

Whole Language : A Whole New World for ESL/EFL Programs*

Dumrong Adunyarittigun**

บทคัดย่อ

Whole Language ได้รับการวิจัยและได้รับการยอมรับอย่างแพร่หลายว่าเป็นวิธีการที่มีประสิทธิผลต่อการสอนอ่านและเขียนในภาษาที่หนึ่ง ในขณะที่เดียวกัน ผู้เขียนยังมีความเห็นว่า เทคนิคการสอนแบบดังกล่าวมีความเหมาะสมสำหรับการสอนอ่านและเขียน แก่ผู้เรียนภาษาอังกฤษในฐานะที่เป็นภาษาที่สอง หรือเป็นภาษาต่างประเทศอีกด้วย ดังนั้นผู้เขียนจึงใคร่เสนอแนะข้อปฏิบัติ ๗ ประการสำหรับนำวิธีการดังกล่าวไปใช้สอนอ่านและเขียนภาษาอังกฤษในฐานะที่เป็นภาษาที่สอง หรือในฐานะที่เป็นภาษาต่างประเทศ ดังต่อไปนี้

๑. การเรียนรู้การอ่านและการเขียนภาษาอังกฤษในฐานะภาษาที่สอง หรือภาษาต่างประเทศควรเริ่มจากหน่วยใหญ่ของภาษาไปสู่หน่วยย่อย หรือจากแนวคิดของเรื่องไปสู่ระดับของประโยคและคำ
๒. จุดศูนย์กลางของบทเรียนและการสอนควรเริ่มจากตัวผู้เรียน
๓. บทเรียนควรมีความหมายและเป็นวัตถุประสงค์ของผู้เรียนเอง
๔. บทเรียนควรมีบทบาทในการกระตุ้นให้ผู้เรียนมีปฏิสัมพันธ์ทางสังคมซึ่งกันและกัน
๕. ความสามารถในการรับรู้ภาษาและการใช้ภาษาควรได้รับการพัฒนาไปพร้อม ๆ กัน
๖. ภาษาแม่ของนักเรียนควรมีบทบาทต่อการสอนอ่านและเขียนภาษาอังกฤษในฐานะภาษาที่สอง หรือในฐานะภาษาต่างประเทศ
๗. ครูผู้สอนควรมีส่วนช่วยลดอุปสรรคทางจิตวิทยาที่มีผลต่อการเรียนภาษาอังกฤษ

* This article is based on and updated from work published in Adunyarittigun, D. (1993). Whole Language: A whole new world for ESL programs. College Park, MD (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 386 024)
** Ph.D. Candidate in Reading Education at the University of Maryland, College Park, USA.
Department of Curriculum and Instruction, Reading Center, College of Education, Room 1117, H. R. W. Benjamin Bldg., University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742-1175, Tel. (301) 405-3153, Fax. (301) 495-9270, Email. Dumrong@wam.umd.edu

Abstract.

Whole language which has been proven as an effective approach to teach first language literacy is presented as an appropriate means for teaching reading to learners of English as a second/foreign language. Drawing on the research evidence, the author proposes 7 significant implications for effective ESL/EFL reading instruction based on basic tenets of whole language: (1) Lessons should proceed from whole to parts; (2) Lessons should be learner-centered; (3) Lessons should have meaning and purpose for learners; (4) Lessons should engage groups of students in social interaction; (5) Receptive and generative linguistic competence should be developed simultaneously; (6) Students' native languages should be used for instruction; and (7) Teachers should help L2 learners decrease their affective filters. (116 words)

A responsibility of teachers of English as a second/foreign language (ESL/EFL) is to make reading in a second language (L2) or a foreign language possible for readers of another language. These teachers have been applying such approaches as Grammar-Translation and Basal Readers to reach this goal. Unfortunately, these traditional approaches have not always met with success. They have, in fact, caused some teachers to turn to more innovative approaches. One of these approaches beginning to interest ESL and EFL teachers is whole language. The crucial concern for these ESL and EFL teachers is how to apply whole language, a philosophical belief system widely used for first language (L1) instruction, to L2 and foreign language reading instruction.

In the whole language perspective, readers are regarded as meaning creators. They

construct meanings from texts by applying cueing systems such as orthographics, graphophonics, syntax, semantics and pragmatics. They also employ simultaneously and cyclically such cognitive strategies as initiation, sampling, inference, prediction, confirming, disconfirming and correction to construct and construe meanings (Goodman 1986, 1994). Both Goodman (1971) and Grove (1981) believed that the reading process in all languages is the same except for accommodating the orthographies and grammatical structures of each language. They also believed that the whole language perspective is as applicable in L2 learning as it is for L1 learning. A consideration of several basic tenets of whole language offers significant implications for effective ESL/EFL reading instruction.

1. Lessons should proceed from whole to parts.

In traditional EFL approaches, teachers teach from smaller units to bigger units of English language, from letters to words to sentences. Materials used include grammar textbooks, vocabulary books and controlled reading books. Students often complain of not understanding what they have learned or read, and even make acrid statements like, "English is the most bitter medicine."

According to Goodman (1986), and Freeman and Freeman (1992), the traditional L2 approaches have a tendency to make language learning difficult for L2 learners because it is hard to understand individual parts isolated from contexts of the whole. Cummins (cited in Freeman & Freeman, 1992) asserts that reduced-context books--traditional ESL reading materials--scarcely provide adequate contexts to make reading understandable.

Even when L2 readers know all the parts, namely phonology, vocabulary and grammatical structures, they often do not understand the whole. When Freeman and Freeman (1992) assigned their ESL students to read a passage without the title, they could not understand the story although they were able to articulate words and knew word meanings in the passage. If the

students had been provided the title which normally contains the main idea, they could have understood the story.

According to Krashen and Terrell's input hypothesis of L2 acquisition (1983), a second language is acquired when the inputs are comprehensible for learners. In whole language, teachers keep language whole and comprehensible by utilizing meaningful and authentic literature and by immersing L2 readers in functional and purposeful language activities. Teachers also provide L2 students with extralinguistic clues such as audio-visual aids, gestures and authentic experiences. The students can then gather abundant contexts to facilitate their comprehension.

Keeping lessons whole not only makes them more comprehensible for L2 readers, but facilitates the learners' use of their previously acquired knowledge. Krashen (1982) proposed that making lessons understandable facilitates the readers' prediction more accurately. When the L2 readers comprehend the text, they can subsequently master the parts of the language (Krashen & Terrell, 1983), namely new vocabulary and its concepts as well as phonics.

2. Lessons should be learner-centered.

In the transactional-sociopsycholinguistic model of reading (Goodman, 1994), readers

play the significant role of active meaning creators. Thus, lessons should center around learners.

Generally, L2 readers are underestimated because they have acquired inadequate linguistic competence in the target language; in other words, their experience with the L2 is limited (Boyle & Perego, 1990). Nonetheless, this does not mean that they have not acquired the most crucial component of reading--background knowledge. Studies in L2 reading (Robinet, 1980; Johnson, 1982, Levine & Haus, 1985, Nelson, 1987) have shown the pivotal role of background knowledge. Hudelson (1984), Carrell (1989), Carrell and Eisterhold (1989) and Grove (1981) suggested that ESL teachers should take advantage of the knowledge the L2 readers have already had in their first language. Their schemata should be activated and their prior knowledge should be extended before they read in order to facilitate comprehension. In addition, because the L2 readers' prior knowledge may be different from that of the target language culture, ESL teachers should also provide meaningful L2 texts pertaining to the readers' cultures at the initial stage of L2 reading. Lim's (1988), and Nurss and Hough's studies (1989) revealed that ESL readers demonstrate good comprehension of materials

culturally close to their own experiences and cultures.

Lessons should be designed based on L2 students' interests and needs (Goodman, 1986). To obtain information about students' interests and attitudes towards reading, teachers might have one-on-one reading conferences with students or gain their responses through interest inventories (Wiseman, 1992). Teachers and students should share the responsibility for planning the curriculum. Shared planning not only makes lessons serve the L2 students' needs and interests, but also makes the students have a sense of ownership (McWhirter, 1990).

3. Lessons should have meaning and purpose for learners.

Krashen and Terrell (1983) believed that L2 learners develop a second language by natural acquisition. In other words, linguistic competence is meaningfully and purposefully developed through authentic communication. To make L2 learners acquire language more easily, Krashen (1982) and Milk (1985) suggested that language learning should be focused on using language for substantive purposes rather than focused on talking about language or language structures. Likewise, the L2 reading classroom should underscore authentic reading. L2 readers should have

plenty of opportunities to read meaningful materials for authentic purposes, but not to read practice exercises. As mentioned by Maguire (1991), the L2 readers derive any language system from what they experience of it.

To motivate and interest L2 readers to read an L2 text, quality literature should be used for reading. It promotes risk-taking in constructing meanings and helps to sustain interest. L2 readers can be exposed to literature through shared reading, sustained silent reading and reading aloud. Specifically, reading aloud familiarizes L2 readers with rhythm, intonation and syntax of the new language. Additionally, reading literature can motivate the L2 learners to appreciate the second language aesthetically in a meaningful context (Heald-Taylor, 1986).

Another way to make reading more meaningful for L2 readers is to focus on content area reading (Blanton, 1992; Freeman & Freeman, 1988, 1992). L2 students do not learn a language for its own sake, but learn the language to fulfill their academic purposes. As Halliday (cited in Freeman & Freeman 1992) has pointed out, as we learn through language, we also learn about language. When L2 learners read in such content areas as science and social studies, do research on digestion systems

and discuss solutions of mathematic problems or development of cloning techniques, they meaningfully develop both their linguistic capacities and their academic abilities.

4. Lessons should engage groups of students in social interaction.

The reading process will be incomplete without the social interaction among readers. Upon finishing reading, readers may construct different meanings from the same text, miss some important points or have unanswered questions. Having an opportunity to share individual interpretations helps L2 students clarify their questions, get a variety of interesting aspects of interpretation, as well as extend their comprehension. According to Vygotsky's the Zone of Proximal Development (1978), each reader has his own zone of understanding. When readers have interaction with each other, they have the potential to extend their zone of understanding further.

In addition, social interaction with native speakers can provide L2 learners with a better sense of the nuances of the second language. During their interacting and communicating through the target language, the L2 learners unconsciously learn how, when and where utterance should be utilized appropriately (Lim, 1988). Having social interaction, especially

with native speakers, considerably motivates L2 learners to acquire and learn the L2 more effectively and meaningfully. Rigg and Allen (1989, p. VIII) have described about language learning as, "learning to do the things you want to do with people who speak that language."

Nurss and Hough (1989) also maintained that successful language learners tend to have a strong desire to be a part of a new language society and to take risks in experimenting with their linguistic capacities in meaningful communication. Thus, to promote the L2 proficiency of the L2 learners and make L2 learning more meaningful, Rigg (1991) suggested that teachers should integrate L2 students with L1 students.

5. Receptive and generative linguistic competence should be developed simultaneously.

Some ESL/EFL teachers whose instruction is based on the Audio-lingual approach believe that there should be a time gap between the presentation of oral language and written language to ESL/EFL students. They also believe that reading and writing should not be taught until the L2 students can master listening and speaking skills (Celce-Murcia, 1991). Hudelson (1984) implies that this belief is a misconception. According to her study (1984),

ESL learners can read English before they completely control their oral language. Miscue analysis studies in the second language (Connor 1981, Rigg 1989) also revealed that although some miscues generated by the L2 readers may alter some meaning of what is being read, they do not affect the L2 readers' comprehension.

In a language community, learners naturally use language to communicate not only by listening and speaking, but by reading and writing. To make a language classroom more natural and effective, all language modes should be developed simultaneously. According to Hudelson (1984), Carson, Carrell, Siberstein, Kroll and Kuehn (1990) and Wiseman (1992), the language processes-- listening, speaking, reading and writing--are mutually supportive and interrelated. Hence, when a second language is taught, each modality in the language system should not be isolated but should be developed at the same time.

6. Students' native languages should be used for instruction.

Krashen (1982, 1983) claimed in his input hypothesis that L2 learners most effectively acquire a second language when presented with comprehensible inputs. When L2 learners do not understand what is being taught in class and are not able to express their

experiences, they will remain silent. Consequently, L2 professionals as Hudelson (1987), Krashen (1991), and Terdal (1986) have encouraged the use of students' native languages in instruction. Utilizing the student's L1 for instruction is critical in providing comprehensible inputs and in building background knowledge at this initial stage of L2 learning.

In addition to utilizing the student's first language for instruction, teachers should allow L2 students to discuss texts and to exhibit their appreciation of texts through their first language. According to Connor (1981) and Rigg (1989), ESL students are able to demonstrate their profound understandings of reading materials if retelling the stories in their native language. Finally, lessons which take place in the student's first language make L2 readers gain self-confidence and have a positive attitude toward schools. The learners are aware that teachers support and respect the significance of their cultures and native languages.

7. Teachers should help L2 learners decrease their affective filters.

According to the affective filter hypothesis (Krashen, 1982; Krashen & Terrell, 1983), L2 learners acquire a language more effectively when they have a low affective filter. As such, they have a positive orientation to speakers of

the second language, low anxiety and considerable self-confidence.

There are several factors which can make the L2 learners' affective filters increase and cause them to become more resistant to learning.

First and foremost is the incautious use of standardized tests to assess the L2 learners' abilities. Such tests do not assess the authentic competence of L2 learners as many educators such as Altwerger, Edelsky and Flores (1987), and Heald-Taylor (1986) have commented. If the teachers incautiously use standardized tests with the L2 learners, most L2 students will lose their sense of success in language learning, and unconsciously increase their affective filters. If ESL teachers are required to use standardized tests, they should be cautious in their interpretation of the results. Teachers' misinterpretation of the L2 learners' linguistic competence may enhance the learners' affective filters and make learning the second language more difficult.

Another factor causing the accretion of L2 learners' affective filters is labeling the L2 learners as Limited English Proficient (LEP) (Freeman & Freeman, 1992; Smith, 1985). Labeling the L2 learners as LEP diminishes their self-confidence, and leads them to believe

that they will never succeed in language learning. The Label of L2 learners should be changed to something more positive such as Potentially English Proficient (PEP) (cited in Freeman & Freeman, 1992), and Readers and writers of English as Another Language (REAL) (Rigg & Allen, 1989). Such positive labels demonstrate the teachers' belief in the L2 learners' potential to achieve in the L2 learning; they also enhance the L2 learners' self-esteem.

The last factor affecting the L2 learners' affective filters is the teachers' feedback to students. Teachers' belief that they can best improve linguistic abilities of the L2 students by correcting their mistakes immediately is a misconception. More often, such instant criticism causes L2 learners to lose self-confidence and avoid taking risks in using their L2 abilities. Teachers' responses to L2 learners should be drawn first from the students' strengths in what they read, speak and write (Keefe & Meyer, 1991), so they will feel that there is no danger in risk-taking.

Whole language has become very popular in first language instruction. Its popularity has begun to attract ESL/EFL teachers and encourage them to translate this set of beliefs into appropriate practice with L2 learners. As more time that elapses, there will be more whole

language-based research in second/foreign language development to corroborate the effectiveness of whole language in second/foreign language teaching. Outstanding experimental research conducted in Taiwan by Chen (1992) demonstrated the superior results in using whole language in teaching EFL learners over using the Basal approach. Chen's research also serves to refute the claim by opponents that whole language has little experimental research to support it.

There is substantial research support for the belief that whole language benefits both ESL/EFL and L2 instruction:

1. Whole language underscores the idea of wholeness: lessons begin from whole to parts; learners in the language community all get involved in language activities; and all language modalities are simultaneously developed.

2. Language learning based on whole language perspectives provides comprehensible inputs to expand L2 learners' potential in learning the target language.

3. Lessons are centered upon learners.

4. Whole language respects and honors the importance of learners and trusts their potential to reach the language achievement.

5. Language instruction based on whole

language facilitates growth in both L1 and L2 (Heald-Taylor, 1986).

6. Teachers can create classroom environments which will decrease the L2 learners' affective filters and increase their potential in L2 learning and their self-esteem (Freeman & Freeman, 1992; Clark, 1992).

7. Lessons derived from learners' interests substantially motivate students to learn.

Therefore, whole language should be applied to make reading in a second language more possible and effective for ESL/EFL readers.

Acknowledgment

I would like to express my appreciation to professors who contributed to make this paper possible. First of all, I would like to thank Dr. Bess Altwerger who taught me the Sociopsycholinguistics of Reading and guided me to know what whole language is. Second, my thanks, must go to Dr. Karen Blair, my academic adviser, who never ends her encouragement to her students to do research and learn themselves. Finally, my thanks must go to Dr. James Cook, an ESL/EFL specialist of Towson State University, who devoted his valuable time to review my paper and gave me his valuable comment on a draft of this paper.

References

- Altwerger, B., Edelsky, C., & Flores, B. M. (1987). Whole language: What's new? *The Reading Teacher*, 41(2), 144-154.
- Blanton, L. L. (1992). A holistic approach to college ESL: Integrating language and content. *ELT Journal*, 46(3), 285-293.
- Boyle, O. F., & Peregoy, S. F. (1990). Literacy scaffolds: Strategies for first-and second-language readers and writers. *The Reading Teachers*, 44(3), 194-199.
- Carrell, P. (1989). Interactive text processing: Implications for ESL/Second language reading classrooms. In P. L. Carrell, J. Devine, & D. E. Eskey (Eds.), *Interactive approaches to second language reading* (pp.239-259). NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Carrell, P., & Eisterhold, J. (1989). Schema theory and ESL reading pedagogy. In P.L. Carrell, J. Devine, & D. E. Eskey (Eds.), *Interactive approaches to second language reading* (pp.

73-92). NY: Cambridge University Press.

Carson, J. E., Carrell, P. L., Silberstein, S., Kroll, B., & Kuehn, P. A. (1990). Reading-writing relationships in first and second language. *TESOL Quarterly*, **24**(2), 245-263.

Celce-Murcia, M. (1991). Language teaching approaches: An overview. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp.3-11). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Chen, J. (1992). An experimental study of whole language instruction and basal reader instruction for the junior high English as a Second Language (ESL) students in Taiwan, Republic of China (Doctoral dissertation, University of Northern Colorado, 1991). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, **52**(8), 2817A.

Clark, J. M. (1992). **Whole language literacy for at-risk learners** (Report No. RC 018 708). Washington, DC: Department of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 347-025)

Conner, U. (1981). The application of reading miscue analysis to diagnosis of English as a second language learners' reading skills. In C. W. Twyford, W. Diehl & K. Feathers (Eds), *Reading English as a second language: Moving from theory* (pp. 47-55). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University School of Education.

Edelsky, C., Altwerger, B., & Flores, B. (1991). **Whole language: What's the difference?** Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Freeman, D. E., & Freeman, Y. S. (1988). **Whole language content lessons for ESL students**. (Report No. FL 0170409). Chicago, IL: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Teachers of Speakers of Other Languages. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 295 468)

Freeman, Y. S., & Freeman, D. E. (1992). **Whole language for second language learners**. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Goodman, K. S. (1971). Psycholinguistic universality in the reading process. In P. Pimselur & T. Quinn (Eds.), *The psychology of second language learning* (pp. 135-142). NY: Cambridge University Press.

Goodman, K. S. (1980). Transactional psycholinguistic model. In H. Singer & R. B.

Ruddell (Eds.), **Theoretical models and processes of reading** (pp. 813-840). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Goodman, K. S. (1986). **What's whole in whole language?** Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Goodman, K. S. (1994). Reading, writing, and written texts: A transactional sociopsycholinguistic view. In R. B. Ruddell, M. R. Ruddell, & H. Singer (Eds.), **Theoretical models and processes of reading** (pp. 1093-1130). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Grove, M. P. (1981). Psycholinguistic theories and ESL-reading. In C. W. Twyford, W. Diehl & K. Feathers (Eds.), **Reading English as a second language: Moving from theory** (pp. 3-20). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University School of Education.

Heald-Taylor, G. (1986). **Whole language strategies for ESL students.** (Report No. FL 016 548). Ontario: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 280 287)

Hudelson, S. (1984). Kan yu ret an rayt en ingles: Children become literate in English as a second language. **TESOL Quarterly**, **18**(2), 221-238.

Hudelson, S. (1987). The role of native language literacy in education of language minority children. **Language Arts**, **64**(8), 827-841.

Johnson, P. (1982). Effects on reading comprehension of building background knowledge. **TESOL Quarterly**, **16**(4), 503-515.

Keefe, D., & Meyer, V. (1991). Teaching adult new readers the whole language way. **Journal of Reading**, **35**(3), 180-183.

Krashen, S. D. (1982). **Principles and practice in second language acquisition.** NY: Pergamon Press.

Krashen, S. D. (1991). Second language learning. In K. S. Goodman, L. B. Bird & Y. M. Goodman (Eds.), **The whole language catalog** (p. 86). Santa Rosa, CA: American School Publishers.

Krashen, S. D., & Terrell, T. D. (1985). **The natural approach.** NY: Pergamon Press.

Levine, M., & Haus, G. (1985). The effect of background knowledge on the reading comprehension of second language learners. **Foreign Language Annals**, **18**(5), 391-396.

Lim, H. L. (1988). Literacy development of Limited English Proficient (LEP) children in a whole language classroom using predictable language materials (Doctoral dissertation,

- University of Missouri-Columbia, 1987). **Dissertation Abstracts International**, 48(12), 3042A.
- Maguire, M. H. (1991). Bilingualism and whole language. **ORBIT**, 22(4), 12-16.
- McWhirter, A. M. (1990). Whole language in the middle school. **The ReadingTeacher**, 43(8), 562-565.
- Milk, R. (1985). The changing role of ESL in bilingual education. **TESOL Quarterly**, 19(4), 657-670.
- Nelson, G. L. (1987). Culture's role in reading comprehension: A schema theoretical approach. **Journal of Reading**, 30(5), 424-428.
- Nurss, J. R. & Hough, R. A. (1989). Reading and the ESL students. In K. Busch & M. Atwell (Eds.), **Proceedings of the Annual California State University, San Bernardino, Reading Conference (13th, San Bernardino, CA, May 17, 1989)** (pp. 277-311). (Report No. CS 009848). San Bernardino, CA: California State University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 313 657)
- Rigg, P. (1989). The miscue-ESL project. In P. L. Carrell, J. Devine & D. E. Eskey (Eds.), **Interactive approaches to second language reading** (pp. 206-219). NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Rigg, P. (1991). Whole language in TESOL. **TESOL Quarterly**, 25(3), 521-542.
- Rigg, P., & Allen, V. G. (1989). Introduction. In P. Rigg & V. G. Allen (Eds.), **When they don't all speak English** (pp. VII-XX). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Robinett, B. W. (1980). Reading English as a second language. In K. Croft (Ed.), **Reading of English as a second language** (pp. 355-366). MA: Winthrop Publishers.
- Smith, F. (1985). **Reading without nonsense**. NY: Teachers College Press.
- Terdal, M. S. (1986). Learning to read and write in English: Case studies of two Southeast Asian students in a Northeast urban high school (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1985), **Dissertation Abstracts International**, 46(11), 3276A.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). **Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes**. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wiseman, D. L. (1992). **Learning to read with literature**. Neelham Heights, MA: Simon & Schuster Inc.

อารมณ์ขันของกวีไทย*

ในวรรณคดีไทย **หาสุรธ** คือรสแห่งความขบขันนั้น เราพอจะหาอ่านกันอยู่ได้ทั่วไป เพราะกวีไทยมองโลกด้วยความขบขัน ด้วยความรู้เท่าทันแห่งโลกธรรม มีสุข ลาก ยศ สรรเสริญ และความตรงกันข้ามคือ ทุกข์ ความขัดสน ความตกอับ และการนิทาว่าร้าย ดังนั้นกวีจึงแทรกอารมณ์ขันเหล่านี้ไว้ในวรรณกรรม เพื่อให้ผู้อ่านได้เกิดความครื้นเครง และมีกำลังใจที่จะต่อสู้กับชะตาชีวิตต่อไป

...มูลเหตุของความขบขันนั้นมีอยู่ด้วยกัน ๓ ประการ ได้แก่ ความแปลกประหลาดผิดธรรมดา เช่นเรื่องศิระษะของขุนช้าง ความขัดแย้งกัน เช่น ตลกอ้วนผอม และการลดชั้นการกระทำให้ต่ำกว่าธรรมดา เช่น อิเหนามีระเด่นมนตรีเป็นพระเอก ผู้แต่งก็จับแขกขทานชื่อลันไคเป็นพระเอกเรื่องระเด่นลันไค เป็นต้น

ว่าเฉพาะความขบขันเนื่องด้วยความขัดแย้งกัน ฉันทน์นับถือกันว่าเป็นบทประพันธ์ชั้นสูงเพราะแต่งยาก และนิยมใช้ศัพท์แสงสูงหรรหาว ยิ่งอ่านแล้วไม่รู้เรื่องเลยเป็นดี ดังนั้นหากได้อ่านฉันทน์ที่ใช้คำศัพท์ภาษาไทยล้วน ๆ ข้ามีสำนวนจัดจ้านอย่างชาวตลาด ท่านจะรู้สึกขันทันทน์ที่ เช่น ฉันทน์ของนายชิต บุรทัตต่อไปนี้

- | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|
| ◎ ปากบอนเอะกูรู้
เรื่องนั้นจะดันดึง | หละก็กูจะตบมึง
และแคะแแต่เพราะไกรธดาล | ◎ หากกูมิช่วยดับ
ปานนั้นะคงผะ | จะระงับกระไรเหวย
กระจะหมดกระจ่างเมือง |
| ◎ รู้เห็นอะไรหน้อย
เลือกเสจะรังควาน | สิจะค้อยเสนอชาน
เอะอะอิงตะบึงไป | ◎ เรื่องใดก็ดีกู
แมนชุ่นและครุ่นเคือง | เอะแล้วรู้เณะเนื่องเนื่อง
ก็มีคิดจะไซชาน |
| ◎ ถ้าหนักกบาลมึง
นี่เล่าก็เปล่าย | จะทะลึ่งก็ตามใจ
เสาะเสะเลือกมิเห็นสม | ◎ เรื่องใครก็เรื่องใคร
มิงานประกอบงาน | เกาะเกาะโยะเะป่วยการ
เฉพาะตนก็เย็นใจ |
| ◎ เรื่องกูก็เรื่องกู
อย่าค้ายระบายลม | มิจะรู้ก็ควอรอม
เหลาะแหละให้กะใครฟัง | ◎ เรื่องกูกระนี้มึง
เป็นไรก็เป็นไป | สะเอะอิงกะใครใคร
เอะจะตบมิงับหน |
| ◎ ก่อนมึงก็มีควา
กูสู้สงบบัง | ระบุดาวระฉ่อนดั่ง
มิแคะไค้กะใครเลย | ◎ แก่ปากกะเยอค้น
ต่อไปอะไรดล | มิจะนั้นจะเคยตน
ก็จะแดงเพราะมิงบอนฯ |

*บทความกลางเรื่องของนายทองต่อ กล้วยไม้ ณ อยุธยา, หน้า ๕๖-๖๔. กรุงเทพมหานคร :

สำนักพิมพ์ศูนย์ส่งเสริมวิชาการ, ม.ป.ป.