BRINGING LINGUISTICS TO LIFE: AN ANCHORED APPROACH TO TEACHING LINGUISTICS TO NON-LINGUISTS

Arianna Berardi-Wiltshire: *Linguistics and Applied Linguistics, Massey University <a.berardi-wiltshire@massey.ac.nz>*

Peter Petrucci: *Linguistics, Massey University <p.r.petrucci@massey.ac.nz>*

Abstract

Massey University has a long established programme in Linguistics in the Bachelor of Arts, in both face-to-face and distance modes. With the recent introduction of the Bachelor of Communication, linguistics-teaching staff find themselves working with a new and growing cohort of students whose specific needs and interests unambiguously straddle the arts/social sciences *and* business. This article examines two courses that form part of the BC major and minor in Linguistics. Activities from these papers are presented as examples of the ways in which our course coordinators endeavour to meet the pedagogical challenges of 'teaching linguistics to non-linguists' by applying the principles of Anchored Instruction (Bransford et al., 1990) to embed linguistics in current issues and contexts that are authentic and often familiar to students, and by utilising students' existing skills and intuitions about language as a valuable starting point for learning and as a key to unlocking a positive sense of belonging to an established linguistics community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1990). We conclude with a reflection on the need to adapt teaching philosophies and practices to the ever-evolving needs of the student population by continually re-packaging linguistics in a new light without compromising the integrity of the discipline, an endeavour that we feel has profound and on-going implications for our identities as linguistics educators.

1. Introduction

Since its beginnings in the now remote mid-1970s, the distinctive identity of the Linguistics programme at Massey University has been largely shaped by two main factors, which throughout the years have influenced not only the range of papers offered and their content, but also, and most pertinently, the pedagogical philosophies and practises of the teaching staff. A first, historical factor is to be found in the nature of Massey University as a provider of distance education as well as of traditional face-to-face courses. A second, more recent influence is the inclusion of Linguistics as a major in the recently established Bachelor of Communication (BC), a joint degree shared by the College of Business and the College of Humanities and Social Sciences. Throughout the evolution of the programme to the present day, we have endeavoured to meet the pedagogical challenges of 'teaching linguistics to non-linguists' in a context whereby the inherent complexity of the task is compounded by the need to do so across internal and distance mode, achieving the mandated degree of cross-mode equivalence and without compromising the integrity of the discipline.

This paper discusses our approach to teaching Linguistics by examining learning activities from two offerings 172.236 Forensic Linguistics and 172.232 Language and Society in New Zealand, two papers recently tailored to align more closely with the interests of our BC students. Activities from these papers are presented here to illustrate the ways in which our course coordinators successfully apply the principles of *Anchored Instruction* (Bransford et al., 1990) to embed linguistics in current issues and contexts that are authentic and often familiar to students, and by utilising students' existing skills and intuitions about language as a starting point for learning and as a key to unlocking a positive sense of belonging to an established linguistics community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1990). The ultimate aim of the paper is to offer our experience with the principles of Anchored Instruction in teaching linguistics within our specific setting as a way to illustrate how such principles can be employed in the linguistics classroom to overcome some of the challenges of teaching linguistics to 'non-linguists', or in other words, to students who are not pursuing linguistics qualifications, and/or that have little or no previous knowledge of the subject.

The concluding comments offer a reflection on the necessity to adapt teaching perspectives and practices to satisfy the ever-evolving needs of a

complex student population Ultimately, in our experience, this necessity requires teachers to continually re-package linguistics in a new light without compromising the integrity of the discipline, an endeavour that we believe has profound and on-going implications for our identities as linguistics educators.

2. Linguistics in the BA and BC

The beginnings of Linguistics as a subject in the Bachelor of Arts (BA) saw the discipline taught through a traditional structured programme including a range of courses focused around the discipline's main subfields, i.e. phonetics, syntax, sociolinguistics, etc. In the early 2000s, in response to changes and fluctuations in the student population associated with a marked increase of international students, attempts were made to restructure the linguistics programme so to appeal to a wider range of students both within the humanities and the social sciences, whose students had the option of taking linguistics papers as electives. Primarily, this involved efforts towards framing the instruction of traditional linguistic theories and issues in ways that made them both relevant and interesting not only to students wanting to major in linguistics or traditionally related subjects such as English or European languages, but to potentially all students in the BA, irrespectively of their chosen major. Naturally this also involved a rethinking of both content and instruction strategies that would address the need to cater for internal students as well as large cohorts of distance students, maintaining a strict degree of teaching equivalence across the two modes. Roughly at the same time, the university wide adoption of new distance teaching technologies contributed to the need for innovation, offering new opportunities, but also requiring from teachers consistently high levels of flexibility and adaptability to unfamiliar strategies and tools.

Then, more recently in 2005, Linguistics as a subject was included in Massey's new Bachelor of Communication (BC), a joint degree offered through the colleges of Business and Humanities and Social Sciences. The university website describes the BC as a degree that combines Business with Humanities 'to create a well-rounded innovated communication specialist who is sought after by employers' ('BC', n.d.). Students who pursue this degree need to major in one subject from one college and minor in another subject in the other college. Possible majors from the College of Business are Communication Management, Journalism Studies, Marketing Communication

and Public Relations. From the College of Humanities and Social Sciences, possible majors include Expressive Arts, Media Studies, and Linguistics. So, for instance, a BC student might major in Linguistics and minor in Journalism Studies, or the reverse, major in Journalism Studies and minor in Linguistics.

With the inclusion of Linguistics in the BC, the programme saw the emergence of a very specific and complex set of teaching requirements arising from the combination of teaching linguistics to both majoring and non-majoring students of both BA and BC students in both internal and distance mode. Particularly pressing in this regard are the challenges associated with a current student population consisting of:

1. Students who, for the most part, have never even heard of linguistics as a subject, and have never envisaged linguistics as a potential study subject and/or career path. For these students, explanations of linguistics need to be accessible and interesting, possibly relating to areas of their personal experience.

2. Students who did not set out to major in linguistics, but that are instead pursuing majors in other subjects such as Psychology, Developmental Studies, Journalism, Media Studies and Communication Management. To these students, linguistics is made particularly interesting and worthwhile when introduced in its conceptual associations and applications to fields of knowledge they are pursuing, which most often lie beyond the humanities and social sciences.

3. Students who fall into the 'non-traditional' category, pursuing either a BA or BC through distance mode. These students tend to be more mature, both in terms of age and life experiences, and many are already in well-established careers in a wide range of contexts. Over the years this group has included, for example, police and customs officers, government consultants and language teachers in New Zealand and abroad. While these students tend to be more readily able to see the applications of linguistics outside purely academic contexts, they require specific and consistent efforts to build and maintain interest, motivation and engagement through teaching strategies that offset the sense of social isolation and lack of personal support that can be common to distance learners.

3. The Anchored Instruction approach

Anchored instruction is a technology-based type of situated-learning approach originally developed by John Bransford and The Cognitive and Technology Group at Vanderbilt University in the US state of Tennessee (Branford et al., 1990), which stresses the importance of placing learning within a meaningful, problem-solving context. Within anchored instruction, an *anchor* is a story, a context or a specific situation that includes a problem or issue to be resolved and that is designed to be of interest to the learners. The 'anchoring' reference has to do with the grounding of the teaching content through a realistic and authentic scenario, making learning meaningful for students, often allowing them to experience the same dilemmas facing experts in a given field.

In typical anchored instruction classrooms, anchors are presented through a brief video clip, and the students work together in small groups to formulate strategies for solving the problem embedded in the anchor. During this collaborative stage of the activity, students are allowed to take ownership of the problem and to become actively involved in generating a solution, while the teacher's role shifts to that of a facilitator, helping the students through the extraction and organisation of data related to the problem, allowing the students to struggle, but supporting the process when necessary. Later, on completion of the activity, the teacher might use analogous scenarios or problems to help students understand issues more deeply by exploring the relationship among different variable (e.g. *What if you encountered this same situation but instead of X you had Y?*). Similarly, extension problems requiring skills or strategies similar to those used in the initial scenarios can also be used to expand and/or strengthen learning.

Similar to problem-based learning and case-based learning, anchored instruction is based on cognitive constructivist perspectives that stress the importance of 'situated cognition' (Brown, Collins, & Duguid, 1989) and 'cognitive apprenticeship' (Collins, Brown, & Newman, 1989). Specifically, the approach was proposed as a way to engage students in activities that can help reduce the 'inert knowledge' phenomenon, whereby ideas 'are merely received into the mind without being utilised, or tested, or thrown into fresh combinations' (Whitehead, 1929:1). Overall this principle suits the teaching of linguistics well, and indeed many areas of formal linguistics are commonly delivered largely through problem-based or dataset-based lessons in traditional linguistics programmes. The point of difference with Anchored

Instruction is that the way the problem-solving task is designed, packaged and introduced to the students using anchors that encompass situations, stories, characters that are purposely designed to appeal to the students, presented though familiar media. Within such anchors, linguistic knowledge and skills are contextualised to issues and problems that are likely to be relevant to the students' own life and experiences, making it easier for them to internalise relevant concepts and to recognise when to appropriately apply these to solve similar problems in the future.

As with other forms of situated learning, anchored instruction is based on a social constructivist perspective whereby learning is seen as a function of the activity, context and culture in which it occurs, and where social interaction is crucial to learners' access to knowledge and behaviours that are specific to a particular community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991). As a beginner moves from the periphery of this community to its centre through activities of an interactive and collaborative nature, they become active and engaged with the community's culture, gradually gaining the expertise associated with full membership. Of course in order for this to happen, novices must be presented with discipline-specific content that approximates and/or reproduces the ways in which knowledge is used in real-world applications by members of the community, as it is only through authentic learning environments that learners can develop the knowledge and skills necessary to 'create, innovate and communicate' (Herrington & Herrington, 2007:69) like an expert in the field.

The principles of anchored instruction are easily applied to learning activities designed to teach linguistics both in the classroom and within online environments aimed at distance learning, where linguistics concepts, theories and applications can be introduced and illustrated by anchors that are readily available via YouTube and other online sources, and with which the students are often already familiar. On the first day of Language and Communication, for instance, students are made to engage in a preliminary analysis of the language used in a current and well-known drink driving commercial targeted at young viewers. The conclusions they come to, with some guidance from the instructor but without the use of any previously introduced linguistic concept or analytical tool, serve as a launching point into a discussion of linguistics and communication.

Even in this illustrative rather than strictly problem-solving form, our experience with elements of anchored instruction suggests that this is an effective approach that can help address many of the challenges of teaching linguistics to non linguists across different modes. Specifically, in our

experience, the use of an anchored instruction approach in our linguistics classes have helped with:

1. making information and learning more relevant, useful, and personally meaningful to our students, introducing linguistic concepts in an immediate and accessible way that can stimulate interest and facilitate learning, empowering learners to engage with the discipline independently from their academic background and level;
2. making linguistics interesting and worthwhile by introducing it in its conceptual associations and applications to the other fields of knowledge and/or experience, giving students an appreciation for the power of common concepts and cross contextual applications;
3. encouraging the adoption of multiple perspectives and social collaboration in problem-solving activities that highlight the value of individual viewpoints, promote peer-to-peer connections and contribute to stimulating and supportive learning environments, both in the classroom and by distance.

The following sections will illustrate the above points with specific examples of how the principles of anchored instructions are currently used to teach linguistics in our internal and distance courses within the BA and the BC.

4. Anchored instruction in practice

Within the programme, face-to-face teaching tends to follow a traditional lecture/tutorial/assessment format. For distance students, written study guides replace internal lectures and online forums act as the main means of student-to-student and student-to-teacher interaction. *Moodle*, Massey's online learning interface used for distance teaching, allows for the sharing of multimedia content, and increasingly distance students are also being given access to recorded lectures and to synchronous online tutorials using interactive technology such as Scopia or Adobe Connect.

Whether delivered in a classroom or online, the content of our linguistics courses is for the most part immediately linked to specific contexts and real-life situations through learning activities designed according to the principles of anchored instruction discussed above. For instance, in addition to the drink-

driving commercial mentioned above, the Language and Communication paper introduces language functions and speech acts by guiding the students through an analysis of the linguistic features in Air New Zealand inflight safety videos available on YouTube. Similarly, in Language and Society in New Zealand, students are introduced to the key factors in language maintenance and shift through a problem-based activity designed around a series of video interviews with New Zealand migrants discussing their efforts to maintain their mother tongues, also available on YouTube.

The anchors used in these activities diverge from those in traditional anchored instruction classrooms in that they are not tailor-made for the specific activities they are to be a part of; however, we believe that this does not compromise their suitability in any way. As a matter of fact, in our discipline, where the authenticity of linguistic data is so often crucial, anchors of a non-customised nature can be just as—if not more—effective than tailor-made ones in supporting students' learning by effectively demonstrating the relevance of linguistics to all areas of life where language is involved.

The basic principles of anchored instruction are so adaptable that they can be used not only to introduce new linguistic concepts in lectures, but also for extension activities in tutorials and even in tasks designed to assess different types of discipline-related proficiencies. To illustrate this point, the following two sections will examine an example of anchored instruction in a tutorial activity and as part of the preliminary stages of a course assignment task.

4.1 Forensic Linguistics tutorial activity: Acoustic analysis and authorship

Forensic Linguistics is a second-year paper popular with BC, BA and students of many other disciplines, including sciences and human health subjects. Because the prerequisite is any first-year BA paper, rather than an introductory linguistics paper, some students who enrol in Forensic Linguistics have not studied linguistics before. Consequently, the paper also acts as an introduction to linguistics. The course is broken down into four main topics, Trademark Issues, Product Liability, Questioned Authorship, and the Use/abuse of Language in Legal Contexts, all concurrently presented with information about particular linguistic subfields. For instance, the unit exploring Questioned Authorship includes segments on acoustic phonetics, syntax, corpus linguistics and pragmatics. The discussion of linguistic concepts for each unit is not exhaustive. Instead, much the way a forensic linguist acting as an expert witness might introduce linguistic concepts to

a jury (McMenamin, 2002), the linguistic material included in the paper is that which is necessary for understanding the topics and actual forensic cases under discussion.

The tutorials are designed to allow students to apply forensic analytical procedures to real-life contexts. Many of the situations that act as anchors in the tutorials are freely available on YouTube and other video-sharing platforms. One such tutorial, covering spoken authorship and intended meaning, is designed around a controversy involving an American politician on the 2012 presidential campaign trail. At a campaign event in the state of Iowa, the politician addressed welfare reform and allegedly made the following racially insensitive comment in front of the national media: 'I don't want to make black people's lives better by giving them somebody else's money.' He later denied making this comment and pointed out that welfare recipients were not limited to a specific ethnic group. He claimed that what he had actually said was not *black*, but rather *blah*, to signal a change in his line of thinking for the utterance at hand. The controversy appeared on YouTube in various forms shortly after it happened.

Figure 1: ***Rick Santorum said blah or black*** **(YouTube, n.d.)**

In the tutorial the students are asked whether an analysis based on the articulatory and acoustic phonetic concepts previously discussed in the lectures might help determine what the politician actually said at the Iowa campaign stop. Provided with a list of relevant concepts including 'phoneme', 'stop' and 'formant', the students are tasked with identifying the steps that a forensic linguist might take to shed some light on the controversy. They are also informed that their approach and possible solution to the authorship problem needs to be accessible to a non-linguistic audience, as the application of linguistics to forensic contexts is only one step to analysing language evidence. The other step is the ability to convince the layperson of the value of linguistics in such analyses. This second step is especially challenging because, as forensic linguist Malcolm Coulthard and others have observed, the layperson—whether judge, jury member, attorney, witness or defendant—generally have strong opinions about a given piece of language evidence (Coulthard and Johnson, 2007).

Working in groups in the face-to-face tutorial—or individually on the distance online forum—students tease out, present and discuss a number of sequenced steps for the problem at hand. In the past three years, the sequential steps proposed by the students have roughly been as follows:

Step 1 – Identify which part of the controversial statement should be analysed
This is a crucial starting point because, in the case at hand, students realise that an acoustic analysis of *black* versus *blah* needs to take into account the fluidity of the sequence in which the words have been uttered, meaning that the juncture between the final sound in *black* or *blah* needs to be examined in relation to the initial sound in *people*.

Step 2 – Identify how many sounds comprise the sequence
This and the following two steps illustrate that the authorship problem is one of sounds, not letters. Although self-evident for linguists, this observation can be initially perplexing for the layperson schooled in the alphabet from an early age.

Step 3 – Identify each segment as C or V

Step 4 – Identify each C or V as a specific sound
Students have learned about IPA prior to the tutorial but not all students will use IPA here. Instead, some students draw on descriptions like

'the *trap* vowel' or a '*k* sound'. This less than precise description is not crucial for the outcome of the activity and, interestingly, reflects the way in which a forensic linguist might present articulatory information to a lay audience, at least initially.

Step 5 – Plot the statement on a spectrogram and analyse the sequence identified above

Students use PRAAT for this step. The acoustic software has already been introduced and practised in the previous week's lecture.

Step 6 – Obtain exemplar recordings for comparison

Although this step has been identified and would most likely form part of a forensic linguist's analysis of this particular authorship problem, it is not practical because students do not have access to a speaker of American English whose sociolinguistic background is the same as that of the politician in question.

Once the steps have been discussed, the students embark on a general discussion of what they can see in the spectrogram of *black/blah people.* Significantly, the actual spectrogram of the controversial statement is inconclusive and contradictory. Namely, there is a fair amount of silence, which would be indicative of the juncture between the adjacent stops in *black people*. However, the vowel formants in the first word do not clearly suggest the low front vowel /æ/ like that in *black*. In fact, the formants are more indicative of the diphthong /aɪ/, which suggest the politician uttered [blaɪk]. Although the YouTube video that the students started with clearly leads a person to believe they are hearing *black people* as opposed to the politician's claim of *blah people*, it is quite possible that, as he claims, the politician did change his utterance, if ever so slightly.

This tutorial activity reveals that forensic linguistic data can be indecisive, in spite of the rigours of analysis. But what is most important for the students here is not the outcome of the analysis *per se* but rather the steps that the analysis comprises and the linguistic concepts in which those steps are grounded. But beyond the learning of the specific knowledge and processes involved in the task, the video anchor helps the students see their value in making sense of and taking an educated position on a high-stake, real real-life context that has attracted much attention, as highlighted by the footage itself and the reactions to it from the media and the YouTube community. Linguistic data 'anchored' in this way allows students to step away from their readings

and apply what they are learning to real-life situations whose understanding depends on specific linguistic concepts and tools.

4.2 Assessment task: Language planning

Language and Society in New Zealand is a course designed to teach the fundamentals of sociolinguistics with specific reference to the local context. It includes units on NZ English and te reo Māori, and relies largely on New Zealand-based research and examples as an initial platform to introduce the key elements of the subfield before exploring their applications to international contexts. As with other linguistics papers in the programme, this course makes use of the principles of anchored instruction during face-to-face lectures and tutorials, as well as in the materials designed for distance teaching. In addition, in this course, elements of this approach are found in the design of the students' assessment tasks.

One of these tasks, centred around the unit on language planning, requires the students to imagine they are acting as language planning consultants to advise the Angolan government on which language or combination of languages should feature in a hypothetical new Angolan national anthem. The main aim of the assignment is to assess the students' ability to recall and appropriately apply the sociolinguistic knowledge they have gained during the term to propose a rational and defensible solution to the kind of real-world problem a career linguist might be called upon to solve. Ultimately, the problem of language choice in a national anthem replicates previously introduced content relating to official languages and anthem languages in New Zealand: by encouraging the students to recollect such content and use it to solve the Angolan problem, the task is aimed at building an understanding of language planning principles and their applications beyond the local context.

The assignment is presented to the students as consisting of three parts. In Part A, the students are given the assignment instructions (in written form) and the instructor explains the main task to the class. To help the students begin their exploration of the linguistic situation of Angola (which they will further on their own and which will form the basis of their recommendation to the Angolan government), the students are shown a recent documentary about Angola. The documentary, which is available on YouTube, offers some basic information about the African country, its recent history and its languages.

The internal students are shown parts of the documentary in class during a tutorial session, while the distance students are given the video's URL and directed to view it online. As part of the introduction to the documentary,

Figure 2: ***Made in Angola*** **(YouTube, n.d.)**

all students are encouraged to take notes during the viewing, to record information that may be of use in forming a decision about the language(s) to be used in the new anthem.

In part B, the students are made to work together to discuss the content of the documentary using a number of prompts designed to encourage a discussion on what issues should be considered in making a decision regarding the anthem. In the classroom the discussion takes place in small groups, while distance students make use of a specific online discussion forum to post their thoughts and comments. In the exchanges that follow, key concepts are recalled, relevant information is extracted, preliminary opinions emerge and suggestions for further research and possible information sources are identified and shared.

Finally, in Part C, the students need to work individually to further their research and apply their knowledge of sociolinguistics to the information they have gathered by writing a formal report that presents and justifies their final recommendation.

While the nature of the anchor in this task makes it less likely for the students to already be familiar with it, its use as a way to introduce a real-life context and as a source of key data reflects the anchored nature of the assignment, and particularly of Part A and B, which are not in themselves assessed, but which are crucial to preparing the students for the task in part C.

In part A, the assignment's instructions and the documentary work together as the anchor through which the students are presented with an example of the 'kind of problem that experts may encounter and the knowledge that these experts use as tools' (CTGV, 1990:3). This part of the assignment reflects the importance that authenticity (of teaching content, contexts and tasks) is given in anchored instruction as a way to avoid rote or inert learning, whereby learners are able to recall knowledge when asked to, but unable to use it spontaneously in problem solving. The imaginative component of the task, which requires students to adopt the persona of a language planner (i.e. an expert), contributes an important element of stimulation and interest, while at the same time minimising the impact of potential emotional barriers between the student as a novice and/or outsider and the field, helping learners to access and apply knowledge of a linguistic nature within an unthreatening environment, while at the same time preserving the authenticity of the task.

In terms of the advantages of this task for the specific audience the course is designed to teach, particularly noteworthy is the possibility to lead students with little or no linguistics background to engage in a task that illustrates some of the discipline-related theoretical and practical aspects while at the same time drawing attention to linguistics and its applications to real-world contexts. Because of the argumentative nature of the assignment, which gives students the freedom to come to their own solution by constructing their own argument for their final choice of language(s) to be included in the anthem, the task tends to appeal to students who approach linguistics from the main perspective of other disciplines, and who are likely to use such perspectives to enrich their work. In other words, by highlighting the complex nature of sociolinguistics and its connections with related fields of knowledge and/or experience, the task helps showcase the significance of linguistics, particularly to non-majoring students, as well as to students who are completely new to the subject.

Part B of the assignment is designed as an opportunity for the students to collaborate with their peers in the preliminary stages of the problem-solving part of the assigned task. This phase is again well aligned with the principles of anchored instruction, as 'one of the goals of anchored instruction is to

help create environments that are conducive to cooperative learning' (CTGV, 1993:58). In particular, this phase, in which the students come together to brainstorm on how to use the information they collected from the documentary to begin shaping their recommendation and the supporting argument, is intended as a means to ease the students into the problem, which, partly because of its realistic nature, can be perceived as challenging and even threatening. The benefits of collaboration are particularly high for students who are completely new to linguistics and who might not yet have a firm idea of what linguistics is, as within the safer and more supportive environment of small group work, they are given the opportunity to take control of their own engagement with the task, feeling supported in their transition into the role of expert. Students who are new to the subject but have some academic grounding in other fields might use their knowledge as an entry point to the discussion and as an opportunity to contribute a fresh perspective on the problem. It is not uncommon for students' discussions at this stage to take interesting and unexpected turns resonating with ideas and terminology associated with fields such as marketing, psychology and human development. In line with the tenets of the social constructivist perspective underpinning anchored instruction, the role of the teacher as a facilitator during this stage is particularly important, not only to help learners sift through the available information and to emphasise possible links to relevant sociolinguistic concepts, but also to highlight the value of students' contributions by validating cross-discipline and cross-contextual connections. In the case of the distance learners' discussion, the same benefits extend to students who have extensive life and/work experiences, which, when contributed to the discussion, can encourage engagement and stimulate learning, enhancing students' motivation by creating feelings of self-worth and self-confidence as well as contributing to a sense of community that we know to be crucial to learning in distance mode.

5. Conclusion

As the examples above illustrate, within our specific context the principles of anchored instruction can offer useful affordances for teaching linguistics to non-linguists to meet the learning needs and interests of a complex and varied student population across two different modes. In our experience, consistently supported by positive feedback from our students, there are significant benefits in linking linguistic content with real-world issues and scenarios through

an anchored instruction approach. Especially when introducing linguistic principles and/concepts to students who are not pursuing linguistics as a major or a minor, the use of realistic anchors that connect with their other academic interests and personal experiences can enhance the immediacy, interest and relevance of linguistics as a subject for individuals from a wide range of backgrounds and walks of life. As with all teaching content and activities in our linguistics courses, we view authenticity as an absolute necessity in order to construct effective—albeit non-traditional—learning environments that help our students develop their knowledge of linguistics and their identity as a linguist (if that is what they aspire to) while at the same time providing effective training in communicating linguistics to laypeople, a skill which we view as particularly important for our students, given the wide variety of professions and careers they will be likely to pursue in the future.

References

BC. N.d. Retrieved from http://www.massey.ac.nz/massey/learning/programme-course-paper/programme.cfm?prog_id=93330

Bransford, John D., Robert S. Sherwood., Ted S. Hasselbring., Charles K. Kinzer and Susan M. Williams. 1990. 'Anchored instruction: Why we need it and how technology can help'. In Don Nix and Rand Spiro (eds) *Cognition, education, and multimedia: Exploring ideas in high technology*. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. 115–141.

Brown, John S., Allan Collins and Paul Duguid. 1989. 'Situated cognition and the culture of learning'. *Educational Researcher, 17(1)*, 32–41.

Cognition and Technology Group at Vanderbilt University (CTGV). 1990. 'Anchored instruction and its relationship to situated cognition'. *Educational Researcher,* 19(3), 2–10.

Cognition and Technology Group at Vanderbilt University (CTGV). 1993. 'Anchored instruction and situated cognition revisited'. *Educational Technology* 33(3), 52–70.

Collins, Allan, John S. Brown and Susan E. Newman, 1989. 'Cognitive apprenticeship: Teaching the crafts of reading, writing, and mathematics'. In Lauren B. Resnick (ed) *Knowing, learning, and instruction: Essays in honor of Robert Glaser* Hillsdale, New Jersey: Erlbaum. 453–494.

Coulthard, Malcolm and Allison Johnson. 2007. *An Introduction to Forensic Linguistics: Language in Evidence*. London: Routledge.

Herrington, Anthony and Jan Herrington. 2007. 'What is an authentic learning environment?' In Lawrence A. Tomei (ed) *Online and distance learning: Concepts, methodologies, tools, and applications*. Hershey, Pennsylvania: Information Science Reference. 68–76.

Lave, Jean and Etienne Wenger. 1991. *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Made in Angola. N.d. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1gdrQ7MV9Qs
McMenamin, Gerald R. 2002. *Forensic Linguistics: Advances in Forensic Stylistics*. Boca Raton, Florida: CRC Press.
Rick Santorum said blah or black. N.d. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VR-ceU0oXBo
Whitehead, Alfred N. 1929. *The aims of education*. New York, New York: New American Library.