker does not have to formally express tense and aspect in a verbal structure here. With knowledge of the context, the listener can likely ascertain the situation. Along the learning path, the formal grammar and vocabulary will presumably be learned, and then that structure, still often working in tandem with context, will be the conveyor of 'am going.' Thus, meaning often precedes form in terms of learning. Of course, studies on stages of development also reinforce the concept of a series of “imperfect” steps leading to a proper target form.³

A parallel in historical linguistics is the similar tenet that meaning often changes before form (and thus steps are taken toward a kind of endpoint). Speakers/hearers can reanalyze (or reinterpret) an utterance; that utterance associated with the innovative meaning then may become ritualized, resulting in higher frequency, and then phonological reduction is more likely to take place (e.g., formal change shortens a word). A case in point is the history of the English construction *be going to* (Hopper & Traugott, 2003, pp. 1-3, 87-93). Initially, *be going to* signaled the concrete action of movement to another place as in *I am going to the bookstore*. Over time, however, it displayed intention and future tense. En route to signifying future, an overlapping period exists, as is typically the case, where either a physical movement or tense

interpretation is possible, as in *I am going to buy a book*. The listener needs to know from the context whether the speaker is on the way to the bookstore or whether he is stating his future intention for the weekend, for example. As this usage has progressed over the centuries, the future collocation has been routinized and also changed phonologically, changing

“...meaning often precedes form in terms of learning.”

from *am going to* to *gonna* (thus meaning changed before form). Note that *gonna* is not used to express physical movement — one does not say **I'm gonna the bookstore*.⁴ The future *gonna* usage has existed for scores of years, yet its correctness is questioned and it still varies with other English future forms (e.g. *be going to, will, etc.*).

Change in meaning preceding change in form is just one of many examples of active variation in language change. In both acquisition and historical change, we can expect a certain amount of dynamic variation before the “correct” forms dominate (even after a “correct” form appears). That is, there is a tendency for multiple forms to exist to express a given meaning. Over time, speakers often have a preference for a particular form to carry the meaning, and the word that survives is typically accepted institutionally or by a certain speaker population, at least until the language variety might change again. The forms that lose out tend to enjoy less recognition, are seen as ungrammatical, or are dropped from usage altogether. Youth speech is also well known for its competing terms for “great,” for example, which cycle with a high degree of variation. Some of the forms would include *boss, radical/rad, wicked, groovy, tubular, phat, the bomb, aces*, and so forth.

“...the learner who allows her/himself to speak only after all relevant parts of the developing linguistic system have been perfectly built up can expect a long wait...”

“A Learner Should Not Speak Until Certain the Utterance is Correct”

Again, we find the common denominator notion of “bad” errors enmeshed in this third misconception, just as it plays a part in the two related former ones.⁵ The main problem is that the learner who allows her/himself to speak only after all relevant parts of the developing linguistic system have been perfectly built up can expect a long wait (if that is even possible⁶). A learner needs to actually practice using the language to be able to produce it with a certain degree of accuracy. This is understood from some of the same research noted above (Corder, 1967; Givón, 1979), including interlanguage theory, which has variation of imperfect forms as a notable feature. Such theoretical variation would not exist if it were not being produced by learners.

If a learner does not experiment with the language somewhat, practicing it, then of course there is no opportunity for the person to advance naturally through the various stages of development to arrive at an accurate, or at least fairly accurate, level of usage. If the musculature of the vocal tract cannot practice the foreign and at times difficult movements, it is unlikely that this physiological necessity will be met even if the learner somehow has the grammar straight in her/his mind. Part of this practicing with the foreign language can be considered negotiation of meaning. Leeman Guthrie (1984) is noted for sparking interest in negotiation of meaning for acquisition, and Lee (2000) provides more recent data. Most researchers recognize the importance of producing imperfect target language and then working meaningfully and strategically with an interlocutor to overcome the linguistic hurdle.

For the L2 learner, optimal acquisition probably demands that unsure learners practice and that certain communicative risks be taken. The old adage “nothing ven-

“Abduction starts with a result, invokes a law/rule, and supposes a certain case may be.”

tured, nothing gained” holds here. Brown (1989) states: “Studies have shown that people can be categorized as high, moderate, and low risk takers. Guess which ones have the best success index? The moderate risk-takers ... Good language learners are willing but accurate guessers” (p. 18).

A parallel situation from the historical linguistic literature involves speakers over time taking risks to comprehend language or to arrive at an innovation themselves. Andersen (1973) is generally acknowledged as having made this risk-taking understandable in terms of the types of reasoning known as induction, deduction, and abduction.⁷ We find induction and deduction in applied linguistic work,⁸ but abduction occurs less if at all. All three ways of thinking involve asserting three propositions, but in different orders respectively. Induction refers to reasoning from observed cases and results to arrive at a law/rule, and deduction does the opposite, a law/rule is invoked with respect to a case and predicts a result. Abduction starts with a result, invokes a law/rule, and supposes a certain case may be. To illustrate, we have the following three propositions:

The Law: All regular English plural nouns take –s as an ending

The Case: *Reasons* is a regular English plural noun

The Result: *Reasons'* ending is –s

Deductive reasoning, then, is the simple application of a rule/law: All of those types of nouns noted take –s as an ending, the word *reasons* is one of those nouns, therefore –s is an ending of *reasons*. Inductive reasoning is also an application of information to attain an unsurprising rule: Since *reasons* is that type of noun, and *reasons'* ending is –s, then all such types of nouns take –s as an ending. A person arrives at a generalization which is true as long as the premises are correct.

Abductive reasoning, however, involves risk taking. We begin with an observable result (*Reasons'* ending is –s), call on a known rule/law (All of those types of plural nouns take –s as an ending), and then guess that the certain case (*Reasons* is one of those nouns) might hold. Even when the premises (i.e., the result seen and the known rule) are correct, the particular case construed may be false. The word *reasons* could also be a third person singular verb, depending on its usage. If it were a verb in the context under question, then the abductive reasoning would not have succeeded, but if it were the noun, then the learner is rewarded with recognition of a correct context and a new regular noun form — new information is acquired from a somewhat risky guess. In other words, a person does not need to have everything necessarily spelled out in order to arrive at a useful conclusion.

“Some Language Rules are Just Arbitrary”

Applied linguistics demonstrates a degree of non-arbitrariness in language acquisition. Much work deals with the patterns and regularities found in varieties of learners' interlanguage, such as stages of development (Ellis, 1986) and orders of acquisition (Lee & VanPatten, 2003; Mitchell & Myles, 2004). It should follow logically that the regularity inherent in interlanguage varieties leads us to assume a degree of regular, non-arbitrary

nature in a target language. It would not make sense, in other words, for systematic language change at the individual level to lead to a variety of language that was the devoid of that same systematic nature.

This final misconception's parallel in historical language change is the oft-cited pattern of language change in the cyclical development of verb structures. A cycle in many languages throughout the world fluctuates between synthetic and periphrastic representation (e.g., Anttila, 1989; Hopper & Traugott, 2003). Synthetic denotes single-word forms which convey tense, for example, through inflectional endings, as in the case of the Latin future structure *cantabimus* 'we will sing,' which itself is presumed to have developed from the periphrastic (i.e., multi-word) reconstructed formulation **kanta bhumos* 'we are to sing.' The Latin synthetic form *cantabimus* then wended its way into a sort of competition with the similar meaning periphrastic expression *cantare habemus* 'we have to sing.' This squaring off of the two future structures later yields the French synthetic future (*nous*) *chanterons* '(we) will sing,' where the inflectional endings (here *-ons*) mirror the endings or whole forms of *avoir* 'to have' (*nous avons* 'we have'), since they emerged from the analytic 'have to sing' formula. French (*nous*) *chanterons* then competes in spoken contemporary French with the periphrastic (*nous*) *allons chanter* '(we) are going to sing' (Hopper & Traugott, 2003, pp. 8-9). Since these sorts of systematic historical changes occur in multiple languages, there is a strong case for recognizing regularity in historical language change, thereby strengthening the argument for regularity in general language change.

“...there is a strong case for recognizing regularity in historical language change...”

The four main misconceptions here provide an opportunity to juxtapose apparently general aspects of language change that are valid for both individual foreign language acquisition and historical linguistic change. Recognition of the roles of frequency and dynamic variation in both kinds of language change counters the first two misconceptions: that the learner should be able to start using target language accurately once it has been taught, and that accuracy should remain once a target language structure shows up correctly the very first time. Allowance for risk-taking counters the third misconception about exercising extreme caution before producing language, and acknowledgment of the systematic nature of language change calls into question the absolute arbitrariness of language change, and, by extension, of language itself.

Language change is in part due to these factors working together. Individuals take calculated risks that give us variation in the language, albeit variation that tends to follow certain paths in overall development, and the changes tend to endure that follow the paths most taken. Other routes for language change also exist, but we do not pursue them here.

Implications for Professional Training

This paper suggests that language change in acquisition and language change in historical linguistic development have certain parallels, and moreover that both phenomena adhere to certain principles of general language change. These similarities suggest

“The ideal option would be for instructors to have received training in language change during their undergraduate and possibly graduate studies, and then to continue that learning somewhat independently.”

that those trained in both disciplines would have a reinforced knowledge base on which to rely when considering matters of interlanguage and language change. The present article thus supports the general call in the profession for foreign language instructors to be familiar with language change.

The American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education's (NCATE) teacher education standards mandate an understanding of language change as well as of the broader notion of linguistics. Standard 1.b. states: “Understanding Linguistics. Candidates know the linguistic features of the target language system, recognize the changing nature of language, and accommodate for gaps in their own knowledge of the target language by learning on their own” (2002, p. 32).¹⁰

Instructors and future instructors who do not have this training but wish to adhere to the professional standards of ACTFL and NCATE have options. They may explore material on historical linguistics as well as the individual history of their specialty foreign language(s), which can be an intrinsically valuable tool. This goal could be accomplished through coursework or workshops in the United States or abroad (which are sometimes generously supported in the summer). Venues to begin searching for such resources include universities, the foreign language teaching professional organizations, the national cultural centers of certain countries (such as the Goethe Institutes for German), humanities centers (my home state has one which recently provided full financial support and a stipend for extended, multi-faceted foreign language workshops), the Linguistic Society of America's summer institutes,¹¹ and the various national foreign language resource centers, of which there are fourteen across the nation and readily available on the web.¹² Independent study is also an ever-present opportunity.

The ideal option would be for instructors to have received training in language change during their undergraduate and possibly graduate studies, and then to continue that learning somewhat independently. However, while many have coursework in the structure and history of a particular language, many still do not. Often the expertise or resources are not present for such offerings.¹³ Farley (2004) points out that it is not unusual for instructors to finish their formal degrees with linguistic exposure primarily or solely in teaching methodology, i.e., without thorough exposure to historical language change or other branches of linguistics. This issue must continue to be addressed, and strong advocacy for the training and continued education of foreign language instructors is necessary.

Current, well-documented information should be gathered on each foreign language teaching program in order to evaluate it with the recognized standards of teaching and learning. The data should contain information such as the kinds of linguistics courses required, whether they are generic or language-specific, whether they are

taught in the target language, whether the faculty involved have the appropriate expertise, and whether the content is presented in a manner most beneficial for those who must teach it later on. Discrepancies between actual programs and recommended standards may provide some needed impetus to bring about improvements.

Implications for Instructed Language Learning

This work leads to two main implications for the foreign language classroom and opens the door to a number of others. First, we see that the four classroom learning and teaching misconceptions are refuted by language change principles established in applied linguistics and historical linguistics. This refutation has the potential to be valuable, since my own experience and what is reported in the literature (Brown, 1989, pp. 17-19; Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991, p. 82; Schulz, 1991, p. 24; VanPatten, 2003, pp. 9-24, 77-101) indicate that some instructors do struggle with these misconceptions. Indeed, some instructors may give credence to their own experience in foreign language learning over information acquired during teacher training or while teaching, even if the two are at stark odds (Glisan, 1996, pp. 60 ff.; Schrier, 2001, p. 73; Vélez-Rendón, 2002, p. 459).

Thus, we reinforce the notion that the initial explicit instruction of a grammar rule is not necessarily enough for the learner to acquire the rule. For example, repeated exposure and practice is required for the learner to somewhat accurately apply personal endings onto present tense verbs in a context. We reinforce the similar notion that an instructor cannot expect one accurate usage of the plural form, for example, to mean that the learner should henceforth be able to use that same plural form correctly. The informed instructor knows and teaches as if a variety of inaccurate plural formations may be expected in the learner's output for a certain amount of time. We can better understand that the overly cautious learner is likely not making optimal progress. The instructor heartily encourages calculated guesses in language production, since these seem to spur acquisition. Anttila (1989) goes so far to assert that "Any learning or understanding must be by abduction. Its purpose is to stand as the basis for, or to represent, predictions (p. 197)." And finally, we corroborate and strengthen the premise that language is not solely a collection of arbitrary rules and sounds. There are many patterns to help guide the learner, such as pointing out that the German definite articles' endings are virtually the same as the demonstrative pronouns' since the article developed from the pronoun.

The second main implication connects theory and practice. Expanding and deepening instructors' understanding of language change adds to the repertoire of resources that build up their knowledge base. This translates into more perspectives on language and a potential flexibility to draw upon a greater variety of examples and explanations in the classroom. On top of providing rich, varied input and ample chances for the learner to practice producing a certain form, the instructor has the further option to briefly point out something like a writing or sound correspondence that can help learners identify cognate vocabulary. In French, for example, Arteaga and Herschensohn (1995) claim that learners benefited from an explanation of the circumflex accent appearing in certain words where there used to be an *s*, as in *hôte* 'host' and *fête* 'feast' (p. 215).¹⁴

“Teaching that includes content about language change also includes cultural knowledge.”

We should include the benefits to instructors cited in the *ACTFL/NCATE Program Standards for the Preparation of Foreign Language Teachers* (2002, pp. 32-34) here. Instructors who have an understanding of language change should be more likely to seek out and observe ongoing changes, and thus be in a position to provide their learners with authentic language varieties. Many learners have an interest in current youth slang, for example. If they travel abroad, especially, they tend to have a strong desire

to understand their peers' spoken language, which can diverge greatly from standard written varieties. The complex relationship with the teaching of culture is also noted above. Teaching that includes content about language change also includes cultural knowledge. For example, imparting to learners that in German the term *Fräulein* 'Miss' has been giving way to *Frau* 'Mrs.,' even when the female in question is not married, tells something about the status of women in a German-speaking society. Etymologies, or word histories, are often rich in cultural and historical content.

This discussion can easily lead the instructor to ask if all of this is not too much content information. Does it take away too much time from classroom learners who could be expressing themselves meaningfully in the target language about their likes and dislikes? How much information about language change should be used in class? The answer depends on individual instructors and the particular group of learners. The degree of expertise of the instructor, the proportion of learners with analytic learning styles, and general interest levels determine how much is too much or too little. It should always be kept in mind, however, that communicative practice in the target language is the prime focus of the classroom. Many instructors are opting to expose learners to detailed content, sometimes in English, outside the classroom. Belz (2000, p. 294) indicates the recent trend in German programs to utilize cultural readings outside of class, and recommends that a similar strategy be considered to enhance students' learning of target language change and linguistic perspectives.

Conclusions

Comparing aspects of language change in applied linguistics and in historical linguistics has the potential to enhance instructors' understanding of general language change. This greater theoretical and content understanding can in turn give the instructor more resources and options in the classroom.

The specific principles of historical language change discussed here have been frequency, overlapping variation, abduction, and regular historical patterning. Frequency is important in combating the notion that initially "teaching" a rule means having it instilled within learners. Overlapping variation helps counter the notion that initial proper usage of a form should signal further such appropriate usage. Abduction helps refute the assertion that a learner should wait and not produce any imperfect target language (make guesses). Relatively regular historical patterning assists in pleading the case for language not being absolutely arbitrary (and thus more frustrating to learn).

Implications for training indicate a recognition in the profession that instructors should be familiar with language change, and resources for instructor development are suggested. Classroom implications for instructors include a heightened pedagogical awareness and a better understanding of content to pass on to learners.

My arguments here should not insinuate that applied linguistics cannot powerfully inform educators on its own, or that a concrete connection exists between acquisition and language change. The point

is that a robust knowledge base is further invigorated when related fields of inquiry corroborate its basic principles. It is advisable to use every means available in the linguistic arsenal to plead the case of effective language learning and teaching. Historical linguistics is well suited to reinforce general principles of applied linguistics. Both disciplines investigate a type of language development, and that invites cautious comparison. It could be highly instructive to examine where further parallels with language change may exist to enhance foreign language teaching. More empirical data are required to determine how much of what type of historical explanation may be beneficial to certain types of learners.

“...a robust knowledge base is further invigorated when related fields of inquiry corroborate its basic principles.”

Notes

- * Thank you to the anonymous reviewers, as well as Sharon Wilkinson and Charles James for improvements in this paper. The project was supported by a grant from the Research Advisory Committee of The University of Alabama.
1. The asterisk here follows the historical linguistic convention of indicating a reconstruction, that is, the form is not found in any documents.
 2. Here the asterisk follows the applied linguistic convention of signifying a nonce utterance, which is an invented, one-time utterance.
 3. The classic example of stages for English negation is from Ellis (1986), and all of the commonly-taught languages have been examined to a certain degree.
 4. Utterances that do not occur in correct usage also have the asterisk.
 5. This aversion to imperfect L2 production has theoretical roots in behaviorism. It was believed that foreign language errors develop into bad habits that stay with the learner (fossilization), and therefore they were to be avoided even at the initial stages of L2 learning.
 6. According to Krashen and Terrell (1983, pp. 41-42), for example, acquisition can be seriously impeded from too much monitoring of language production for correctness.
 7. Andersen (1973) explicitly connects abduction to child language acquisition, but it is also accepted that new ideas among adult speakers spring from abduction (H. Andersen, personal communication, June 22, 2004).
 8. Deduction and induction are discussed in applied linguistics with regard to explicit and implicit grammar instruction. Communicative approaches typically advocate a blend of deduction and induction.
 9. “Arbitrary” here is meant as “completely devoid of patterns and rationale.”

10. The supporting explanation in the *ACTFL/NCATE Program Standards for Foreign Language Teachers* (2002) asserts that an understanding of language change promotes an awareness of the current variety of the target language, and indicates that this may provide impetus to “keep abreast of these [current] changes (p. 32).” Furthermore, candidates who exceed Standard 1.b. should be able to “adapt the language of their instructional materials accordingly (p. 34),” to avoid promoting outdated language. E. Glisan agrees and further notes that understanding language change “entails understanding the connection between language and culture (personal communication, February 16, 2005).” Thus, weakness in this area is more likely to render an instructor a weaker communicator in and about the current state of the target language, and less capable of assisting learners to develop cultural awareness. The issue of language and culture being inseparable is more complicated, of course, but is not this work’s focus.
11. From the organization’s homepage, select “members” to arrive at workshop information. The summer 2005 program has had an emphasis on workshops featuring aspects of language change. Scholarships are offered.
12. All fourteen non-profit centers are available through the Foreign Language Resource Centers’ website. If a center’s workshops do not include the topic of language change, I advise interested instructors to request that such a topic be offered in the future.
13. Note that the 1995-1999 MLA foreign language enrollment survey reveals that on average, only 65% of programs at the post-secondary level have a full-time language coordinator. The percentage of AA-granting institutions with a coordinator is 32%, BA- is 23.1%, MA- is 59.6%, and 81.1% of PhD-granting departments have them (Goldberg & Welles, 2001, p. 189). The major caveat here, of course, is that it is not clarified whether the “language coordinators” are actually applied linguists, general linguists, literary scholars, etc. Schulz (2000, p. 514) points out Teschner’s (1987) figures from a survey of 404 T.A. coordinators of whom 59% were literature specialists, 19% were theoretical linguists, and 14% had specialties in applied or educational linguistics. Thus, in many cases, future instructors may well not be receiving the foreign language-specific type of linguistics background noted in the *ACTFL/NCATE Program Standards for the Preparation of Foreign Language Teachers*.
14. To complement this French resource, Wolff (1993) discusses language change for German and Sanz (2000) does so for Spanish instruction.

References

- American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. (2002). *ACTFL/NCATE program standards for the preparation of foreign language teachers*. Yonkers, NY: ACTFL.
- Andersen, H. (1973). Abductive and deductive change. *Language*, 49, 765-793.
- Anttila, R. (1989). *Historical and comparative linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Arteaga, D. & Herschensohn, J. (1995). Using diachronic linguistics in the language classroom. *Modern Language Journal*, 79(2), 212-222.
- Belz, J. (2000). [Review of the book *Exploring the German language*]. *Modern Language Journal*, 84, 294-295.
- Brown, H. D. (1989). *A practical guide to language learning*. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Corder, S. (1967). The significance of learners’ errors. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 5, 161-169.
- Ditmar, N. (1984). Semantic features of pidginized learners of German. In R. Andersen (Ed.), *Second languages: A cross-linguistic perspective* (pp. 243-270). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Ellis, R. (1986). *Understanding second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Farley, A. (2004). Discussion at the McGraw-Hill Satellite Teleconference on Topics in Second Language Acquisition: Testing and Assessment in the Second Language Classroom. Retrieved July 22, 2005, available from <http://www.amp.csulb.edu/mh/>
- Foreign Language Resource Centers. (n.d.). Retrieved July 22, 2005, from <http://nflrc.msu.edu/>
- Givón, T. (1979). From discourse to syntax: Grammar as a processing strategy. In T. Givón (Ed.), *Syntax and semantics* (Vol. 12), (pp. 81-112). New York: Academic Press.
- Glisan, E. (1996). A collaborative approach to professional development. In R. Lafayette (Ed.), *National standards: A catalyst for reform* (pp. 57-95). Lincolnwood, Illinois: National Textbook Company/ACTFL.
- Goldberg, D. & Welles, E. (2001). Successful college and university foreign language programs, 1995-99: Part 1. *Profession 2001*. U.S.A: M.L.A.
- Hopper, P. & Traugott, E. C. (2003). *Grammaticalization* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Joseph, B. & Janda, R. (Eds.). (2003). *The handbook of historical linguistics*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Krashen, S. D. & Terrell, T. D. (1983). *The natural approach: Language acquisition in the classroom*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. & Long, M. (1991). *An introduction to second language acquisition Research*. London: Longman.
- Lee, J. F. (2000). *Tasks and communicating in language classrooms*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Lee, J. F. & VanPatten, B. (2003). *Making communicative language teaching happen*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Leemann Guthrie, E. (1984). Intake, communication, and second language teaching. In S. J. Savignon & M. S. Berns (Eds.), *Initiatives in communicative language teaching* (pp. 35-54). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Linguistic Society of America. (n.d.). Retrieved July 22, 2005, available from <http://www.lsadc.org/>
- Mitchell, R. & Myles, F. (2004). *Second language learning theories*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Sanz, C. (2000). What form to focus on? Linguistics, language awareness, and the education of L2 teachers. In J. F. Lee & A. Valdman (Eds.), *Form and meaning: Multiple perspectives* (pp. 3-23). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Schrier, L. (2001). Developing precollegiate foreign language teachers: An overlooked mission of foreign language departments. *ADFL Bulletin*, 32(3), 71-78.
- Schulz, R. (1991). Second language acquisition theories and teaching practice: how do they fit? *Modern Language Journal*, 75, 17-26.
- Schulz, R. (2000). Foreign language teacher development: MLJ perspectives — 1916-1999. *Modern Language Journal*, 84(4), 495-522.
- Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 10, 209-231.
- Teschner, R. (1987). A profile of the specialization and expertise of lower division foreign language program directors in American universities. *Modern Language Journal*, 71(1), 28-35.
- VanPatten, B. (2003). *From input to output: A teacher's guide to second language acquisition*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Vélez-Rendón, G. (2002). Second language teacher education: A review of the literature. *Foreign Language Annals*, 35(4), 457-467.
- Wolff, R.A. (1993). The history of the language as an instructional aid. *Unterrichtspraxis*, 26(1), 27-35.