TESOL QUARTERLY

Volume 3 | June, 1969 | Number 2

Table of Contents

To print, select PDF page nos. in parentheses

Adding a Second Language . . . . *Clifford H. Prator* 95 (3-12)

TESOL: Current Problems and
Classroom Practices . . . . *Ronald Wardhaugh* 105 (13-24)

Linguistic Universals and
Their Relevance to TESOL . . . . . *Roderick A. Jacobs* 117 (25-30)

Linguistic Universals, Deep Structure, and English
as a Second Language . . . . *Ralph B. Long* 123 (31-40)

TESOL Today—A View from the Center . . *Sirarpi Ohannessian* 133 (41-49)

Implications for ESOL of Some Recent
Linguistic Research . . . . *William E. Rutherford* 143 (50-56)

The Present Perfect Again . . . . *Bruce Pattison* 151 (57-62)

Providing for ESL Pupils During the
Total School Day . . . . *Ruth Perlman Klebaner* 157 (63-65)

Songs in Language Learning . . . . *Jack Richards* 161 (66-79)

ERIC-TESOL Documents 175

Announcements 182

Publications Received 183

TESOL QUARTERLY

A Journal for Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages

TESOL OFFICERS 1969–70

President
David P. Harris
American Language Institute
Georgetown University

First Vice President
Mary Finocchiaro
Hunter College

Second Vice President
John A. Upshur
English Language Institute
Ann Arbor, Michigan

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The officers and

Paul W. Bell (ex officio)
Dade County Board of Education (Florida)

Julia M. Burks
U.S. Information Agency

Harry Freeman
San Francisco State College

Tom R. Hopkins
U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs

William E. Norris
University of Pittsburgh

Alfonso Ramirez
Region One Education Service Center
Edinburgh, Texas

Pauline Rojas
Miami, Florida

Rudolph Troike
University of Texas

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

James E. Alatis
Georgetown University

EDITOR

Betty Wallace Robinett
University of Minnesota

EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD

Virginia French Allen
Temple University

Marie Esman Barker
University of Texas, El Paso

Evelyn Bauer
U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs

Eugène J. Brière
University of Southern California

Mary Finocchiaro
Hunter College

Maurice Imhoof
Ball State University

Andrew MacLeish
University of Minnesota

A. Iris Mulvaney
Tucson, Arizona
Public Schools

Bernard Spolsky
University of New Mexico

Hadley Thomas
Tuba City, Arizona
Public Schools

Membership in TESOL ($6.00) includes a subscription to the journal.
TESOL QUARTERLY is published in March, June, September, and December.
Business correspondence should be addressed to James E. Alatis, Institute of Languages and Linguistics, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.

Copyright © 1969

Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages

Vol 3 No 2 Jun 1969

*Adding a Second Language**

Clifford H. Prator

This paper attempts to sum up, in non-technical terms, the essential differences between the acquisition of a first and a second language. It represents a conviction that a large number of the key concepts of TESOL can be drawn out of this type of comparison.

1. Acquiring the Mother Tongue

A very significant difference between the acquisition of one's mother tongue (L1) and adding a second language (L2) is that the former is merely *learned* whereas the latter must usually be *taught.* Though the difference is not absolute, it still has enormous consequences.

There is a great deal of interest today in finding out exactly how a child does learn his L1, and a large amount of research is being carried out in an attempt to discover just how and when the various components of language mastery are developed. Though few incontrovertible facts are as yet available for the guidance of the language teacher, the various stages in which the learning process takes place are coming to be understood with increasing clarity.

The first phase is often labeled *the exploratory stage.* Just as the newborn child instinctively exercises his limbs in order to develop them, he also exercises his lungs, mouth, tongue, and lips to produce sounds. His early cries of anger, pain, fear, or hunger are soon supplemented by increasing amounts of babbling activity, apparently aimed at exploring the range of his own vocal possibilities. He often makes a wide variety of sounds which he can never have heard before and which he would find it very difficult to emit later as an adult: velar spirants, voiceless nasals, retroflex sibilants, or simultaneous labio-velar stops plus vowels.

The second phase of language learning has been called the *imitative stage.* There are signs that the infant is beginning to pay more attention to the speech sounds made by other people, and he may even become temporarily less vocal himself as he concentrates on listening to others. The sounds he produces become progressively more similar to those made by his elders, and he abandons many of his earlier sounds altogether. His parents find that, by giving him the benefit of every doubt, they can identify some of his sounds as the vowels and consonants of the mother tongue.

---

* This was the opening paper presented to the Pre-Convention Study Groups at the TESOL Convention, March 1969.

Mr. Prator, Professor and Vice-Chairman of the Department of English, University of California, Los Angeles, is the author of *Manual of American English Pronunciation* (Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967) and many articles on teaching English as a second language. In 1967-68 he was Field Director of the Survey of Language Use and Language Teaching in Eastern Africa.

At first there are very few of these recognizable sounds, and each production of one of them may vary widely from other productions of what the infant and eventually his listeners come to think of as the same sound. Little by little, successive productions of the same sound grow more standardized and the distinction between sounds is therefore clearer. What has happened so far can be explained in terms of B. F. Skinner's theory that a habit is formed by a shaping process involving successive approximations to a behavioral model. Perhaps the infant is motivated at this stage by his urge to imitate and by the approval of his elders.

In his earliest efforts to speak, the child typically favors one vowel and one consonant, seeming to prefer to produce them with the consonant first and the vowel following it; his first syllable is often recognized by his delighted parents as /ma/, /da/, or /ga/. The child may then split his general, all-purpose consonant into a stop and a continuant, learning to distinguish between a sound something like /na/ and another a little like /da/. The general vowel may then split into a high vowel and a low vowel. The stop may split into a pair, one of whose members is voiced, the other voiceless. Somewhat as a primitive organism develops through the splitting of cells, the child's phonological system becomes more complicated as he learns to make use of the various features—such as voicing, aspiration, and nasalization—that are used in his mother tongue in various combinations to distinguish between sounds and between words.

He now has what can be thought of as a stock of words to which he can attach meanings. This is when he begins to produce one-word sentences and finds that they can effect more specific desirable results than can be effected by mere noise-making. "/ap/" may result in his being picked up and cuddled. He can obtain the box he wants to play with by articulating "/ba/." A good, clear "/dada/" will attract the attention of the male parent. More and more he relies on speech to fulfill his basic physical and emotional needs. His linguistic successes are immediately reinforced by tangible rewards.

Sometime during the child's second year he usually begins to enter the third phase of learning his mother tongue, the *analogical stage.* He has developed a small vocabulary of content words that symbolize people, things, actions, qualities, places, directions, etc. He now draws on his innate language ability to try to relate these ideas one to another.

Still without any awareness that he is learning a language, he explores the various possibilities of patterning among words. When does one make a certain group of words and with a certain sound as his elders do? What is the effect of making one word precede or follow another? Or of pronouncing one word on a higher pitch than another? What is the meaning of those obscure little words that people seem to insert between important words? In other terms, he becomes aware of the existence and potential significance of inflectional and derivational endings, word order, stress, intonation, and function words as opposed to content words.

In experimenting with patterns he produces word forms that he has never

heard before and, eventually, completely new sentences that no one has ever before uttered. His listeners detect only a few of these—those that violate the accepted norms of the local adult speech community. Many children independently invent such forms as *feets, childs, brung, catched,* and *more better.* I shall never forget some of the analogical creations of my own children. Upon being somewhat violently admonished to behave, one of them answered in an aggrieved voice: "But Dad, I *am* being have." Another replied to a warning about diving into shallow water with a memorable: "Yeah, I know. Many a people have cracken their head on the bottom of the pool."

Seldom is the child corrected for such "mistakes." He gradually learns to avoid them because his listeners do not understand him, laugh at him, or simply never use those patterns themselves. In Skinnerian terms, the stimulus responses no longer occur because they are not positively reinforced.

Though sentences of this aberrant type, in which each departure from accepted norms can be justified by an impeccable analogy with acceptable patterns, do not persist long in the child's speech, the irrefutable fact that all normal children do produce such sentences may have great significance for the language teacher. It seems clear that a child does *not* learn to speak his mother tongue by imitation alone. Nor can such creations as "many a people have cracken their head" be satisfactorily explained as the result of a mechanical process of habit formation. The most convincing explanation of the child's ability to create new sentences appears to be that put forward by the current school of transformational grammarians: he acquires his competence by internalizing the rules that the grammar of his L1 prescribes for the generation of sentences. And he normally does this without ever knowingly formulating the rules himself or hearing them formulated.

When the child enters school, he begins the fourth and final phase of acquiring his mother tongue, the *stage of formal instruction* Up to now he has merely been *learning* the language; it would be grossly inaccurate in most cases to say that he has been *taught* it. Now, for the first time, someone undertakes to teach it to him; but what remains to be taught? Charles C. Fries used to go so far as to say that nothing essential remains to be taught and that the child has already mastered his language before he goes to school.

Today we tend to regard such statements as considerable exaggerations, but there is certainly a large amount of truth in them. Fries was equating "language" with "speech." What he was really saying was that a pre-school child has already mastered the essentials of speaking his mother tongue: its phonological and grammatical systems. All that remains to be done in school is to enlarge his vocabulary and to teach him to read and write, to make him literate.

Many of us would not agree with his conviction that the spoken language *is* the language and that writing is merely an imperfect symbolization of speech. It seems more realistic and helpful for teachers to regard English speech and writing as two closely related but distinct linguistic systems each of which should be given equal priority in education for modern urban living.

Moreover, research such as that of Mildred Templin, Frederick Davis, and Jean Berko has shown that the average six-year-old is still far from having mastered many basic essentials of the spoken form of his L1. Phonemicization—the process described earlier in this paper whereby the child singles out certain sounds as the only distinctive sounds in his language—is far from complete at the age of six. Many children have still not learned to produce some of the rarer sounds in the mother tongue's phonological inventory. Many have not yet internalized some of the most basic rules of the grammar, such as that which in English governs the alternation among the three forms of the plural endings: /–s/, /–z/, and /–əz/.

Be that as it may, most pupils get very little intentional help from their teachers in their efforts to increase their command of the spoken language after they have entered school. In some well developed school systems an organized attempt is made to augment the child's vocabulary through activities designed to lead him to form new concepts. But over most of the world teachers concentrate almost all their efforts during the first year or two of schooling on teaching their pupils to read and write. Henceforth, most vocabulary development takes place as a by-product of reading.

2. Teaching a Second Language

From time to time theoreticians have championed a so-called "natural method" of second-language teaching. The basic tenet of the method is that children should, in so far as possible, be allowed to learn their L2 in exactly the same way they learned their L1. This implies that there is no need for the teacher to concern himself with drills, or correctness, or organizing his subject matter. All he needs to do is to create situations in which the child will feel a sufficiently strong need to use the L2. He can then content himself with encouraging the child to persevere through a prolonged period of trial-and-error activity, and the language will eventually be learned. The method would seem to be about as sensible as trying to train a telegraph operator by giving him exciting news to transmit and then leaving him to work out the Morse Code for himself without benefit of systematic instruction.

There is actually no way whereby the circumstances under which a child learned his mother tongue can ever be reduplicated for the learning of a second language. The rest of this paper will be devoted to a consideration of the basic differences between acquiring an L1 and adding an L2. These differences will be classified under ten headings:

1. Time available
2. Responsibility of the teacher
3. Structured content
4. Formalized activities
5. Motivation
6. Experience of life
7. Sequencing of skills
8. Analogy and generalization

9. Danger of anomie
10. Linguistic interference

One of the most self-evident differences is the much more limited amount of *time available* for acquiring the second language. The child normally has at his disposal almost all the waking hours of whatever number of years he needs to master his mother tongue. During that time he can experiment with new sounds, try out novel structural patterns at his leisure. He constantly hears authentic models of the type of speech he needs to learn and can usually afford to listen or not as he pleases. If he doesn't understand a word the first time he hears it and it is really something he needs to know, he can be sure that he will have many further opportunities to grasp its meaning.

But, unless his cirmustances are quite exceptional, he must learn his second language largely at school, within the brief hours set aside in the schedule for teaching it. The total amount of time available varies considerably from school system to school system. If he wishes to be a polyglot, the Filipino child is lucky. He will begin to study English at least one period per day in the first grade, and from the third grade on he may receive all of his instruction in English. He will probably hear it spoken and sometimes may even have an opportunity to speak it outside of class. On the other hand, the cards are stacked against the average American who wants to learn French. He will be fortunate if his school offers two full years of instruction in the language and if his teacher allows him actually to try to speak French for a few hours of that time. He may never, alas, have an opportunity to use his L2 for any practical purpose in school or out. Even the Filipino, however, has to learn his second language in a small fraction of the time he had at his disposal for learning his first.

The shorter the time available for instruction, the greater the *responsibility of the teacher* to see to it that full advantage is taken of every precious minute. The necessity for careful planning and timing is still further increased by the fact that, whereas the L1 teacher is responsible for only a tiny portion of his pupils' language experience, the L2 teacher is responsible for almost all of it. In the second-language classroom there is both much more to be taught and much less time in which to teach it. The teacher of the mother tongue can afford to devote a great deal of attention at an early stage to the mechanics of writing and at a later stage to the niceties of usage, but his second-language counterpart must first deal with much more basic elements of language. One of the chief concerns of the former is to build up his pupils' vocabulary; the latter can allow himself to introduce only a small, carefully selected stock of the most useful new words.

Because of the pressure of time, the L2 teacher can afford to use only the most economical and effective instructional techniques. There may be differences of opinion as to what these are, but I think almost no one would argue, with regard to the most elementary stages of teaching a second language, that it is either economical or efficient to allow pupils to flounder through long periods of trial-and-error activity. Such activity inevitably leads to the

formation of incorrect speech habits, which then have to be unlearned. And few processes can be more time consuming than unlearning well established habits.

One of the principal responsibilities, then, of the L2 teacher is to see to it that his pupils use correct language as often as possible. This does not mean that he must constantly correct them for the slightest error. That is seldom either feasible or desirable. Too many corrections by the teacher can render activities meaningless and reduce sensitive children to stubborn silence. What it does mean is that the teacher finds as many ways as he can to prevent the occurrence of errors. In other words, he begins by supplying the best possible model for imitation; he controls the language to be used. Then, little by little, when he is convinced that his pupils have mastered the material at hand, he relaxes his control to the extent that the absence of errors permits relaxation. The whole process, repeated each time new language material is to be taught, can be thought of as a gradual progression from the manipulation of language to communication through language.

Another consequence of the pressure of time is that the linguistic *content* of an L2 course, and even the content of each class of such a course, needs to be carefully *structured.* In an elementary L1 class, where attention is focused on developing the skills of reading and writing, there is room for a very large amount of spontaneity and improvisation. Structural controls are not essential in the reading selections, provided that the sentences are not too long and complicated. But the L2 teacher must be aware at all times of just what elements of the language he is teaching. There is a clearly determined inventory of sounds and combinations of sounds that his pupils must master. He cannot afford to omit or slight any of them, and he should observe an ordered sequence in introducing them.

Completeness and sequencing are perhaps even more important in his major task, which is that of making certain that his pupils have an adequate opportunity to master the basic structures and sentence patterns that the grammar of the language permits. The pupils must then be given a chance to internalize the various formulas whereby the basic patterns are expanded, shortened, transformed, and embedded in other patterns to generate more complex sentences. All this requires practice and more practice. If a basic structure is overlooked somewhere early in the sequence, there can be no assurance that it will sooner or later reappear as a matter of chance sufficiently often to be learned. This is not to say that there is no room at all in the second-language class for spontaneity and improvisation. Without improvisation there is probably no true communication. It does seem to mean, however, that even spontaneity must be timed and rationed.

The rate at which a child acquires a second language probably depends above all else on the amount of time he spends in actually using the language. Whereas the L1 teacher can encourage pupils to speak one at a time and even allow them the option of remaining silent if they feel so inclined, the L2 teacher is forced to rely much more heavily on *formalized activities* in which

participation is obligatory. He must have at his command an extensive repertory of drill techniques. These should range from purely manipulative drills in which all the child has to do is to imitate a model, through predominantly manipulative drills that require the child to supply certain linguistic elements within a framework provided by the model, through predominantly communicative activities over whose linguistic content the teacher still retains some slight degree of control, to purely communicative activities such as free conversation and the writing of original compositions. Many L2 teachers feel that choral drills, in which groups of pupils or all the members of the class participate simultaneously, are an essential part of the repertory because they effectively multiply the amount of time each child spends in actually using the language.

Since formalized activities tend to be boring if they are continued for too long, the L2 teacher must learn to move from one activity to another in a rhythm that provides sufficient drill for mastery but that also moves fast enough to give the pupils a sense of achievement. As Earl Stevick has pointed out, this probably involves skill in recognizing technemes; Stevick defines a techneme as a classroom technique that pupils will react to as being different from a previously used technique.

Most of the remaining basic differences between acquiring an L1 and adding an L2 arise not so much from the fact that a more limited amount of time is available for the L2 but that the child usually begins to learn his second language at a more mature stage in his general development. Perhaps the most far-reaching in its effects of these differences is the difference in *motivation.* Recent research has been rather inconclusive as to the importance of some of our cherished methodological dogmas, such as our preference for presenting grammar inductively rather than deductively and our earlier insistence that structural patterns be drilled to the point of over-learning. On the other hand, all the pertinent research that I am aware of, particularly that of Wallace Lambert and his colleagues at McGill University in Montreal, has clearly demonstrated the central importance of motivation.

The child learns a great deal of his mother tongue without awareness that he is learning. His most basic drives—hunger, fear, the need for affection—urge him to communicate. His very existence depends on his ability to make his needs known in some way to those upon whom he is utterly dependent. It is hard to imagine how stronger motivation could exist. As he grows older his degree of independence of course increases, and he is certainly aware in school that he is being taught how to read and write. Even so, his motivation usually remains fairly high: it is not hard to comprehend the value of becoming literate, and many children really do discover that reading is fun.

But how inferior is the natural motivation for learning a second language! Instead of being a tool for the satisfaction of immediate needs, it may seem more like a questionable superfluity. It may be associated with unsympathetic foreigners or an objectionable social group rather than with the learner's family, peers, and favorite people.

Obviously, the L2 teacher must bend every effort toward supplying at least a portion of the natural motivation that is lacking. He must try to show that native speakers of the language are an interesting and even an admirable lot who have said and written many things that can enrich anybody's life. He may be able to convince his pupils that mastery of the language will open doors to professional advancement that would otherwise remain closed. Above all he will need to make sure that his pupils often experience that simplest and most solid of the satisfactions that accompany the successful learning of an L2, the pleasure of being able actually to communicate thought in a language other than one's own. He certainly cannot allow them to conclude, basing their judgment on what goes on in the classroom, that most of what is said in the second language is empty verbiage unrelated to reality. Even manipulative drill can be made meaningful.

A second consequence of increased maturity is a wider *experience of life.* The L2 teacher has less need than does the L1 teacher to provide his pupils with new, non-linguistic experiences. A child normally brings to learning his second language a larger stock of more sophisticated concepts than he brought to acquiring his first. This is one reason why readers in English, for example, that have been written for American children are not usually suitable for, say, Filipino children. Such texts tend to be too difficult linguistically and too simple conceptually. Unless this difference is kept in mind, L2 drills prepared for adolescents and adults may turn out because of the simple-minded language in which they are written to be an insult to the intelligence of the learners.

Almost inevitably the native speaker of a widely written language learns the skills involved in mastering his mother tongue in a certain fixed order: first hearing, then speaking, then reading then writing. Is this *sequencing of skills* equally inevitable in the teaching of a second language? There is a great deal of evidence that it is certainly not inevitable and, indeed, that it may sometimes not even be desirable. Every year thousands of graduate students in American universities learn to read French or German, because they must do so to fulfill advanced degree requirements, without ever having spoken either language. It may be argued that they do not really read but merely decipher with the aid of a dictionary. I am not sure that this is anything more than a verbal quibble. It cannot be denied that they do manage to get meaning from the printed page. And if that is all they need to do with their French or German, then it hardly seems justifiable to criticize the method on the grounds that that is not the way in which children learn their mother tongue.

Perhaps it is wise to maintain, except in cases of special need like that of the graduate students cited above, that the pupils in an L2 class should generally speak only what they have first heard and understood well, should read only what they have spoken, and should attempt to write only what they have read. This seems to be a particularly wise policy in a school system like that of Kenya or the United States, in which English is almost

universally the medium of instruction at all levels. In the lower grades of such schools teachers—and parents—tend to measure achievement in terms of reading alone, and the pressures to begin reading early may therefore become nearly irresistible. If, however, the children are required to read large amounts of material with which they have not earlier familiarized themselves in oral form, they have no other recourse than to parrot, to mouth words without understanding their meaning. In time parroting may become a fixed habit, a besetting sin that imperils the mental development of the child. Anyone who has worked in the schools of Kenya or who has studied the problems of Spanish-speaking children in American schools will recognize the reality of the danger.

There is a great and, it seems to me, insufficiently recognized difference between sequencing skills in terms of the linguistic material contained in one lesson or unit of lessons, as described at the beginning of the preceding paragraph, and sequencing them in terms of the total skills. Some methodologists, basing their judgment on the analogy with first-language learning, have gone so far as to say that the L2 teacher should not ask his pupils to begin to speak until they have learned to hear the differences between all the sounds that the language distinguishes, that pupils should not be allowed to read before they have mastered all the essentials of the spoken language, etc. Such a doctrine seems to ignore the well established fact that, as children mature, they tend rapidly to become more visually-minded. That is to say, they find it increasingly difficult to learn and remember a word without having seen it in writing. There is evidence that prolonged postponement, over a period of months or even years, of all contact with the written form of the language in an L2 class may be definitely counter-productive. Therein may lie another basic difference between acquiring an L1 and adding an L2.

As his maturity increases, a child also becomes more capable of learning through *analogy and generalization.* We have noted that in his linguistic development he begins to make good use of these processes as early as his second year. It seems reasonable to assume that they can be even more useful in teaching him his second language than they were to him in learning his mother tongue. We are not yet sure whether it is better actually to formulate the rules that govern the generation of sentences in the L2 or merely to lead the child to internalize them without overt formulation. There are also differences of opinion as to whether the formulation should be done by the pupils or by the teacher. But rules can obviously provide a short-cut to learning. This belief is in harmony with the modern view of language as rule-governed behavior rather than as the result of a mechanical process of habit formation. Provided that the rules are phrased in the simplest and most non-technical language possible and that learning them is never confused with being governed by them, it is difficult to see how formulating them could be other than helpful.

By acquiring his L1 a child relates himself more closely to his own speech community and culture. When he learns an L2, he is in *danger of anomie,*

or alienation from his own culture. How can the danger be avoided or at least minimized, especially in a situation in which the L2 is begun early and eventually becomes the medium of instruction? This is one of the most significant problems of second-language teaching. Unless it can be solved, English may in time lose much of the favor it now enjoys in many of the world's newly independent countries. The spokesmen for ethnic minority groups within the United States are becoming increasingly insistent that it be solved in American schools. The search for a solution is made more difficult by the teachers' conviction, already alluded to in this paper, that a language cannot be well taught apart from the culture of which it is an expression and that adequate motivation for learning an L2 is impossible unless the pupils are favorably disposed toward those who speak the language natively. Part of the solution may lie in dividing instruction into two phases, in Africanizing or Hispanizing the subject matter dealt with during the first phase, and in postponing any attempt to explain British or traditional American culture until the second phase. Until a more complete solution is worked out, second-language teaching will continue to be characterized and bedeviled by the need for serving two apparently contradictory sets of goals.

I have saved until last the difference that is perhaps of most interest to linguists, the difference that arises from the *linguistic interference* which affects every element of teaching a second language. Whereas the child acquires his L1 without prejudice or predisposition toward certain forms of language, when he comes to add his L2 he must do so against the ingrained and often misleading influence of his mother tongue. I have saved this point until last and include it here only for the sake of completeness. Its importance is so obvious and it has so frequently been discussed at length that it hardly seems necessary to consider it further in this paper.

Vol 3 No 2 Jun 1969

*TESOL: Current Problems and Classsroom Practices**

Ronald Wardhaugh

This paper is devoted to a discussion of some of the current theoretical problems that we face in teaching English to speakers of other languages in order to relate the theory of teaching English as a second language to some current practices in teaching English as a second language. It attempts to bridge the gap between the *practical* orientation of teachers and the theoretical concerns that should underlie practice. We can never ignore theory in talking about classroom practices, because good practices must necessarily be built on good theory. Every classroom practice that we have derives from an underlying theory of some kind: every good practice derives from an adequate or good knowledge of language, psychology, and pedagogical philosophy; every bad practice gives evidence of some or other weakness in our understanding of language, or of psychology, or of pedagogy.

In building, or at least attempting to build, a bridge between practice and theory, *linguistics, psychology* and *pedagogy* will be discussed in turn. I intend to ask what some of the problems are in each of these three disciplines and show how these problems have certain consequences for classroom practice. In the conclusion, reference will be made to an interesting paper written several years ago by a former president of the TESOL organization, Professor Anthony of the University of Pittsburgh, in which he discussed the differences between *approach, method,* and *technique* in second language teaching.[1] This paper will present further arguments for keeping such important distinctions in mind in planning our teaching. Like Anthony, I too will insist on the priority of approach over method, and, in turn, of method over technique.

First of all, what are some of the current problems in the discipline of linguistics as that discipline bears on problems of language teaching and language learning? One of the very first problems is that of coming to an understanding of the nature of language itself. While all linguists will acknowledge that a language is a system of some kind, they will tend to disagree among themselves as to how that system should be characterized and what its total scope should be. Is it, for example, a system which may be expressed in a set of rules, or a set of patterns, or in some other special kinds of grammatical category? Should the system merely describe or characterize a set of sentences which the linguist has happened to observe, possibly a very large set, or should it characterize the set of all possible sentences, a set he has no

---

* This paper was Presented to the Pre-Convention Study Groups at the TESOL Convention, March 1969.

Mr. Wardhaugh, Director of the English Language *Institute, The* University of Michigan, is the author of *Reading: A Linguistic Perspective,* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1969).

1 Edward M. Anthony, "Approach, Method, and Technique," *English Language Teaching,* 17 (1963), 63-7.

possible hope of everobserving because it is an infinite set? Even if linguists agree that a language is a system which may be expressed in the form of rules, there may well be disagreement about the "reality" of the rules a particular linguist writes. Are the rules he writes in his grammar psychologically real; that is, do they somehow also exist in a speaker's and a listener's minds, or are they merely an artifact, a peculiar view of what a linguistic description should be and should encompass? It is certainly true to say that in many cases there is a great deal of confusion about the terms *rule* and *rule of grammar* and it is well to be on the alert for potential confusion in the use of these terms.

Linguists will also tend not to be in complete agreement about what the discipline of linguistics is all about. Some will say that linguistics is really a search for language universals, that it is for linguistic characteristics which may be found in all languages; others will say that linguistics is a search for methods of analysis; still others will be concerned with making language descriptions, particularly descriptions of exotic languages, on a largely *ad hoc* basis. The results of such different emphases, of course, are very different kinds of linguistic interests, varying according to the particular linguist one reads or listens to, and very different kinds of understandings about the discipline of linguistics itself. It is not surprising, therefore, that there is a variety of views as to what a grammar is. Is a grammar a theory both about language in general and one language in particular, or is a grammar no more than a description of one language, or is a grammar simply some kind of demonstration that a particular linguistic analysis is workable? Then, even given some measure of agreement about what language is, what linguistics is about, what a grammar is or should be, there may well still be disagreement about whether actual language use is a *skill* which is largely *habitual* or an *ability* which is largely *creative.* Is language use a skill which can be learned much as one learns to type, or is it an ability, an ability like walking, which is acquired in an entirely different way from typing skill. Everyone learns to walk but not everyone learns to type. And everyone learns to talk, too. There do appear to be some critically important differences which must be recognized.

When attention is turned to second language learning and we examine it in the light of what linguists believe a language and grammar to be, we must ask ourselves what must be learned. Is it some kind of system of abstract rules, or some kind of system of habits, or some set of general principles? Or is it a collection of specific items, for example, "sentences" or "patterns," which are then manipulated by the second language learner in a way that we do not well understand today? Most linguists will admit that they really do not know much At all about exactly what must be learned in second language learning.

This overview of the discipline of linguistics suggests that there are all kinds of unanswered questions. In fact, one could say that linguists are currently more concerned with formulating questions than with proposing an-

swers. A healthy attitude towards this state of affairs would be to accept it as a sign of the good health of the discipline, for it indicates the likelihood of major new advances, not of decay and dissolution. It is possible to see some of the results of this kind of concern for formulating interesting questions if one looks at certain very specific linguistic concepts which have been around for many years. For example, the concept of the phoneme has been with us for several decades. This concept has always been a controversial one in linguistics and it is just as controversial today as it was a decade or two ago. However, today the controversies relate to an entirely different set of problems: they now relate to the connection between meaning and sound within an overall language system rather than to such problems as neutralization and overall system, which plagued linguistics for so long. Then again the distinction between a class of words called *verbs* and another called *adjectives,* which seems to many of us to be such a simple and obvious distinction, has been called into question by some linguists who believe that verbs and adjectives are really the same kind of word. They claim that adjectives behave very much like verbs and that there are really only basically three types of words: noun-like words, verb-like words, of which adjectives are a sub-group, and a set of relational words, which do not have any propositional or referential content and function therefore quite differently from the other two types. There are many such problems one could discuss: the current concern with the place of meaning in linguistic analysis and linguistic description; the concern with various kinds of abstract syntactic processes; and the concern with the relationship of meaning to syntax, and of meaning and syntax together to phonology. In all of these areas the student of linguistics will see many questions asked, for linguistics is in a state of rapid development, of quick changes, and of great excitement. However, he will find few answers.

It is well to ask at this point how such facts as these influence what we do in our TESOL classrooms. How do current concerns in linguistic theory bear on classroom practices? First of all, we must say that our students still have to learn certain things if they are to speak the second language, regardless of the state that theoretical linguistics finds itself in. For example, students who are learning English must still learn to distinguish *beet* from *bit,* *bait* from *bet,* and *bet* from *bat.* They must learn that in English those words which we may still want to refer to as adjectives go in front of nouns, and that subjects usually precede predicates. They must still learn that adjectives do not agree in number with nouns. They must still learn that an animal which barks is called a *dog,* not a *Hund,* nor a *chien,* nor a *perro.* They must still learn what the acceptable sentence patterns of English are, even though these sentence patterns might be called *surface structures* and be somehow of less interest to theoretically-minded linguists than something called *deep structures.* Our students must still learn that there are basic building blocks which they must be able to put together to make sense in the new language. They must still learn to speak by being required to do some speaking, for they cannot possibly learn to speak only by thinking about

speaking. Therefore, they need drill and they need practice. We cannot hope to inject them with some kind of abstract underlying structure in the hope that they will come out speaking English, several recent claims apparently to the contrary notwithstanding.

Certainly the discipline of linguistics is in a state of flux and the questions being asked are extremely theoretical. However, we cannot teach English as a second language by teaching our students to understand the questions or the theoretical formulations of some of the proposed answers. The students still need to hear dialogues; they still need to have expansion drills in which, given one part of a sentence, they add on another part, add then another part, and finally build up the complete sentence, as it were, from the back to the front. Students need substitution drills in which they learn to deal with problems such as anaphora, that is, the problems of the substitution of words like *it, one* and other pronominals, those very difficult words in English. They also need transformational exercises to practice changing one structure into another. It should be emphasized that *transformation* in this sense is not the transformation beloved of the generative-transformationalist grammarian. The generative-transformationalist uses the term transformation in an entriely different way, so that again it is necessary to be on the alert for confusion.

Now it is quite legitimate to ask, as many linguists do, what exactly a child is learning about language when he mimics dialogues, when he expands sentences, when he makes substitutions, when he changes one sentence into another. We are surely not just teaching the child rote habits which are completely unproductive, as sometimes we are accused. We are somtimes also accused of stifling his creativity, or, less severely, of not recognizing the fact that language use is a creative activity, and that creativity cannot be encouraged or even initiated by the kinds of exercises we employ. However, those who have criticized such practices have not yet demonstrated how a learner can create a second language *without* stimuli, and they have not been afraid to use language stimuli in their own teaching which look rather like those so many of us have been using for quite a long time. There is obviously need for good stimuli in language teaching, and the kinds of exercises just mentioned (mimicry, expansion, substitution and transformation) seem to be necessary in any kind of systematic second language teaching. It would be entirely foolish for us to throw these overboard in order to sail the completely uncharted sea of creativity!

The last statements should not be interpreted as presenting a case for mindless pattern drill, blind mim-mem methods, and pattern practice *ad nauseam.* The learner does make a large contribution in language learning and linguists have very rightly stressed that contribution in any kind of language learning. However, it must in all fairness be pointed out that linguists are uncertain what the contribution is, even though they are quite certain that it does exist. A learner always knows certain things about another language before he learns it. For example, he knows that certain kinds of pho-

nological contrasts will occur, that there will be naming and action words, and he can be absolutely sure that there will be sentences which have definite structures to enable him to make statements, give commands, and ask questions. Of course, children cannot verbalize such understandings, but it is fair to assume that they do have them nevertheless. Our linguistic knowledge would suggest that when he learns a second language he is aware that both meaning and structure are involved in the learning and that there is a critical relationship between the context in which the language is used and the structure of the language which is used in that context. It is quite obvious that no one can learn a language in a vacuum in which the sounds he hears are unconnected to events in the real world, just as it is quite obvious that no one can learn a language without having actual linguistic data presented to him. What linguistic theory would seem to tell us is that we should not forget the *context* of language learning. Linguistic theory would suggest that we cannot rely exclusively on mimicry, dialogues, mim-mem methods and pattern practice drill, ignoring actual language use and the contexts in which language is used. Nor should we go to the opposite extreme of following a method, like the Direct Method, in which linguistic structure is almost totally ignored. Our classroom practices should follow some kind of middle road, some kind of strategy in which we use the natural contexts of language to prompt language use, together with an awareness of the language structures which must be mastered.

When we turn our attention to psychology, we discover many of the same problems that arose in considering the relevance of linguistic knowledge. Indeed linguistics itself has been called a branch of cognitive psychology, because many of the same questions interest both linguists and psychologists. For example, both linguists and psychologists are interested in the basic question of what the human mind is like, and particularly, what the human mind must be like, given the kind of structures that languages have. Linguists ask what kinds of structures all languages have and what the universal characteristics of language are. Then they tend to speculate on what human minds must be like to be able to use such languages. Or they may speculate that human languages must be as they are as a result of the structure of human minds. While we can observe human languages in action, we cannot directly observe human minds in action, because of a lack of sufficiently sophisticated equipment. Therefore, the study of language turns out to be one very interesting way of making hypotheses about the structure of human minds, and it is largely for this reason that linguistics has been referred to as a branch of cognitive psychology.

However, when we look at psychology in second language teaching and learning, we are really less concerned with speculation about what human minds are like than with the problems of language learning. Note the deliberate emphasis on language *learning* rather than on language teaching. It has been said, with some justification, that first languages are not taught; they are learned, for they are just too complicated to be taught. How can a par-

ent, or a teacher for that matter, possibly teach something that even very sophisticated linguists hardly even begin to understand? In second language learning and teaching the same problem exists. How can anyone teach a second language when so little is known about any one language, never mind two, and also so little is known about almost every aspect of the learning process? It is necessary to assume that the learner makes a tremendous contribution in the process.

Given that so little is known about the structure of language, it therefore seems difficult to explain how a second language can be learned through some of the simplistic psychological learning models that are available, through, for example, any kind of stimulus-response theory, that is, through a theory in which a language is said to be a simple habit system. Nor can that variation of behavioristic learning theory called reinforcement theory adequately describe or account for how a second language can be learned in its totality. Learning a second language means acquiring a system of rules, but just as very little is known about these rules, even less is known about how such rule systems are acquired. Certainly it is possible to speculate about the effectiveness of deductive learning and inductive learning. But most of what is said on this topic is speculative and has not been proved out in any rigorous manner. We can also make hypotheses about the influence of motivation on learning, of both extrinsic and intrinsic motivation. We can investigate different types of learning as these vary, for example, with the age or the sense preferences of the learner. We can inquire into the various halo effects associated with learning, those halo effects associated with the equipment we use, our materials, the time of day our class is held, the teacher's personality, and particular mixes of students. There are numerous psychological factors in any learning situation, and we really know very little about them.

There are certain data available on the learning process, of course, that do have special interest for us. One of the most interesting collections of such data is the evidence that linguistic interference provides. We know that students from certain linguistic backgrounds have difficulty in learning various aspects of English and that they do make predictable mistakes while learning. The Spanish student fails to distinguish *beat* and *bit* and *bait* and *bet,* and he does not pronounce *school* as *school* but as *eschool.* The Japanese student comes to study at the *Engrish Ranguage Institute.* Such mistakes, or deviations from an expected response, can tell us a lot, but not possibly as much as some people have claimed they can tell us. There was a time when contrastive analysis, as it is called, the analysis of the two languages involved in second language learning and a statement of their contrasts, promised to work us miracles. The miracles never came. We should not abandon such analyses but rather we should look at the unexpected responses in more fruitful ways than we have done in the past.

There are many problems then in psychology and we are just beginning to ask answerable and interesting questions about them. From what we do know already we can suggest ways in which classroom practices might be

modified and improved. There seems to be one very obvious way in which there could be some rather immediate improvement in the classroom and that is through a change of emphasis from *teaching* to *learning.* Too often the classroom is regarded as a place in which the teacher is at the center of interest, a place in which everything flows from the teacher, who knows what is to be taught and exactly how he is going to teach it, and in which the learner is merely the end point of some kind of process. A change of direction seems called for, particularly if language is something that we understand but a little of and if any particular language is a system of which we have merely fragmentary knowledge. If our goal is somehow to help our students to acquire an adequate control of that second language, then the focus must be changed from the teacher to the *student.* Somehow we have to realize that the student must do the job for himself, that we can help him, that we can struggle with him in *his* task of learning the second language, but that since we know so little about that second language, we can provide little more than encouragement and a certain, but not unimportant, amount of help.

The emphasis, therefore, should be less on the teacher and the course or text and more on the student himself. We should attempt to stimulate him to use the language and encourage him to use the innate processes of language acquisition that he has. This means, of course, that in our methods it will be necessary to be eclectic rather than single-minded and monolithic. It means that we cannot rely on any one single narrow pedagogical approach. It means too that we must respond to the different needs of students, the different learning patterns they exhibit, and the different inclinations and motives that they have in learning. Obviously, in such a setting the teacher's role is less one of providing something absolutely sure, certain and definitive, for such certainty does not exist, and more one of trying to create an atmosphere in which learning is encouraged, in which the teacher's enthusiasm for learning, desire for his students' success, and overall commitment to his task somehow rub off on his students. Consequently, I see a need for lots of examples, lots of variety, and lots of context-oriented work.

All of this may seem rather paradoxical, particularly if some of the preceding statements have been interpreted as meaning that we know nothing about language. We certainly do know many things about language, but not a few of these are superficial. For example, many of the phonological contrasts that we know about exist as phonetic contrasts, that is, as actual contrasts in the stream of sound that comes out of the speakers' mouths, but not necessarily as contrasts at a more abstract level of language function. Many of the grammatical contrasts may be only surface contrasts existing in the sentences which are produced and may not be as significant as certain deep contrasts which interest linguists. These surface contrasts are still important in language use and fortunately we do know something about them. We must try to make sure that our students systematically acquire these same contrasts and some systematic approach to this task is possible. How-

ever, we should be more concerned with the student's gradual development as a person who controls a second language than with his apparent mastery of this pattern or that one. *We should attempt continually to find out what the student is doing with the language we are trying to teach him.* We should find out what the student is doing, not what the teacher is doing. We should find out what the student can do, because, after all, he is the one who is at the center of our task. Our task is to help him to learn.

It is at this point that interference phenomena are so important. When a student does say something incorrectly, does not control a certain contrast, produces an ungrammatical sentence, does not know the right word, we should, in Newmark and Reibel's terms, take this as evidence of his ignorance and incomplete learning.[2] Linguistic interference is therefore linguistic ignorance. We should assume that the student is trying to use the second language and, because he does not know enough, he is failing. The problem so far as pedagogy is concerned is that, having recognized this as ignorance, how do we deal with it? Do we treat it through more drill or through explanation? The answer again is not a particularly simple one, because different people learn in different ways and there are also variables like age and motivation. It is quite possible that drill activities will work better with younger students, but in similar circumstances older students may prefer explanation. However, it is doubtful that one can explain the differences between the vowels in *beat* and *bit:* the tenseness of one vowel versus the laxness of the other; the off-glide of one versus the lack of glide of the other; and the height of one versus that of the other. The student must learn to feel the difference in the vowels and it is hard, if not impossible, to explain a feeling of this kind. A grammatical point, however, may be explained, but explanation will not guarantee learning. Many of us know foreign students who know a lot *about* English but whose English is atrocious. Many of us know foreign students who speak beautiful English but do not know anything *about* English. In language teaching we must be prepared to mix drill *and* explanation because we can never be sure which technique works with which student.

Pedagogy has been kept to the last in this discussion because it is true to say that even less is known about pedagogy than is known about linguistics and psychology. Some people would even say that there is nothing to know, but I am not one of them. There is also the classic question: "Is teaching an art or is it a science?" And also the question: "Can we examine the teaching process in any scientific manner?" This paper does not propose to try to answer either question, except by saying that there is evidence that teaching is an art but that it can also be studied scientifically. Indirectly, comments have been made on teaching in the discussions of language and psychology. In second language teaching much of what is discussed under teaching actually turns out to be discussion of linguistics or of psychology. For example, it has long been fashionable to import into teaching certain

---

2 Leonard Newmark and David A. Reibel, "Necessity and Sufficiency in Language *Learning," IRAL,* 6 (1969), 146-161.

techniques which linguists use in analyzing languages or in making language descriptions. Consider, if you will, the use of minimal pairs such as *beat-bit, bait-bet, bet-bat* in language teaching. Such use seems to be the importing of a linguistic technique into the classroom. The same use may be seen of ideas from psychology: one way of explaining certain psychological phenomena is to set up S-R bonds. Consequently the teacher attempts to import into the classroom a technique in which students are taught to associate certain stimuli with certain responses in a rather mechanical way. This again seems to be a direct extension into the classroom of a technique from another discipline.

To many of us though, pedagogy involves such matters as the equipment we use rather than the content we teach, so that we become fascinated by the "hardware" of education, things like audio-visual aids, language laboratories, overhead projectors, tape recorders, reading kits, and so on. Many of the pedagogical issues we become concerned about turn out to be about such matters as whether or not we should install a language laboratory, or buy an overhead projector, or requisition one particular set of audio-visual aids. It is just such hardware that we show visitors to our school, that we insist on being provided with when we move into a new building, and that we fight the principal, curriculum supervisor, and school board for. And, rather tragically, it is just such hardware we nearly always end up by completely underusing when we do acquire it. We install a beautiful language laboratory and then find we do not have suitable tapes to play at the master console. We equip our new school with a closed-circuit television system and then find that we either cannot maintain it or do not know how to use it. We buy some elaborate equipment to use with programmed materials and then we find there are no programmed materials at all, or that the programmed materials which are available are completely inadequate. We should not get too caught up with bigger and better hardware at the expense of the "software" of education, the actual content of teaching. There is some reason to believe that the best hardware is chalk, a blackboard, and books, and the most valuable teaching aid in the classroom is a well-prepared teacher. We cannot solve our problems in the classroom by importing more and more equipment into it, nor is the language laboratory the answer to all our needs in second language teaching.

In pedagogy, if we escape being hung up on hardware, we generally get hung up with techniques. For example, we may always insist that sounds and structures must be taught in contrast to each other. We may always insist on contrasting *l*'s with *r*'s, *e*'s with *i*'s and one grammatical structure with another. Or we may insist that we must have a particular kind of textbook for a particular kind of student; for example, specially oriented texts for various ethnic groups. Or we may insist that every new item must be repeated *n* times, the particular value of *n* itself varying from three to five or more, but always some magical prime number! Or we may insist that whenever we present a new point the presentation has to follow a certain order:

preparation, presentation, consolidation, evaluation, review, and so on. Or we may have notions about simple and complex sounds and structures, notions which are often intuitively based but present nevertheless. Or we may insist on programming a certain grammatical sequence in a certain series of steps, again largely on an intuitive basis. Or we may believe in the effects of spiraling or cycling of our materials rather than in straight line programming.

Publishers cater to these preferences and advertise their offerings as much for the particular techniques they exemplify as for any intrinsic content. They sell us English through pictures, or English through Basic English, or English through pattern drill, or English through generative-transformational grammar, or English through portable transistorized transmitters that can be plugged gently into the ear so that the learner can acquire English quite painlessly as he goes about his daily living and even daily sleeping. Teachers tend to accept such things as these, for they do appear to make our jobs easier. Having been a teacher and having been faced with the relentless succession of classes throughout the school day, I can understand why. We think our jobs will be easier if we have just the right texts, or if there is a language laboratory, or if we control a little teaching formula that will do the trick time and time again. Given the kinds of pressures that we work under in our classrooms, it is not surprising that it should be like this, nor am I saying that we should abandon techniques which succeed for us. However, we should ask ourselves why the techniques which succeed do succeed. The answer is likely to be that they work bcause they really involve our students in worthwhile activity and have a good theoretical justification.

It is impossible to teach language to children, especially, in a sterile, inactive environment. Language is a vehicle for dealing with reality. All linguistic activity must be associated with meaningful activity so any techniques designed to encourage meaningful activity are obviously important in language learning. Consequently, movement, involvement, and situation, and the concomitants of these --- laughter, games, and stories --- are important in teaching. Our teaching techniques should be focused on trying to encourage as much of this as possible. Good pedagogy then will be less concerned with gimmickry, the pat solution, the utterly predictable lesson plan, and the rather dull teacher-centered activities of classrooms than with involving students and the teacher in some kind of joint meaningful activity in which the focus is on language learning rather than on language teaching. But we should not forget the teacher. We should remember that he is extremely important, if only for the fact that he teaches not only the course that is prescribed, but also what *he himself is,* and what he is is usually learned much better by the students than any content he ever tries to get across!

It would be useful to sum up this discussion of linguistics, psychology, and pedagogy, the three aspects of second language teaching that we have to take into consideration, by referring to the article that Professor Anthony wrote several years ago, an article in which Anthony discussed the differences between what he called *approach, method,* and *technique.*

By *approach* Anthony referred to the assumptions that underlie our language teaching, that is, the assumptions we have about language and about psychology. He rightly said that such assumptions are generally matters of belief and that they are the axioms from which we derive the theorems, or the methods, and then the derivative techniques that we use. As classroom teachers we should concern ourselves with the underlying axioms of our profession, because everything that we do in our classrooms derives from the assumptions that we make. It does not matter whether or not we can articulate these assumptions; they are still there, articulated or not.

To Anthony *method* meant the plans for curriculum and teaching which derive from approaches, the plans by which we ultimately present the data. They are plans for the curriculum of a particular kindergarten room in which there are Mexican-American children, of a particular ghetto school, or of a small number of foreign students on a Midwest college campus, or of a special class for non-English-speaking students in a suburban school system. Method then is the particular kind of strategy that derives from an approach; it is the overall plan that we have in mind for teaching the language in a particular set of circumstances.

Technique, for Anthony, meant exactly how to do what you decide to do, the specific kinds of practices and techniques that one chooses to employ in a specific classroom. It is quite apparent to me that this is just where much of the interest of classroom teachers lies. We are all interested in becoming better classroom teachers. We all like to find something good and immediately useful in book displays at conventions. We all like to go away from professional meetings with at least one new practical idea that will work. But we would be doing a disservice to ourselves if all we do is hunt for gimmickry and new wrinkles, say a tape recorder with some new kind of switch, or a book which has appeared in a new cover, possibly even in a new edition, but really only the same old wine again. We should try instead, on occasion, to stand back from such concerns in order to achieve a perspective on our task and to evaluate our methods and our general approach. Periodically it is good to rephrase the basic questions that must be asked in a growing and vital discipline like teaching English to speakers of other languages.

Classroom teachers must be prepared to find out as much as they can about what the issues and questions are in linguistics and psychology, in order to gain some idea of where the answers might lie. In the years ahead it will be more vital to understand what the basic questions are in the discipline than it will be to understand what a certain switch does on the latest tape recorder, or how to use a particular set of flash cards, or what a very specific teaching technique will do in a rather limited set of circumstances. A teacher cannot get through a lifetime of teaching by throwing a succession of switches, or by using a collection of charts, or by inventing a new teaching wrinkle every day. Inevitably the result will be boredom or learning of the wrong things. However, he can take inspiration from a new idea about language teaching, from new sources of information, from new insights into the

language-learning process, and from new ideas about what a total teaching strategy could be like. A good teacher probably should know how to use a tape recorder, an overhead projector, and some of the other media effectively, but a good teacher is not just a technician. A good teacher is someone who continually examines what he does, continually strives to arrive at new understandings of his discipline, and continually tries to steer a course between doubt and dogma. Good teaching practice is based on good theoretical understanding. *There is indeed nothing so practical as a good theory.* Teachers should focus from time to time not on techniques, not on methods, but on approach, that is, on theory, and should try in those moments to capture some of the excitement of the many challenges that confront us in teaching **English to speakers of other languages.**

Vol 3 No 2 Jun 1969

Linguistic Universals and Their Relevance to TESOL *

Roderick A. Jacobs

The more we learn about language, the more ignorant we find we are. The transformational explosion in the past decade has generated an incredible amount of research into English exceeding both in quantity and quality that of any two earlier decades. But the result has been to make grammarians uneasily aware of vast quantities of linguistic facts, generalizations, properties, rules which cannot easily be subsumed within any neat grammatical framework. So the apparently glib mention of "universals" in the title of this paper may seem somewhat presumptuous. Perhaps I should have used the term "linguistic tendencies." But since all the evidence is never in and since exceptions are hard if not impossible to find for the ones I shall discuss, the term "universals" does not seem too risky.

The two fairly secure universals discussed here may appear rather obvious, but their consequences have been little explored or exploited in the teaching of English as a second language. The discussion involves considerable use of meaning not only as a route for determining deep structure but as being almost if not completely identical to deep structure. That is, semantics and syntax are treated as fundamentally interdependent. Chomsky's early claim that grammar is best formulated as "a self-contained study independent of semantics" now appears more of a holdover from the heydays of structural linguistics than a useful tenet underlying present work in transformational linguistics. McCawley[1] has claimed that selectional restrictions have little or no independent status in linguistics. These seem to be semantic constraints on the set of possible messages. Thus it is pointless to claim that a paranoid who says

My toothbrush is alive and is trying to kill me.

is not observing grammatical restrictions requiring animate subjects for "alive" and "trying." The difference between his usage and ours corresponds exactly to a difference in beliefs regarding relationships with inanimate objects. As McCawley has pointed out, a man uttering a sentence like the example above should be referred to a psychiatric clinic, not to a remedial English course.

---

* This paper was presented at the TESOL Convention, March 1969.

Mr. Jacobs, Research Fellow in Linguistics, University of California, San Diego, is the author (with Peter S. Rosenbaum) of *English Transformational Grammar* (Ginn-Blaisdell, 1968). After graduating from the University of London, he taught English as a second language in the south of England and later worked with Cypriot children in London.

1 James D. McCawley, "Where Do Noun Phrases Come From?" in Jacobs and Rosenbaum's *Readings in English Transformational Grammar* (Ginn-Blaisdell, to be published in 1970).

In practice, at least, deep structure is taken to be a semantic construct which should eventually turn out to be common to all languages. In deep structure are all the elements which make up the meaning of a sentence. Obviously not all the elements are physically represented in the surface form of a sentence in any language. Since, like the traditional grammarians, I find the "process" image the most revealing, I treat this as *deletion* and claim it as a universal process in human languages. Although there is much redundancy in human language, a full semantic representation would involve considerably more redundancy. Obviously there must be certain conditions for deletion or the hearer would never be able to fill in the appropriate missing elements of the content. My three-year-old son now says

I want me to go.

He is quite logical. He is the one to do the wanting—hence the first pronoun. He is the one to do the traveling—hence the second pronoun. Later he will learn that the second pronoun must be deleted. Since he already understands the adult version, this kind of deletion is at least part of his language competence and auditory performance. Notice that he has filled in the missing part of a paradigm:

* I want me to go.
I want you to go.
I want him/her to go.
I want us to go.
I want you (people) to go.
I want them to go.

The verb *want* is now quite regular. It is followed by a proposition containing an accusative, serving as semantic subject of go, and an infinitive, serving as predicate of the proposition. It just happens that under certain conditions the accusative form may or must be deleted. What kind of conditions govern possible deletions? There are two major ones that have been found in any human language, ranging from the Yuman languages of the southwest United States to the Malay-Indonesian languages in the Far East. However, I shall here use English for my examples.

In the sentences

1. Cinderella promised her sisters to clean her room.
2. Cinderella ordered her sisters to clean her room.

the surface forms look much alike, but there are important differences in the semantic relationships. In the first sentence Cinderella does the promising and Cinderella is also the one to do the cleaning. Thus the first sentence means somthing like

Cinderella promised her sisters for Cinderella to clean her room.

The second *Cinderella* is redundant here and is deleted on the basis of identity with another noun phrase. (The *for* is deleted for different reasons

although it was retained in earlier forms of the language.) In the second sentence, although Cinderella does the ordering, *her sisters* are the ones scheduled to do the cleaning. Thus the second sentence means, roughly,

Cinderella ordered her sisters for her sisters to clean her room.

Here the second *her sisters* is redundant and must be deleted. (Note that abbreviatory formulas are not needed to express these insights.) The difference between the two sentences—the first having the *subjects* of both verbs identical, the second having the *object* of the main verb identical to the *subject* of the other verb—has some important consequences. For example, the passive transformation applies only where the identical elements are the main *object* and the lower *subject:*

* Her sisters were promised by Cinderella to clean her room.
Her sisters were ordered by Cinderella to clean her room.

The reasons for this are beyond the scope of this paper.

This kind of deletion under identity is also part of what we call pronominalization. Thus when both references to *Caesar* in the following sentence refer to different persons

Caesar admired Caesar in the mirror.

the sentence is correct. But when they refer to the same person, i.e. the identity condition applies, the second *Caesar* is deleted and replaced by a form having the same gender, number, and case interpretation but with the "proper-ness" removed, namely the reflexive pronoun *himself.*[2] The *-self* form, it should be noted, depends not just upon grammar but upon semantic reference.

In English, deletion under identity involves certain other properties which may not apply in some other languages and which are not as obvious as they might seem. We will take pronominalization and reference as an example. Assume that the pronoun *he* in each sentence refers *only* to Leif Eiriksson. In the following pairs of sentences, only the *a* sentences are acceptable:

3a Leif Eiriksson said that he was coming.
b He said that Leif Eiriksson was coming.

4a Leif enjoyed exploring although he complained frequently.
b He enjoyed exploring although Leif complained frequently.

This suggests that the "antecedent" of a pronoun must actually antecede.

---

2 For more detailed discussion, see Jacobs and Rosenbamn, *English Transformational Grammar* (1968) and *An Introduction to English Syntax* (forthcoming), both from Ginn-Blaisdell.

The question of distance between the antecedent and the pronoun seems to make little difference, as can be seen in

5a *Leif* claimed that the maiden who had asked the king to send the ship to Greenland although it was supposed to be sailing to Vinland had said that *he* was cute.
b *He claimed that the maiden who had asked the king to send the ship to Greenland although it was supposed to be sailing to Vinland had said that *Leif* was cute.

But it is not necessary for the "antecedent" to antecede:

6 Although *they* enjoyed ravaging, *the Vikings* preferred mead-drinking.
7 As soon as *he* entered, *Darcy* encountered coy female simpers.

It appears that if the pronoun is in a subordinate clause, it may precede its "antecedent." In fact, the situation is more complex, but this generalization applies fairly widely in English and, I believe, in most Indo-European languages.

I have perhaps implied that deletion applies only to noun phrases. But much the same process, called *gapping* by some grammarians, is noticeable in

8a Isabella *liked* potted plants and Lamia serpents.

The deleted verb in the second of the conjoined sentences can only be *liked,* a verb identical to the verb in the first part of the sentence. Note that deletion here applies only left to right.

8b * Isabella potted plants and Lamia *liked* serpents.

It has been claimed that this kind of deletion, *gapping,* is done left to right in languages where sentences have subject-verb-object ordering, and right-to-left where languages have subject-object-verb ordering. If this is indeed a universal, then presumably the equivalent of 8b would be correct in a S-O-V language except that the verb meaning "liked" would be at the end of the sentence:

Isabella potted plants and Lamia serpents *liked.*

However, evidence from Samoan and some American Indian languages suggests at least that this "universal" may be just a "tendency."

So one main condition for deletion, identity, is probably a universal, although other properties involved vary among languages. Ideally, the teacher of English as a second language knows how identity deletion operates in the native languages (or dialects) of his pupils; in fact, such a situation is unlikely for some time.

The second condition for deletion involves indefinite elements in languages, for example, words like *anyone, someone, anything,* and *something* in English. Thus only the second sentence below

9a It is easy for Authun to please Sweyn.
b It is easy for anyone to please Sweyn.

can be paraphrased as

9c It is easy to please Sweyn.

Except when it is subject of a clause, an *indefinite* noun phrase may usually be deleted without affecting the basic meaning. This *indefiniteness* condition upon deletion is also believed to be universal.

When a noun phrase has been deleted either because it is identical to some other noun phrase or because it is an indefinite noun phrase like *anyone, can* the native speaker of English always tell which process has been applied? The following sentence suggests that without adequate context he cannot.

10 The police were ordered to stop rioting in Chicago.

There are two principal interpretations here. One can be represented rather roughly as:

10a * The police were ordered for the police to stop rioting in Chicago.

The second "the police" is then deleted under identity. The other interpretation is approximately:

10b The police were ordered to stop anyone from rioting in the park.

The indefinite noun phrase "anyone" is deleted.

Normally native speakers have little trouble where deletion is involved. However difficulties are likely to arise for non-native speakers, especially if their native languages are not Indo-European. The teacher must expect that deletion is a common process in whatever language his pupil speaks. He may wish to find out just how deletion in the other language resembles that in English and how it differs. When I taught Indonesian students I found that the deletion and relativization processes in that language were very similar to those in English. Once the students knew how English relative pronouns were like *jang* in Bahasa Indonesia, it was easier to show the differences and to teach correct usage. Similarly discussion of sentence embedding processes in the other language leads logically into understanding of the *that, for . . . to,* and *possessive . . . ing* complementizers in English used with embedded (or complement) sentences in English. Eventually the non-native speaker must, like the native speaker, know how these sentences happen to be basically synonymous.

11a *That* Galahad had arrived early surprised Lancelot.
b *For* Galahad *to* have arrived early surprised Lancelot.
c Galahad's hav*ing* arrived early surprised Lancelot.
d It surprised Lancelot that Galahad had arrived early.

In advocating more strongly comparative rather than just contrastive emphasis, I am suggesting that the likenesses between languages and even the universal characteristics are inadequately exploited. Moreover I am assuming that the "direct method" alone is likely to be inefficient. And, of course, I am wildly impractical. I seem to be assuming that teachers will know both a transformational grammar and also the relevant characteristics of the native languages of their students. Chemical-type formulas are far from necessary in any grammar although such abbreviations may be of use to theoretical linguists. Without the formulas, a good transformational grammar of English should be easily mastered, and its coverage of English is far more insightful than "mathematophobes" suspect. This does not mean returning to just teaching the "rules" of English. The existence of properties relevant to all or many languages, sometimes in quite detailed ways, has not been adequately exploited. And the teacher who doesn't speak the native language of his students should have a presently non-existent, simply-written booklet, published by the Center for Applied Linguists in the year 2270, which points out how each other language resembles and differs from English in the details of deletion, complementation, expression of quantification, relativization, conjunction, and so on. And if a conceptually and more comprehensive framework than current transformational grammar is then available to linguists, the authors of the booklet will undoubtedly use it. Recent developments in transformational linguistics itself suggest that progress is being made in a number of areas important to teachers of English as a second language. The fact that much of this work is being done in languages ranging from the Uto-Aztecan family to Finnish and Korean suggests that English is not being used as "a strait-jacket into which to force the structures of all other languages." For English-speaking linguists, however, it serves as the most convenient and best documented language on which to start testing hypotheses as to linguistic universals.

Vol 3 No 2 Jun 1969

*Linguistic Universals, Deep Structure, and English As a Second Language**

Ralph B. Long

In English as a second language we are generally interested in helping people master English in two quite different ways. We would like them, first, to be able to hear standard spoken English with easy comprehension and to speak English intelligibly and comfortably. This is the kind of mastery of language that children achieve much better than adolescents and adults are likely to; as such men as Wallace E. Lambert have been telling us, children do not have to "learn" spoken language, they simply "acquire" it. All that children need is to hear languages used frequently and comfortably and well in circumstances that make them want to understmd what is being said. It is a saddening fact, as Eric H. Lenneberg says in *Biological Foundations of Language* (1967), linguistic acquition has been "stabilized" by adolescence. Spoken languages do not have to be taught to adolescents and adults as well as to children; nevertheless if organizations of teachers of English as a second language concentrated on teaching spoken English to adolescents and adults and slighted the problems involved in teaching it to children, they would put themselves in the position organizations of dentists would put themselves in if they concentrated on filling cavities and ignored the preventive dentistry that sees to it that children grow up with teeth that do not have cavities.

In second languages as in first languages the child's mastery is not enough. People should learn to read well, and even to write well. In their use of spoken English, mature people need mature vocabularies. And mature people should be able to put fairly complex grammatical structures to use. Kellogg W. Hunt's *Grammatical Structures Written at Three Grade Levels* (1965) shows even the interdependent proportionative construction of *the more you think about it, the sillier it gets*— which certainly cannot be described as obsolescent or even "literary"—appearing fairly late in English-speaking children's writing. The real work of teachers of English as a second language whose students are past childhood ought to be concerned with the mastery of mature written English, not with the kind of linguistic mastery that children do not need to be taught. The work of teachers of English as a second language should differ from the work of other teachers of English primarily in a single very important respect: it should always be carried on with the perspective that comes from looking at the English language, and at what has been written in the language, from the point of view of the

---

* This paper was presented at the TESOL Convention, March 1969.

Mr. Long, Professor of English, University of Puerto Rico, Rio Piedras, is the author of *The Sentence and Its Parts* (University of Chicago Press, 1961) and many articles on English grammar.

student whose language and way of life are distinct from those of the monolingual speaker of English.

I

Since our approach to English is what it is, surely we will all welcome the extended investigation of linguistic universals that lies ahead. We know that it is not good for languages to live alone, and that indeed they cannot live alone. I myself would like to accept the view expressed in, for example, the excellent final chapter of Ronald W. Langacker's *Language and Its Structure* (1968): that "the same inborn structural framework underlies all languages, and . . . languages can differ from one another only with respect to the peripheral structural features that the child learns through experience." I would like to have learned in my student days, or to learn yet, an "explicit" and generally accepted universal grammar to which the particular grammars of the two languages I live my life in, English and Spanish, could be related point by point. Traditional grammar—"Latin" grammar, its critics often call it—has the merit of rising above the narrowest varieties of linguistic nationalism; and for people like me whose practical concerns are pretty well limited to English and Spanish—the latter a form of Latin—traditional grammar does fairly well even when it is employed in rather naive varieties. The grammatical tradition needs to be reformed; all traditions need to be reformed periodically, and the most effective supporters of all traditions are those who do what they can to reform them. But like people, traditions die. Or they are absorbed in broader traditions. It seems entirely possible that traditional "Latin" grammar can be replaced by a truly universal grammar that will be a more satisfactory tool for use in describing the grammatical structures of non-Indo-European languages of Asia, Africa, Indian America, even Europe.

Clearly not all the content of an explicit universal grammar would be applicable to English. For that matter, some of the content of interlingual "Latin" grammar is not really relevant to modern English: to mention a single example, surely Jespersen was right in maintaining that in dealing with the surface structure of modern English we should avoid such terms as "dative" and "accusative." And we should not forget that the interlingual "morpheme" of Structural analysis proved unmanageable in English, as Charles F. Hockett in effect conceded when he suggested, in *A Course in Modern Linguistics* (1958), that in dealing with such words as *remote, promote, reduce,* and *produce* "an obvious practical step is to set the morphemic problem aside." It remains true, however, that a generally accepted universal grammar, with a generally accepted terminology, would be of tremendous value to all students of language.

Whether or not Samuel Abraham and Ferenc Kiefer are right in saying, in *A Theory of Structural Semantics* (1966), that semantic categories "seem to be more universal" than grammatical ones, a universal grammar based directly in meaning should be the best possible universal grammar. The languages man has developed through the centuries are tools that are employed in the formulation and communication of thought. Up to a point, they im-

press us as quite satisfactory tools. When thought is complex, languages are not so easily managed; and at times we all feel as the Russian poet Tyutchev must have felt when he said that when thought is put into words it is inevitably falsified. At the present time it is much easier to describe the linguistic sequences people produce than it is to describe the thought that these sequences are intended to express. It seems quite clear that at present we simply cannot base grammatical analysis on analysis of meanings. Noam Chomsky was essentially right, for 1969 as for 1957, when he said, in *Syntactic Structures* (1957), that grammar is best formulated as "a self-contained study independent of semantics." At present, grammar cannot really ignore meaning, or phonology, and neither semantics (and lexicography) nor phonology can ignore grammar. No one of these divisions of linguistic analysis can be truly "independent" of the others in 1969, but each requires a considerable degree of autonomy.

However it is based, when a reasonably complete, reasonably explicit set of linguistic universals is proposed, we should all examine it carefully, neither accepting it immediately in the spirit of blind faith that has characterized entirely too many students of linguistics in recent decades nor rejecting it in the spirit of hostility to change that has characterized entrely too many supporters of traditional grammar. One religion should be enough for any of us, and this should be concerned not with language but with the meaning of the lives we live. When linguistic universals are proposed, we should insist on more than vague generalities. Thus when Roderick A. Jacobs and Peter S. Rosenbaum tell us, in *English Transformational Grammar* (1968), that "virtually all human languages exhibit the phenomenon of reflexivization," we should question the value of such an extraordinarily inexplicit bit of information. If we look only at English and Spanish, we see that though both languages have true reflexive pronoun forms, the numbers and the uses of these forma are quite different in the two languages. Spanish has only one distinct reflexive form, *se;* English has ten oddly compounded forms, counting *oneself* and the *ourself* that is employed in the *New Yorker* at least. In Spanish one says what parallels English *I hurt me,* not something more exactly paralleling *I hurt myself.* On the other hand, Spanish puts reflexives to varied uses that have no parallels in English. For example, Spanish commonly uses active verb forms with reflexive complements where English uses sometimes passive verb forms and the sometimes active forms without complements. Thus in Spanish one is likely to say what parallels English *the stores close themselves at six* where in English one can say *the stores are closed at six,* which is unfortunately ambiguous, or *the stores close at six.* It is important that when linguistic universals are presented, they be presented with at least a reasonable degree of explicitness. What H. A. Gleason, Jr., has called "the current fad of free-and-easy appeal to universals" is wholly indefensible. It is going to take time to work out a universal grammar. If we think the task can be done overnight simply because computers are now available, we should read Noam Chomsky's caution in *Language and Mind* (1968). And of course before we give any set of linguistic universals more than tentative acceptance

we must know that they are winning more than tentative acceptance among serious students of language all over the world. At the 1968 Georgetown Round Table, Professor Robert A. Hall, Jr., warned against what he regarded as a current tendency among Chomskyan linguists to substitute English for Latin "as a strait-jacket into which to force the structures of all other languages." If this tendency indeed exists, it must be combatted. Surely we do not believe that a satisfactory universal grammar can be based on deep-structure analysis of English alone.

It remains true that the central interest of teachers of English will continue to be the teaching of English. And though the structural differences that distinguish English from other languages can be regarded as "peripheral" if our interest centers in languages in general—just as the structural differences that distinguish one vertebrate from another can be regarded as "peripheral" if our interest centers in vertebrates in general—these differences are nevertheless considerable. It never ceases to amaze me that, for example, Spanish-English bilingual (and even inadequate quasi-bilinguals like me) can ask in either of two very different formulations, rapidly and without confusion, what is in meaning a single question.

Don't you like people?
¿No te gusta la gente?

An account of the surface-structure grammatical differences between these two formulations of a single underlying question should take into account the following matters at least.

1. The English formulation follows the basic English subject-predicator-complement(s) word order of the declarative you *don't like people* fairly closely, though of the phrasal verb form *do like* only the head word *like* is in the basic predictor position. The Spanish formulation has the order complement-predicator-subject.

2. The English formulation is marked as a question grammatically, by the use of the expanded present form *do like* rather than the one-word present for *like* and by the presence of *do* in front of the subject. The distinctive grammatical form of the main-interrogative clause is indicated in this way. The Spanish formulation (like the English formulation you *don't like people?) is* not marked as a question grammatically; in syntax it is identical with the corresponding Spanish declarative.

3. The English negator adverb *not* follows the auxiliary *do*—and makes the use of *do* necessary even when the question is put into the grammatically declarative form *you don't like people?* In informal styles *not* follows *do* directly and merges with it; in the more formal question *do you not like people?* the auxiliary and the adverb are separated by the subject, you. The Spanish negator adverb *no* precedes the complement-predicator-subject sequence in the Spanish formulation.

4. English *like* and Spanish *gustar* have opposite directions of predication. In contemporary English the subject of *like* feels or might feel liking. In Spanish the subject of *gustar* is what might cause the liking.

5. The English verb form *do like is* a common-person-and-number form, usable with all subjects except those with third-person-singular force. The Spanish verb form *gusta* is a true third-person-singular form.

6. The English pronoun form *you* can carry either singular or plural number force and is usable as subject, as complement, and as object of a preposition. The Spanish pronoun form *te* is definitely singular in force and is one of a set of three forms (*tu, te, ti)* that divide the syntactic functions the single English form you performs. The use of English *you* suggests nothing at all about the attitude of the person who uses it toward the person or people he is addressing. The use of Spanish *tu, te, ti* suggests an attitude lacking in a kind of formality that would sometimes seem appropriate.

7. The English noun *people* is plural in force and accepts as modifiers such determinatives of number as many. The Spanish noun *gente* is a quantifiable, comparable to the 1611 English *people* of *there was much people in that place.* The lack of an article with *people* indicates that the reference is to people in general—not precisely "all" people, since allowance for exceptions is certainly implied. The use of the article with *gente is* ambiguous, apart from context: *la gente can* be either people in general or some particular group of people already prominent in a context. Spanish *gente* has true grammatical gender; it is a feminine noun, and this circumstance is clearly reflected in the form of the article. Grammatical gender does not exist in English; awareness of personality and of sex has grammatical consequences at some points (and countries, ships, and dolls can be assigned feminine personalities fictitiously), but this is a different matter.

It is true, of course, that the Spanish formulation *¿no te gusta la gente?* and the English formulation *don't you like people? have* grammatical characteristics in common. Both formulations are "structured strings of words," to borrow a phrasing from Jacobs and Rosenbaum. Both employ what traditional grammar has long called verbs, nouns, pronouns, and adverbs to perform the grammatical functions it is convenient to call predictor, subject, complement, and adjunct. The presence of a negator adjunct serves in both formulations to indicate that the person who asks the question regards a particular answer-in this case, a disturbingly negative one—as appropriate. Nevertheless the grammatical structures of these two formulations are significantly different, and teachers of English to Spanish-speaking students ought to be able to deal fairly explicitly with such distinctions as occur.

II

The principal justification for deep-structure analysis of English, I would say, is that deep-structure analyses of all the languages of our multi-multilingual world, in combination, can serve as a genuinely scientific basis for a defensible universal grammar. In the years just ahead, a great deal of attention should be given to this kind of analysis, especially in dissertations and monographs done by highly trained scholars. In English as a second language, however, and in English language in general, we will be

wise at the present time to teach an intelligent updated traditional surface-structure grammar at all levels below the graduate and even at graduate levels. And dissertations and monographs employing the terminology and procedures of the best surface-structure traditional grammar should be done, too: for most purposes, this kind of terminology and procedures are as yet unsurpassed. I say this after having taught the Jacobs and Rosenbaum *English Transformational Grammar in* a graduate course in problems in grammatical theory and analysis. If what I am about to say about deep-structure grammar is concerned almost constantly with the Jacobs and Rosenbaum volume, this is partly because I have taught it, but it is also partly because I know of no other treatments of deep-structure English grammar of its scope and partly because I find it widely respected. As briefly as possible, I would like to state the case for proceeding cautiously in adopting this kind of analysis.

First, I would say that the terminology and the format of deep-structure English grammar are unnecessarily troublesome at present. The intermittent effort to avoid such terms as "subject" seems unwise. *This exception* is a "noun phrase" in *why was this exception made?* in *why did they make this exception?* and in *why this exception?* The simplest thing to say is that in these three sentences the phrase is used first as subject (in which use it determines the person-and-number form of the predictor), then as complement, and then as an isolate in a sentence that is marked grammatically as interrogative by the use of *why* but nevertheless lacks clear clausal structure. At the other extreme, deep-structure analysis is presenting us with new terms that seem far from satisfactory. Thus Jacobs and Rosenbaum call the *that* of *that Mulligan had behaved recklessly worried Stephen* a "complementizer." though the clause begun and marked by *that* is certainly not a complement, in any sense, in the surface structure. The use of chemical-looking formulas seems unwise at the present time, whatever may be the case twenty years from now. As Emmon Bach wrote in *An Introduction to Transformational Grammars* (1964), "unfortunately the training of most linguists has not included any work either in modern logic or in mathematics"; and the great majority of students and teachers of English are in this respect no luckier than "most linguists." One of Jacobs and Rosenbaum's doubly enlightening example sentences contains the sequence *linguists scared off schoolmarms.* Actually throughout most of my academic lifetime it has seemed to me that American linguists have been doing their best to scare off almost everyone, including even other linguists. A brilliant colleague of mine, European in background and in point of view, has recently contrasted the movement from Latin to the vernacular in his church with the movement from the vernacular to algebraic expression in his profession. His church he says, is trying to clarify what has been obscure; his profession seems intent on obscuring what has been clear. At the 1968 Georgetown Round Table W. Freeman Twaddell warned that while linguists may find it exhilarating "to play with new notations and models and speculations about various edges and depths of lan-

guage and languages," this kind of thing can be undesirable for "people with work to do."

Second, we must not forget that if our purpose is to teach the English that is acutally spoken and written in our day, what we must teach is surface-structure English, and for our purposes the deep structure may be no more than "a superfluous ghost level," to borrow a term from Wallace L. Chafe. If in the deep structure, the sentence *what is the name of that artist?* begins with the constituent QUESTION, continues with a noun phrase represented in the surface structure by *the name of that artist,* has next an auxiliary which is deleted in the intricate process of arriving at the surface structure, and ends with a verb phrase composed of the transitive verb *be* and another noun phrase (which in the surface structure is represented by *what),* then the deep structure and the surface structure are indeed two very different things. Actually, intent to ask a question is signalled in various ways in contemporary English: by the use of word order in is *his name Schwartz?* or by the use of a clause-marking word in *who did that?* or by intonation; or, as Dwight L. Bolinger tells us in *Aspects of Language* (1968), perhaps just by facial gesture in *his name is Schwartz?* And we can be fairly well along in a sentence before we know that it is intended as a question: for example, in *if his wife insists on new furniture and he himself wants a new car, what will Darcy buy?* If in the deep structure the sentence *finding you in this library astonishes me* requires that something that in an "intermediate" structure is represented by *it* precede *finding you in this library* simply because we employ *it* in such sentences as *it astonishes me to find you in this library,* then again the deep structure is strangely unlike the surface structure.

Personally I would ask whether a, deep structure in which what we begin with is constituents and features but no words, words being introduced in "lexical passes" as we go toward surface structure, is not too ghostly to have any satisfactorily definable grammatical form. I have done enough translating from Spanish into English to know that in translating a particular Spanish construction I can often choose between two English constructions which are about equally satisfactory from the point of view of meaning and yet are quite distinct in structure, and that my choice of construction is affected by my choice of words. Thus *she resents irony* and *irony irritates her* are very similar in meaning; but if *resent* is used as predictor, its subject must be what feels emotion; and if *irritate* is used, its subject must be what arouses the emotion. We can say *she resents being treated like a child* or *she hates to be treated like a child;* if we use *hate* as the predictor of the main declarative, we can have as its complement a to-and-infinitival-clause sequence; but if we use *resent, we* cannot. We can say *it rained all night,* using the verb *rain* as predictor, an *it* we cannot define as subject, and the grammatically exceptional nounal unit *all night* as adjunct; or we can say *rain fell throughout the night,* using the noun *rain* as subject, the verb *fall* as predictor, and as adjunct a prepositional unit in which the article *the* is used with the noun *night* in grammatically ordinary fashion. We can say *who owns that?* or *who* (or *whom) does that belong to?* or *whose is that?* It is odd that

though Jacobs and Rosenbaum define sentences as "structured strings of words," in their deep structures they want to delay the introduction of words. If Lenneberg is right in saying in *Biological Foundation of Language* that "words tag the processes by which the species deals cognitively with its environment," I cannot see why anyone should try to keep words out of the deepest-structure grammatical analysis of the particular natural language we call English. An interlingual semantic analysis would of course be another matter.

The deep-structure distinction between constituents, features, and segments attempted in the Jacobs and Rosenbaum volume needs a great deal of pondering, I would say. Jacobs and Rosenbaum assign the *this* of *this book* the deep-structure status of a "feature" of the item represented in the surface structure by the noun *book,* exactly as they do the singular force of this item. "Articles" are assigned feature status, and *this* and *that* are classified as articles. What Jacobs and Rosenbaum think should be done with other determinative modifiers, such as *any* and *every,* they do not make clear; surely they know that since first Palmer and then Bloomfield made the unity and importance of the determinatives clear, it has been reckless indeed to ignore the existence of the total category. When Jacobs and Rosenbaum say that in *Jones approves of the city* what follows *approves* is to be recognized as a constituent belonging to a category of prepositional phrases, surely they are on very weak ground when they describe what follows is in *the tournament is in May* as simply a 'noun segment" in which the preposition *in* is merely a feature of the noun *May.* If in *John is a hero* the verb *be* is used transitively and has full representation in the deep structure, then surely it is more than just a feature of the adjective *heroic* in *John is heroic.* If the *out* of *the landlord put him out* is no more than a feature of the verb *put* (like its tense, which in the deep structure belongs to an auxiliary that has no representation in the surface structure), then a consistent analysis of *the landlord put him into a much better apartment* will have to attach an extraordinarily developed "feature" to the same verb.

Finally, we must ask whether it is any longer defensible to think in terms of transformations at all. As long as I could I myself put off asking this question. For a good many years I did grammatical derivations of a naive transformational type. Thus I called interrogative main clauses such as *are you next?* "conversions" of semantically-grammatically-lexically parallel main clauses such as *you're next.* I was among those who, in print, welcomed the appearance of Zellig Harris's 1957 paper in *Language* and of Noam Chomsky's 1957 *Syntactic Structures.* I will always regard Chomsky as the Moses who led English-language people like me out of a Structuralist bondage in which for much too long we had been trying unsuccessfully to make grammatical bricks out of phonological air. If Chomsky has not led us in conquest of our Promised Land, he has at least been a tremendous influence for good; his position in American linguistics, like Harris', is secure whether we continue to talk about "transformations" or not.

It seems quite clear that what we have in modern English is sets of forms

and structures. Thus we have a set of forms of the verb *know:* in standard usage, *know, knows, knowing, knew, known,* and a number of phrasal forms within which auxiliaries are combined with *know, knowing, and known.* It is reasonable to regard *know* as "basic" among these forms in terms of descriptive convenience. *Knows, knowing,* and *known* all combine inflectional endings with stems that are not distinguishable from this basic form; *knew* shares with *known* the grammatical relationship to *know* that the single regularly inflected form *wanted* has to the "basic" form *want.* If, as Jacobs and Rosenbaum say, transformational grammarians do not know "how to incorporate exceptions into a grammar," they certainly cannot get very far with the surface-structure grammar we all put to use every time we use the English language, and we may have to agree with Charles F. Hockett's judgment, expressed in *Current Anthropology (1968),* that "algebraic grammar" at present involves distortion of "the most important fact about natural human languages"—that they are "ill-defined" systems. From the point of view both of contemporary analysis and of historical development, we should avoid deriving any one of the forms *know, knows, knowing, knew, known* from any one of the others. Sydney M. Lamb was quite right when he suggested, in *Outline of Stratificational Grammar* (1966), that to derive one linguistic form from another existing alongside it is comparable to tracing man's ancestry to the apes existing alongside him on this planet at the present time. Similarly in the set of semantically, grammatically, and lexically parallel main clauses *you are next, are you next?* and *you be next* we should not try to derive any one of the three structures from any other—or from an abstract structure underlying all three-but instead should simply pick one of the three as "basic" and describe the others in terms of how they differ from this one. In his *Syntax* (1931) George O. Curme assigned the main imperative historical primacy among main-clause patterns, and it is noteworthy that in both English and Spanish main-imperative clauses employ—for example, in English *be* and in Spanish *ven* (meaning "come") —verb forms whose internal simplicity suggests that they should be regarded as basic. Transformationalists have tended to downgrade main imperative clauses, first deriving them from main declarative with future-tense predictors and now, if I understand Jacobs and Rosenbaum's discussion of *wash yourself!* deriving them from main declarative with present-tense predicators by deleting subjects. I myself would take not the main imperative but the main declarative as the basic clause pattern. If I were doing deep-structure analysis and beginning main interrogatives with the separate constituent QUESTION, then I would begin main imperatives with a separate constituent REQUEST; certainly the main-imperative pattern, whether with expressed subjects as in *you be next* and *heaven help us* or without them as in *be careful* and *damn that typewriter* (where *you* and *God* are implied), deserves full membership in the set of main-clause patterns.

One of the tremendous advantages of giving up the concept of transformations is that we then have no reason at all to spend precious time running through complex strings of derivation such as transformationalists have been

busying themselves developing in recent years. Thus we can say of *walking down the street,* in *I see a man walking down the street,* that it is a gerundial subordinate clause modifying the immediately preceding nounal head and getting its implied subject from this head. These is no need to start with something represented in surface structure by I see *a man, and he is walking down the street* and carry this through a series of eight formulations, one of them I see a *man such that he is walking down the street,* as Emmon Bach did in a paper entitled *"Have* and *Be* in English Syntax" in *Language* (1967). We can, say of *Rupert himself drank the coffee* that the pronoun *himself* is the reflexive-intensive form of *he* used here as a tight appositive of *Rupert,* without saying that *himself* derives from a second occurrence of *Rupert drank the coffee,* as Owen Thomas did in *Transformational Grammar and the Teacher of English* (1965). And we are not tempted to run through a complicated manipulation of complex formulas to show how the *I* of *I will sleep* begins as a noun in deep structure and ends as an article in surface structure, as Jacobs and Rosenbaum do. Instead we can say simply that *I* is a personal pronoun, and that personal pronouns and proper nouns normally have the syntactic value of determiners and noun heads together, so that both *she* and *Mary* are syntactically much like *that girl* in their behavior. We can do grammar most simply without transformations, and surely simplicity is desirable in grammar. To borrow a phrase from James Sledd, we do not really want to lead our students "from morass to morass."

Vol 3 No 2 Jun 1969

TESOL Today–A View from the Center *

Sirarpi Ohannessian

At the close of the 1957 Ann Arbor Conference on Linguistics and the Teaching of English as a Foreign Language, one of the participants is reported to have remarked that the most important thing about the Conference was that it had taken place. Explaining this, Archibald Hill comments: "The specific conclusions and agreements reached at a first meeting of this sort may well be less important than the fact that communication between quite various groups of people concerned with a common problem which is growing steadily more pressing was successfull established."[1]

The Ann Arbor Conference, which was held under the auspices of the Linguistic Society of America and the Committee on International Exchange of Persons of the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils, with funds from the Ford Foundation, was not the first conference on the teaching of English as a foreign language which, by that time, was an established field of interest in several American universities and an area of growing involvement and concern to several United States Government agencies and foundations. It was, however, the first serious attempt to give attention to the increasingly important need to establish lines of communication in a field that was growing rapidly then, and was destined to grow at a much greater pace in the next decade.

One of the direct results of the Ann Arbor Conference was the establishment of the Center for Applied Linguistics in 1959, through a grant by the Ford Foundation made to the Modern Language Association of America, of which the Center was a part until it became incorporated in 1964. The principal function of the Center was to be that of an informal, internationally oriented clearinghouse and coordinating body in the application of linguistics to practical language problems, with the teaching of English as a foreign or second language as one of its major areas of interest.

The task, as the Center saw it, involved not only collecting and disseminating information on as many aspects of the field as possible, and acting as liaison among institutions, individuals, and government agencies, but, going a step further, anticipating new needs and rising demands and trying to mobilize existing resources or helping to create new machinery to meet them. To do this it was sometimes necessary for the Center to take responsibility in the initial stages of a new project or program, as for instance, its role in

---

* This paper was presented at the TESOL Convention, March 1969.

Miss Ohannessian, Director, English for Speakers of Other Languages Program, Center for Applied Linguistics, is the author of many publications in the field of English as a second language, among which is the very useful *Reference List of Materials for Teachers of English as* a *Second Language,* Volumes 1 and 2 (Center for Applied Linguistics, 1964 and 1966).

1 *Linguistics and the Teaching of English as a Foreign Language, Language Learning,* Special Issue (June 1958), 1.

the creation of the TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language) Program, and, after helping the project become independent, to turn its attention to some new aspect of the field.

This year we are celebrating the Tenth Anniversary of the Center, and it seems appropriate to look at some of the major developments in the field from the point of view of the Center and try to assess what new needs may be arising.

One of the first actions of the Center in 1959 was the sponsoring of a conference on English teaching abroad with the United States Information Agency (USIA) in cooperation with the British Council. The conference, which was attended by a wide range of participants from the United States and Britain, marked the beginning of a far greater degree of communication both between these two countries, and among the various United States government agencies concerned with this field. Commenting on papers presented at the Conference, Albert Marckwardt remarked: "The fact that we should have in a single packet of papers a statement of the scope and purpose of the three United States Agencies involved in an English Teaching Program, and that in addition a similar statement by the British Council is included as well, has exceeded even my wildest expectations. We have all, for so long, been working in the dark as to what the other was doing that this in itself is one of the most hopeful signs, I think, that we have seen in a long time." Anglo-American communication at the government level has been continued since 1959 first in biannual and in more recent years in annual meetings. There has also been a steadily increasing exchange of information within U.S. government agencies, five of which are currently concerned with the teaching of English to speakers of other languages overseas. There is at present an Inter-Agency committee on English as a second language which meets regularly and is coordinated by the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the Department of State.

It was within the same year, 1959, that through a special grant from the Ford Foundation the Survey of Second Language Teaching was launched. The immediate aim of the survey was to investigate the nature and extent of the problem of second language learning as a factor in the national development in countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. It was conducted principally by the Center in collaboration with the British Council, and the French Bureau d'Etude et de Liaison pour l'Enseignement du Français dans le Monde. The survey lasted from 1959 to 1961 and it had several important consequences on the field. I would like to sketch some of these very briefly,

One major consequence was the strengthening of international communication, So successful was the collaboration of the three major institutions involved in the Survey that it was decided to continue the relationship and jointly sponsor an annual conference which came to be known as the International Conference on Second Language Problems. The aims of the Conference have been to continue the exchange of information in the area of second language learning, especially English and French as languages of

wider communication in developing countries, and to provide an informal ground where specialists in second language problems both from government agencies and the academic world can meet to discuss problems of mutual interest.

There have been seven of these Conferences since 1961, held in Holland, France, Italy, Ireland, Canada, West Germany, and Tunisia. The 1969 meeting was held in Senegal in April. The recent tendency to hold the meetings outside Europe has resulted in focusing interest on the sociolinguistic and language-teaching problems of the region in which they are held and in involving many more specialists from the region itself. Although a direct connection can be seen between the Conferences and such a project as the Survey of Language Use and Language Teaching now in progress in Eastern Africa, their more indirect results such as the personal contacts established, the increased exchange of scholars between countries affected, and the interest aroused in linguistics and modern methods of language teaching are less easy to demonstrate. Reports on the Conferences, including brief accounts of developments in British, French, and American activities in the preceding year are available through the sponsoring organizations.

I would like to point out two other significant but perhaps indirect ways in which the Survey has had impact on the exchange of information in this field. During its course a great deal of information was accumulated, which became the nucleus of the country files at the Center for Applied Linguistics. These files, continuously up-dated and expanded, have been a source of information to numerous Americans going abroad to teach English, to government agencies, to publishers, and to many individuals and institutions both from within and outside the U.S. They have provided background information for surveys and for a number of formal and informal publications of the Center. The first listings of American university programs in this field were based on information collected for the survey, and became the periodically updated *University Resources in Linguistics and Teaching English as a Second Language,* the most comprehensive single source of information of this kind for the United States at present. To provide more detailed information on training programs in the teaching of English to speakers of other languages the Center published in 1966 a survey of course offerings and degree programs in twelve universities in the United States and Canada.

A second area in which the Survey has had major impact is that of information on materials in this field. The Center's bibliographical work became part of the Survey in 1959, to be conducted jointly with the British Council. The Center's *Reference List of Materials for English as a Second Language,* in *3* volumes, including both American and other materials covering roughly the years 1953–1968, together with the British Council's *English-Teaching Bibliography* (1963, with occasional supplements, and most recently the combined *Language Teaching Bibliography* of 1968) provide the most comprehensive coverage of the field. There have also been a large number of other

bibliographies prepared by individuals and institutions, so that there is at present adequate coverage of existing materials in the field.

The Center and the British Council have also built up perhaps the most comprehensive libraries in this field. The Center's collection, which is in constant use by out-of-town visitors and students from the Washington area, has formed the source of its numerous selected and specialized bibliographies, beginning with the *Interim Bibliography for Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages* (1960). (Incidentally, I think this is the first use of the expression which was later adopted as the name of the TESOL organization.)

Beside bibliographies, the growing number of periodicals devoted entirely or partly to this field has increased the flow of information not only on theoretical aspects of the field and materials, but on new developments. *The Linguistic Reporter, Language Learning, English Language Teaching,* the *TESOL Quarterly,* the *TESOL Newsletter,* the USIA'S *English Teaching Forum* (available only overseas), and the *NAFSA Newsletter* are but a few of the periodicals that keep the profession informed.

An important body in the coordination of the national effort in this field is the National Advisory Council on the Teaching of English as a Foreign Language for which the Center acts as Secretariat. The Council was established in 1962, on the unanimous recommendation of a conference of English language education specialists convened by the Center for Applied Linguistics for the International Cooperation Administration (now AID). The Council's main function is to relate university and other private resources to the national effort and to act in an advisory capacity to government agencies, foundations, and other institutions in matters of policy and plans. It is, at present, a self-perpetuating body of ten leading scholars in the field. It usually meets twice a year with representatives of these organizations, hears reports on new developments in their activities, and issues a set of *Decisions* which are influential not only in the international effort of the United States in this field, but, increasingly, in the domestic aspects of this effort.

Perhaps the most appropriate example of the Council's influence to give here is its role in the formation of the TESOL organization. The question of such an association has been a matter of concern to people in universities, professional associations, and government agencies for some time. In September 1963 the Center brought together a number of representatives from other professional associations with involvement in this field and other interested organizations to discuss the advisability of an independent association. This meeting resulted in the first national conference on TESOL held in Tucson, Arizona, in 1964, under the auspices of the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE), the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs (NAFSA), the Speech Association of America (SAA), and the Modern Language Association of America/Center for Applied Linguistics (MLA/CAL), but it left open the question of a national association. It was through the strong urging of members of the National Advisory Council, and as a result of one of its Decisions, which pointed out the urgent need for a

register of personnel and the general long-range need of the profession for an independent organization which could give recognized professional status to teachers in this field, that an ad hoc committee met in Chicago in January 1965 and appointed the Planning Committee for the formation of the new association with the Center as Interim Secretariat. After a year of preparation on the part of this committee the organization came into being in March 1966, at the national TESOL conference in New York.

The twelfth meeting of the Council was held at Harpers Ferry last week in conjunction with the Center's Tenth Anniversary conference on the teaching of English as a world-wide problem. Present were British and American scholars who presented papers on topics of current importance, representatives of the British Council, the Ford Foundation, and seven U.S. government agencies and departments: the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the Department of State, Agency for International Development, United States Information Agency, Defense Language Institute, the Peace Corps, the Office of Education, and the Office of Economic Opportunity. Also present were representatives from professional associations, including TESOL, NCTE, NAFSA, the British Association of Teachers of English as a Foreign Language, and other interested institutions. The meeting drew up a set of recommendations on policy and plans which will be submitted to appropriate institutions and agencies, and it is hoped that they will have significant influence on future developments in this field.

It would, in a sense, be true to say today that the problem of establishing lines of communication between various groups in this field as seen at the Ann Arbor Conference has to a large measure been accomplished. The increased international contacts, increased coordination within governmental agencies, the greater flow of information on materials, methods and new developments, and above all, a professional organization concerned entirely with this field would tend to bear this out.

However, in view of the great expansion in the field it would be a grave mistake to consider the task completed. New developments within the United States, chief among them the increased attention to domestic problems in this field, the expansion of American political and economic interest abroad, the rising demand for English overseas, steadily increasing local interest and activity in many parts of the world, make it extremely important not only to keep open and strengthen already existing lines of communication but to look to new ones that need to be opened. New developments have necessitated new ways of looking at the task; in particular there has been greater concern with the cultural, sociological, psychological, and educational background against which teaching must take place, and a parallel need to establish lines of communication between the profession and other disciplines from which assistance is needed.

Within the United States it is the greatly increased attention to the problems of non-English speakers rather than the problem itself that is new. This country has long had established groups of speakers of French, Spanish, and

American Indian languages, as well as a continuous flow of immigrants speaking a large variety of languages. An estimated figure for 1960 gives the total claimants of non-English mother tongue in the United States as just over 19,381,000, with some 3,199,000 of these as of ages between 6-18.[2]

Apart from some schools for American Indians, for a long time virtually no attention was given to the language problems of non-English speakers except in citizenship and adult education classes, with practically no involvement from universities which, at least as early as the mid-1940's, were developing new approaches to teaching English to foreign students. There were a few projects in such areas as New York and California in the mid-50's and early 60's, but nationwide attention to the problems of elementary and secondary schools began with the first two NDEA institutes for teachers of English as a second language in 1964. Since then the number of training programs, seminars, workshops, and institutes for teachers; and materials preparation, research, and experimentation projects under federal, state, city, and foundation auspices has increased greatly. The Office of Education has been perhaps the most active in this field, sponsoring a large variety of research and training projects.

Although the TENES (Survey of the Teaching of English to Non-English Speakers in the United States) survey collected information on the situation during 1964–66 (and there are some current surveys on particular aspects of the field), it is at present very difficult to obtain information on all the diverse activities being carried out throughout the country under various auspices. It is also very difficult to identify people in administrative positions responsible for ESOL in state and city education systems. One urgent need at the moment is the systematic collection, updating, and maintenance of information on all teacher training, materials preparation, research, and experimentation projects in this country. Such information would not only make it possible to establish lines of communication between those engaged in similar projects, but help to avoid undue duplication and perhaps eventually provide the basis for an examination of the most fruitful approaches in given situations.

Systematic information is also lacking on the present distribution of non-English-speaking children in schools in various areas of the United States, on the languages spoken by them, and on the social and cultural background against which they must be taught English. Often those that plan to set up projects are themselves groping in the dark and need guidance. An assessment of the situation in problem areas would be helpful both for the economical and judicious setting up of programs, and for providing guidance to the type of help that is needed. An example of one such assessment is the study of the problems of teaching English to American Indians which the Center conducted for the Bureau of Indian Affairs in 1967. The

---

2 G. Reginald Bishop, cd., *Foreign Language Teaching: Challenges to the Profession* (Princeton, N.J.: The Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 1966), p. 96.

Bureau has already taken steps to implement some of the recommendations of the study.

There are a number of administrative problems that face elementary and secondary schools, and systematic information is needed on how they are being solved in various areas and under various circumstances. The proportion of non-English-speaking children in a school may vary from close to 100% to one or two individuals. They come to school with varying commands of English, and varying language backgrounds, and are often in mixed classes that have speakers of standard, regional, and social varieties of English. Are these non-English-speaking children being separated from the mainstream for special help by specialist teachers, or are they given a few minutes of the teacher's time while other members of the class are somehow "occupied"? If they are separated, what are the provisions for time, classroom space, specialized staff, and procedures for their eventual joining the mainstream? If they are not separated (which is often the case), does the teacher have special training to meet the needs of speakers of standard and non-standard varieties of English as well as those of non-English speakers?

If attitudes and motivation are important in language learning, the problems of these children are very different. The language of the non-standard speaker shares a large amount of phonological, morphological, syntactic, and lexical elements with standard English. A child who is expected to learn another variety of the language he already speaks, or thinks he speaks, of which he has a far better passive understanding than the non-English speaker can have, and into some form of which he can often switch, may find it very difficult to regard the task in the same motivational light as the non-English speaker, or respond meaningfully to the same techniques in the same classroom. New approaches are needed to find solutions to the problems of mixed classes, perhaps in a few experimental schools attached to universities where new patterns of classroom activity, team teaching, and techniques such as the use of structured games, drama, and role playing with special materials reflecting dialect variation and different levels of usage, and so on, can be tried out.

Even more important is the need to develop a sensitivity among teachers to the very different problems and needs of these children. Required courses in principles of language teaching in the certification of all teachers (at least at the elementary level) in areas where mixed classes are likely to occur might help to develop in them a receptivity to new approaches and new techniques in meeting the varying problems of their students.

A new dimension has been added to the situation by the Bilingual Education Act, which is in the first stages of implementation. In recent years the term "bilingual child" has come to be used as a euphemism for the disadvantaged child whose mother tongue is not English. The Act will make it possible for these children to acquire some of their education through the medium of their own language (where this is legal) and to strengthen their English. But the implications of bilingual education for separate time on

the school schedule—especially here mixed classes are found-for trained personnel, for the use of various languages (or their standard forms) as media for instruction, for parallel curriculum content with the mainstream of American education in which these children will eventually compete need very careful attention. Research is needed on the psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic background of these children to find the best ways in which bilingual education can answer their needs.

The last few years have seen a tendency to extend organized education to pre-school children in such programs as Head Start and the new kindergartens for American Indians. The use of the mother tongue in such programs, the methodology of teaching English at this level, the need to keep close ties with the child's home and culture are new areas of activity in this field and need investigation and cooperation from a number of disciplines. In this connection may I refer you to the forthcoming report of a planning conference which the Center convened for the BIA as the first phase of a Navajo-English bilingual kindergarten project. The report may have implications for the setting up of such projects for children in other minority groups.

Related to this, and equally urgent, are the needs of the parents of many of these children. The profession has long neglected the problems of the non-academic adult who finds it more and more difficult to function in a literate society without some command of English for his everyday occupation and some measure of literacy in it.

I have so far concentrated on the domestic scene in new developments as the most appropriate for this article. The survey of the last decade by Albert H. Marckwardt published in the October 1967 issue of *The Linguistic Reporter* provides an excellent summary of developments, especially in the overseas efforts of the United States. I would, however, like to make a few comments on two aspects of the field that concern both domestic and overseas activities.

The first concerns the question of manpower and teacher training. The expansion of the field has necessitated the preparation of a variety of personnel for different aspects and levels of teaching English to those for whom it is not a native language, and American universities have expanded their programs to meet the need. However, for some categories of personnel, such as teachers of English to non-English speakers in mixed elementary and secondary classes in this country, for Peace Corps Volunteers and for Fulbright teachers overseas, ESOL is generally not a full-time career, but either a partial or temporary occupation. In part for this reason and in part because of difficulties in releasing practicing teachers for long-term preparation, especially the vast numbers of teachers overseas, more and more reliance is being placed on short-term training. The Center has been concerned with the problem of how such training can be conducted to the best advantage, and the report of the *Conference on Short-Term Training of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages,* July 1966, sets forth the problem

and attempts to identify components of such training that need attention. An international conference on the same subject, sponsored by the Center, the British Council and the Bureau pour l'Enseignement de la Langue et de la Civilisation Françaises a l'Etranger was held in Colchester, England, in October 1968, and a report is in preparation by the English-Teaching Information Centre of the British Council. Both these conferences stressed that short-term training is not a substitute for long-term preparation and is further very much dependent on university programs for new developments in theory and practice and for the preparation of teacher trainers.

My second comment concerns materials. As we saw, there is at present sufficient bibliographical information on what is available, but this needs to be kept up, and perhaps more importantly, brought to the attention of the practicing teacher and administrator. There is still a tendency to prepare new materials when existing ones could be used or adapted. Materials preparation is a very specialized task and needs training, experience, and an awareness of new developments in the field. The great preoccupation with the purely linguistic aspects of the task, especially contrastive phonology, of even a decade ago, is being supplemented by greater attention to varying needs for varying age levels, and social and cultural situations. At the moment there is urgent need for an assessment of what materials are available for various levels and for the different aspects of the field as a guide to new directions to be followed. One area of need, for instance, is that of materials for use with mechanical devices used as aural and visual aids, an area where, in Professor Marckwardt's words, "the virtuosity of the electronic technician has outrun the ingenuity of the language teacher."[3] Much more attention is needed to software to make use of the more and more sophisticated hardware that is at present available, if such hardware is to be used as an effective aid to English teaching.

I have tried to touch on some of the major developments in the field from the point of view of the clearinghouse and coordinating role of the Center for Applied Linguistics. In new areas needing attention I have emphasized domestic rather than foreign aspects, but even here it was possible to mention only a few. May I conclude with Professor Marckwardt's observation that the expansion of the field has been so inordinately great that it is doubtful that any individual has sufficient competence and experience to assess the entire English-teaching situation today. May I add, however, that the necessity for communication and coordination has grown in equal proportions.

---

[3] Albert H. Marckwardt, "Teaching English as a Foreign Language: A Survey of the Past Decade," *Linguistic Reporter,* Supplement No. 19 (Oct. 1967), 6.

Vol 3 No 2 Jun 1969

*Implication for ESOL of Some Recent Linguistic Research**

William E. Rutherford

The amount of research emanating from the field of modern linguistics has begun to reach staggering proportions. Moreover, a substantial part of this output is extremely significant for general linguistics as well as potentially quite useful for applied linguistics. Exciting things are happening.

Just as a few years ago linguists realized that it made little sense to conduct phonological research independently of syntax, so we have now reached a point where it appears that syntax cannot be divorced from semantics. This fact is reflected in the coinage of a new word referring to precisely this area of current interest: *semantax.*

In recent years, at least in the work of linguists such as Ross, Lakoff, Postal, and McCawley, underlying syntactic representation has been bearing less and less resemblance to surface realizations, but at the same time more and more resemblance to semantic representation. To the extent that syntactic configurations appear ever more abstract then, they point to identity with semantic structure. Furthermore, the more that individual languages are investigated in depth, the more their deepest abstract representations begin to look alike, suggesting really for the first time that "lingustic universal" is something other than just an idealized notion. One need not dwell very long on the interesting implications for language pedagogy that a formalized theory of linguistic universals will have.

In any discussion of the current convergence of syntax and semantics, and its possible relevance for ESOL, one would cite such contributions of the last couple of years as Fillmore's case grammar, Sandra Annear's analysis of relative clauses, Kiparsky's observations on belief and presupposition, plus other efforts, published and unpublished, by such as Postal, Chomsky, Lakoff, Bach, McCawley and the UCLA English Syntax Project. Since, however, it is impossible in a single article to even begin to do justice to this tremendous output of linguistic research, discussion will be limited to the implications for ESOL of just one area of recent inquiry, something known as the "performative hypothesis," which is best presented in an article by J. R. Ross entitled "On Declarative Sentences," to appear in the forthcoming *Readings in English Transformational Grammar,* edited by Jacobs and Rosenbaum. Before looking briefly at Ross's proposal, however, consider the following pairs of sentences:

---

* This article is a somewhat modified version of a paper presented at the annual conference of the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, May 1969.

Mr. Rutherford, Lecturer in English at the University of Southern California and a past contributor to *TESOL Quurterly,* is the author of *Modern English: A Textbook for Foreign Students* (Harcourt, Brace & World, 1968) and a forthcoming English text for American high school students.

(1a) John's not coming to class because he's sick.
(1b) John's not coming to class, because he just called from Glendale.
(2a) She loves her husband even though he beats her.
(2b) She loves her husband, although (I know that) he beats her.
(3a) The paper will be a success if I have my facts straight.
(3b) The paper was a success, if I have my facts straight.
(4a) His testimony will stand up unless you have evidence to the contrary. (i.e. evidence contradicting his testimony)
(4b) His testimony will stand up, unless you have evidence to the contrary. (i.e. evidence that his testimony *won't* stand up)
(5a) He'll take his umbrella in case it rains.
(5b) He'll take his umbrella, in case you're wondering.

Some preliminary assumptions concerning these examples are 1) that of each pair, (a) is semantically distinct from (b), 2) that all the (a)s are alike and all the (b)s alike in some as yet undefined sense, and 3) that linguistic relationship of some kind holds between the (a)s and the (b)s. The examples reveal a number of linguistic facts in support of these assumptions: 1) yes/no questioning of the whole sentence is possible with all the (a) s only; 2) pro-ing with *so* and *neither* covers the entire sentence in (a):

(6a) He'll take his umbrella in case it rains, and so will I.

but only the main clause in (b):

(6b) He'll take his umbrella, in case you're wondering, and so will I.

3) Only the (a)s can occur inside factive nominals:

(7a) her loving her husband even though he beats her
(7b) * her loving her husband, although (I know that) he beats her

4) If two clauses are introduced in one sentence by the same subordinator, they occur either as two (a)s in simple conjunction or as (a) followed by (b) without conjunction:

(8) He's not coming to class because he's sick and because he doesn't like school anyway.

(9) He's not coming to class because he's sick, because his wife told me.

5) Root modals can occur only in (a), epistemic models in (a) or (b):

(10a) He mustn't speak Spanish because this is an English class.
(10b) *He mustn't speak Spanish, because he never studied it.
(11a) He must not speak Spanish because this is an English class. (i.e. He must be speaking it for some other reason.)
(11b) He must not speak Spanish, because he never studied it.

Two other facts seem to lend additional support to the distinction between (a) and (b). One of these is that (1), (2), and (5) have paraphrase a with nominalizations using *because of, in spite of,* and *in case of,* respectively. However, it is only the (a) set which can be paraphrased in this way:

(12a) He'll take his umbrella in case of rain.
(12b) * He'll take his umbrella, in case of your wondering.

Finally, it happens that comma intonation between main clause and subordinate clause generally feels more natural in (b) than in (a) which feeling is reflected in writing as well as in speech.

In the article mentioned above, Ross presents evidence to support a claim that the underlying structure of declarative sentences is a configuration where such sentences are embedded as object clauses of a higher sentence which has *I* as its subject and *you* as its indirect object, and which contains a verb performing some kind of linguistic communication, like *say* or *tell.* Evidence marshaled by Ross in support of his analysis includes facts gathered from such areas as pronominalization, passives, predication, embedding, etc., all of which are intended to show that a large number of declarative sentences have peculiarities which are most plausibly accounted for by means of just such a representation. A rule of "performative deletion" is then required to convert the structure containing the performative, abbreviated as (13a),

(13a) I say to you that prices slumped.

to the simple declarative without the performative, abbreviated as (13b),

(13b) Prices slumped.

Ross's arguments are accepted, and it will be shown that his scheme can account as well for examples (1) to (5), and also some other facts, all of which otherwise pose problems for compilers of ESL materials.

It is claimed here that in examples (1) to (5) the "restrictive" subordinate clause (a) is in construction with the overt main clause, whereas in (b) the non-restrictive subordination is in construction not with the main clause, but with the already deleted *I say to you that. . .* or something to that effect. Thus, in (la) *his being sick* is the reason for his not coming to class, but in (lb) *his hating just called from Glendale* is not the reason for his not coming to class but for my being able to say that he's not coming to class. Moreover, the coordinating conjunction *for* can replace *because* in (lb), although not in (1a).[1] Also, (1a) can be clefted; (1b) cannot:

(14) It's because he's sick that he's not coming to class.

This suggests, in addition to a method of presentation, an interesting kind of written exercise where the student is forced to distinguish between the two instances. The main clause might remain constant, the subordinate clause position filled by a succession of *because* constructions which the student would punctuate where necessary. By this means, and by having him rewrite the restrictive forms as cleft sentences, the student's interpretation of such sentences can be verified.

---

1 On page 29 of the unpublished version of his article, Ross cites the example *Jenny isn't here, for I don't see her as* support for his "performative" arguments, but does not touch further on the kind of subordination being discussed here.

With *though* clauses, and the other examples from (2) to (5), the situation is similar. *Even though* is interpretable only as a restriction on the overt main clause, *although* only as a restriction on the deleted higher verb of saying. An exercise like the one just proposed could be devised where the student's choice of *even though* or *although* for a series of supplied clauses would reveal the extent of his understanding. A further test of comprehension could be devised wherein, given a mixed series of sentences like examples (1), (2), and (5), both (a) and (b), the student converted where possible to *because of, in spite of,* and *in case of* constructions. As we've already seen, it is the subordinate clause only in (a) which can be so paraphrased. The clauses in (b) are tied to a deleted higher performative,

It has so far been shown that subordination is felt to be associated with either the overt main clause or the covert performative. However, behavior of the *wh-* question *why* demonstrates that the association can be with the latter at the same time as the former is being questioned, as shown in (15):

(15) Why isn't he coming to class, because I thought he had a paper to give(?)

Interestingly, the question is really felt to end with *class,* and the question mark at the end seems odd somehow. The first half of the sentence is a question, but the second half is really an assertion. This is true also of yes/no questions, since (16) is equally grammatical:

(16) Is he coming to class, because I thought he was sick(?)

Yes/no questions are an especially good test of this because they require rising intonation. Yet (16) is the odd example of a sentence in English which displays both rising and falling intonation, rising to the comma (the question), and falling at the end (the assertion). The underlying principle at work can be made use of for some interesting intonation practice for the student where the appropriate contour assigned to a series of subordinate clauses in substitution following a constant main clause can again serve as a partial check on comprehension.

Continued examination of *why* questions provides more evidence for the performative analysis. If the answer to a conversational question such as *Did you by chance call me yesterday around noon?* is negative, that response is likely to be not just *no,* but *no, why?* But *why* does *not* mean here that the speaker is questioning his own reason for not calling; he means rather *Why do you ask?* And *ask,* according to Ross's proposal, is one of the verbs whose feature specification corresponds to that required by the conditions for performative deletion. Again, in a two-way conversation A says *It's going to rain; B* says *Why?* But B is not asking for a meteorological accounting of the precipitation phenomenon; he really means *Why do you say that it's going to rain?*

Order is another performative, deletion of the higher sentence containing which, as in *I order you to go,* is Ross's source for imperatives. This also provides an explanation for the grammaticality of (17):

(17) Get out of here, because I have work to do(!)

where *because* S is the reason not for getting out but for the command. Again, the exclamation point would be no more unnatural at the position of the comma.

Certainly the most significant gain in analyzing restrictive and non-restrictive subordination in terms of the performative analysis is that one is thereby able to say that English has not two *becauses, thoughs, ifs,* etc., but only one, the illusion of two arising out of the fact that a (restrictive) subordinate clause associated with the top performative sentence is not erased when the performative deletion rule is applied. This analysis also appears to be one which can be made use of for ESL purposes with relatively little difficulty.

That part of syntax known as "indirect" or "reported" speech yields interesting evidence for the performative hypothesis, which in turn can serve as a more intuitively satisfactory framework for textbook presentation of the facts of indirect speech. It is obvious that a sentence occurring in quotes as somebody's actual utterance will often have to have a different representation when it appears within the object clause of someone else's verb of saying. The differences may be many or few. Thus, in (18) there is only one change:

(18a) John: *"It's raining."*
(18b) John said that *it was raining.*

in (19) there are four:

(19a) John: *"I'll see you here later."*
(19b) John said that *he would see me there later.*

The change in verb tense is obvious and rules for it are given in most texts. The change of person is also familiar. The speaker, when he uses the first person, can be referring only to himself; when he uses the second person, only to the person being spoken to. These facts hold regardless of what else is happening syntactically. However, point-of-time adverbs are also tied to the speaker's performance and must be converted to a different form when the original utterance becomes the sentential object of another speaker's performative verb. The probable correspondences, which can form the basis of some effective exercises, are as follows:

performance	*report*
today	that day
tomorrow	the next/following day
yesterday	the day before/previous day
this afternoon/week	that afternoon/week
next Monday/year	the following Monday/year
last week/month	the .... before, the previous ....
ago	before, prior

One so-called "idiom" which undergoes a similar change is *on the contrary.* Thus, one can reply to someone by saying *On the contrary, I can't*

speak a word of Quechua, which would then have to be reported as *Bill replied to the contrary that he couldn't speak a word of Quechua.* The fact that we refer to certain expressions in English as "idioms" is rather revealing. What we really mean by "idiom" is that the item in question does not conform in any apparent way to the rules of English that happen to be in use at the moment, which means that the structure of that item is a mystery. Presumably, when the mystery is solved, the idiom is no longer an idiom. Recall at this point what was mentioned earlier, that Ross's proposal suggests that declarative sentences all originate as the sentential objects of a higher verb, but specifically that this higher verb is a verb of *saying,* and one which must have a first person subject and a second person indirect object. It may be more than mere accident that English (and perhaps all languages) has a substantial number of idiomatic expressions which meet the aforementioned stipulation with remarkable regularity. Example (20) mirrors all three requirements:

(20) Don't tell { * them / * him / me } you think there's an international conspiracy.

If the intonation at the end is level, the sentence does not feel here like a command, and all but the first person has to be starred. (20) is almost like a question, *Do you think there's an international conspiracy?* accompanied by some disbelief. Even the expression *to tell you the truth,* as in (21):

(21) To tell { * them / * him / you } the truth, I don't know.

which can be paraphrased as (22):

(22) I tell you truthfully that I don't know.

looks like a nominalization of the entire performative sentence, with deletion of *for me.* Additional examples with *say,* and reflecting a first person subject, are *I'll say it is; You don't say.* Those constrained only to a first person subject include *I'll have you know that . . . . Do I make myself clear? Say is* overt in sentences like (23):

(23) Say, haven't I seen you somewhere before?

covert in expressions with *that is,* as in *(24):*

(24) That is (to say), S

Finally, an array of prepositional phrases appear to be tied definitely to the speakers' performance. The interesting thing about these is that although virtually all can occur in sentences like *They meant in other words that . . . , She will write in addition that . . . ,* when the subordinate clause appears as the main clause, preceded by the same idiomatic prepositional phrase, the interpretation is always one which implies a first person subject and a verb of saying:

(I say) { in conclusion / in addition / in all modesty / in all seriousness / in other words / in fact / in brief / in short / in a nutshell / in essence / on the contrary / on the other hand / by the way / for example } (that) S

It has been suggested that the performative analysis, as it applies to English alone, suggests interesting ways of teaching aspects of reported speech and the special changes that some associated adverbs must undergo, of punctuation, intonation, and of a sizable portion of what are usually helplessly referred to as "idioms." It is also true, however, that the performative hypothesis, to cite just one development of recent research, and assuming that it holds universally, points to the possibility of being able to conduct at least some contrastive analyses within a formally defied, linguistically meaningful framework, and not on the mere comparison of two separate language-particular descriptions.

Vol 3 No 2 Jun 1969

The Present Perfect Again

Bruce Pattison

Most teachers will agree with Mr. Ralph H. Walker that "The simple present perfect and the present perfect continuous are for the non-native speaker of English two of the most troublesome tenses in the English verb system."[1] As he says, "It is an easy matter to teach a student to form the present perfect tenses, but quite another matter to teach him how to use them. . . . One often hears a non-native speaker use a simple present where he should use a simple present perfect. . . a present continuous where he should use a present perfect continuous . . . or a simple present perfect where he should use a simple past." The problem, in short, is to ensure selection of one of the present perfect forms when it is the only form of the verb that will do.

Mr. Walker considers time to be the governing factor. The past tense refers to an event in time that has gone by: in his rather odd metaphor, the time frame is closed. Though he mentions only one past tense, he recognizes two present tenses, one indicating an action which occurs repeatedly and the other an action occurring now. With both of these the time frame is open. So is it with the present perfect tenses. The difference between them and the present tenses is that they refer to an action which has already occurred, but "Instead of situating his action at a definite point in the past, the speaker places it within a period of time which extends from some point in the past up to now."

Rather ashamed of this admission of self-determination by the speaker—speakers' intentions not being quite respectable since Bloomfield—Mr. Walker tries to identify tenses with time indicators inside the sentence. He shows that the present perfects have the same collocations as the present tenses. This establishes that they are not past tenses, and this is important, but its practical value is reduced by the number of expressions that will go with either present or past and by the fact that the utterance may contain no specific time indicators at all. The context is the only safe guide to the selection of a particular verb form. He does mention a few expressions peculiar to the present perfects and not compatible with present tenses. This is more helpful for teaching. But what he does not notice is that most of them are found also with past perfects. This confirms what should have been suspected from the pairs of past, present, and present perfect forms, that more than tense is involved.

Tense is the one obligatory choice that has to be made in the verb phrase. The neutral, timeless one-word form is inflected, or undergoes vowel gradation, for the past. When the phrase is expanded, the first word carries the

---

Mr. Pattison is Head of the Division of Language Teaching in the University of London Institute of Education, President of the Association of Teachers of English as a Foreign Language in Great Britain, and a member of the Editorial Board of *English Language Teaching.*

1 "Teaching the Present Perfect Tenses *TESOL Quarterly,* I, 4 (Dec., 1967), 17.

choice between past and non-past. For the one-word verb may be substituted a pastor non-past form of the auxiliary *be* followed by one of two participles which give the action either a perfect or imperfect (progressive) aspect. The distinction is between a state resulting from an action and an action in progress: a *fallen* star is a star whose falling is already complete or perfected, while a *falling* star is in process of falling.

The past participle predicated after *be* is intransitive and takes subjects that usually act as objects of other forms of the verb. In Old English there was an alternative auxiliary *weorðan.* German has two similar auxiliaries, *sein* and *werden.* The distinction is called by Jespersen that between *being* and *becoming:* it is an instance of a more general distinction found elsewhere in the language between the static and the dynamic. It was lost as a formal contrast in early Middle English. It is easy to see, however, how the participle in its static use would approximate to an adjective: in *I am interested in stamps* it has almost lost its verbal character. The dynamic use, on the other hand, would mirror the simple present, its subject being a possible object of the latter: there is not very much difference between viewing an action as a whole and as reaching completion. A full set of duplicate forms has been developed, and the feeling that they represented active and passive voices was strong enough to generate a progressive for the passive during the eighteenth century: *The house is being built* for the ambiguous *The house is building.*

English has always used the auxiliary *have* to transfer the agent, which appears after the passive only optionally in a phrase governed by *by,* to the subject position. In Old English the construction was confined to transitive verbs, and the past participle was congruent with the object in number, gender, and case. In French, where there has been a similar development, the participle still agrees with the object when the latter precedes the former: e.g., *la lettre que j'ai écrite. I have written the letter* implies *The letter is written.* Long after the have construction was extended to intransitive verbs, *be* was frequent with verbs of motion: *He is come; It is* gone—which are virtually equivalent to *He is here* and *It is no longer here.* A few relics of a perfective passive remain in which the verbal force of the participle has not been entirely lost: *The work is finished; the house is built; the box is made of wood.* But generally the perfective sense has been transferred to the *have* forms, and in those with *be,* aspect has been neutralized by voice. *I have lost my wallet* includes *My wallet is lost* and is present, if only because it contrasts with a past form, *I had lost my wallet.*

Have and *be* may act together as auxiliaries, in which case *have* comes first and carries the tense. If there is a modal auxiliary with either or both of them, it comes first. The full structure of the verb phrase is $(\text{M})^{1} (\text{have})^{n}$ $(\text{be})^{\text{ing, n}}$, the indices indicating the form of the auxiliary or main verb following each auxiliary. Since *have* must be followed by a past participle, the perfect progressive forms of the passive are rather awkward and tend to be avoided. *It must be being cleaned* is tolerable, but *It has been being*

cleaned and still more It *may have been being cleaned* is clumsy and would probably be split up into *It may have been away being cleaned.* Nevertheless there are many forms including *have* and therefore to be reckoned as perfect. However, before grappling with modals and passives one would deal with the past/non-past and progressive/non-progressive contrasts:

It has fallen
had been falling.

All the forms concerned regard the action referred to by the main verb as completed but still relevant at a time in the past or present on which the speaker fixes his attention. It is the continuing relevance that is the difficulty, especially in time the speaker chooses to consider not past, since there is an apparent conflict between it and the notion of a completed action.

Any of the forms may refer to an action that was completed before the point of primary interest.

I have broken a few records when I was younger.
It has been raining.
That had happened several times during the previous year.
They had been getting ready and now were all set to go.

Any of the forms may refer to an action continuing up to the point of primary interest.

I have lived here for two years.
We have been playing chess together lately.
I had always taken a walk before supper.
He had been learning Italian for a few months.

The action may not be finished at the time the speaker is chiefly concerned with: in the first of the above examples the speaker does not mean to imply that he is changing his residence. Jespersen calls this usage the inclusive perfect. It is doubtful, however, whether the continuation of the action beyond the speaker's point of primary interest is indicated by the perfect rather than by the verb lexeme or by the context. If there is any such sense in the perfect, it is due to the impossibility of including the past in a statement containing the present tense: English does not allow * *I am living here since last May,* and so *I have been living here since last May* is taken, if the context suggests it, to imply the addition *and I am still living here.*

Walker tries to distinguish between the simple present perfect and the present perfect continuous by saying that the former describes "a complete and finished performance" and the latter "an incomplete action covering a period of time that began at some point in the past and has continued uninterrupted up to now." This last statement has to be modified in a footnote, for, as he admits, when we look out and say, "It has been raining," it is usually not still raining, and when the three bears in the story exclaimed, "Someone has been eating my porridge: and "Someone has been sitting in my chair" there was certainly nobody eating their porridge or sitting in their

chairs; if there had been they would have used the present continuous tense. The distinction between simple and progressive is, indeed, the same with the perfects as with the past and present tenses: the former views an action as a unit, and the latter thinks of it as a process taking a stretch of time. So, just as the simple present is timeless, except by contrast with the past, and can express general and always valid truths, so the simple present perfect is available for stock-taking, for what Zandvoort calls "the perfect of experience." *Have you seen the Ufizzi collection?* may ask about a person's whole lifetime: the word ever would normally be included. The present relevance of the experience enquired about is uppermost in the questioner's mind, not when it happened. The present perfect continuous, with its greater consciousness of time, is more apt to be used for processes continuing up to the present, though, as we have seen, its use is not limited to them.

Past and present perfect forms are very similar in most respects. They differ chiefly in the speakers' time of primary interest. The simple past perfect is rather easier than the simple present perfect, because the relevance of the completed action at the time of primary interest is usually just that it had already happened: the past perfect is therefore generally regarded as a pre-past tense and as such is not difficult to teach. Of the two presents the continuous is perhaps the easier to begin with.

Whatever form is taught, the principles are the same. The problem, as Mr. Walker has pointed out, is when to use it. When experienced speakers use it can be learned only from the situations in which they do so. Mr. Walker's blackboard diagram and his brief comments on his exemplary sentences do not provide sufficient contextualization. Nor does he give his students opportunities to imitate his model sentences in contexts of situation. They are invited merely to respond to linguistic cues. When the teacher asks, "Have you ever. . . .?" they are expected to substitute "No, I never. . . " and continue with the noises the teacher made. Why the forms have been chosen is never made clear. The practice sentences are recited like a ritual. They have no relation to anything and might well be meaningless. There is a high probability that if the teacher gave the cue, "Have you manicured a waterfall?" the students might take a chance on choosing a possible time for this incomprehensible activity and reply, "Yes, I have. I manicured one last week."

Learners must be led gradually from the production of forms in a strictly controlled context to free choice without guidance. This happens too quickly in Mr. Walker's suggested procedure and does not go far enough. From mere response to cues they are expected to jump straight to a written paragraph of seven or eight sentences on a subject such as some of the things they have done this week or places they have visited. As they are warned not to use any past time expressions, they will no doubt carry out the assignment to their own and the teacher's satisfaction by putting every verb in the present perfect. This, of course, proves nothing. The only valid evidence that a student has assimilated the item taught into his language would be that he

produced it without prompting when it alone was appropriate. But the procedures suggested do not train the student in selection; they merely drill him in sentence construction. In this they conform to widespread routines that pass for applied linguistics but should be called non-applied linguistics because the linguistics does not reach the learners' real problems and the teaching procedures owe less to insight into language than to a crude behaviorist psychology.

Any frequently used form is likely to have a wide range of functions, and to expose the learner to the full range too quickly will only bewilder him. It has to be revealed to him little by little. A good starting point is a great help. It must be easy to grasp and capable of expansion, so that the full range of usage develops smoothly, no new revelation unsettling existing practice or interfering with other features of the language. It is like winding a skein of wool into a ball; if one gets hold of the right end straight off, all goes well; otherwise one is landed with a tangle.

Mr. Walker has undoubtedly found the right way into the present perfect continuous. It is by reference to activities starting at a point in the past and continuing right up to the moment of speaking. The verb *start* and the adverb *still* should have been previously learned and can be used to establish the two points of time between which the action has been in progress. Activities the students are accustomed to talking about in English will provide their own contexts:

> "When did we start learning English this morning? . . . Yes, at ten o'clock. We started learning English at ten o'clock. Are we still learning English?. . . Yes, we are. We started learning English at ten o'clock, and we're still learning English. We've been learning English since ten o'clock. What have we been doing since ten o'clock? . . ."

Such examples invite the student merely to repeat the sentence containing the form being taught. After some practice with them, always referring to a context the students are aware of, the teacher can put the *What have we been doing?* question without a preliminary statement containing it. He can go on to show pictures of people obviously engaged in some activity and ask what they have been doing during a time suggested by the stage their activities have reached. This will lead to the production of the form without prompting. The questions can require an inference: "Why is X wet?" "Because he has been swimming."

The simple present perfect may be developed from the present perfect continuous. What is quite certain is that the worst possible starting point is that suggested by Walker, the "perfect of experience," and it is odd that he should have chosen it when his whole approach is to link the perfect with times. The present relevance of the action completed is much more easily demonstrated by reference to its results which are visible here and now, though this is a frequent rather than an essential reason for choosing the form. In the course of the procedure outlined above for introducing the present perfect continuous one may follow a sentence such as "We've been

reading this book for three weeks" with "Have we finished it?" and shunt into "No, we haven't. We've read fifty pages of it," and so on.

From this kind of practice one can go on to situations which are most naturally described in terms of what produced them. A picture of an accident is an example. The students can be asked to say what has happened. If they report in static terms, a *why* question will usually produce the required perfect.

The important requirement of any method of introducing any forms such as these is that the examples should be contextualized. I would be advisable to carry on from the activities sketchily outlined to a story. Stories always provide the best contextualization. The kind of story that is suitable is suggested by one of Mr. Walker's examples already cited, The Three Bears. The bears found what somebody had been doing in their home, and each in turn referred to his activities in a series of sentences containing the present perfect continuous. For more sophisticated learners deducing what has happened from clues visible here and now—the staple material of the detective story—provides what is wanted. As stories are usually reported in the past, the clues will have to be referred to in the dialogue to produce the present perfect forms required, and it will be quite good practice if those already in the text are supplemented by additional dialogue invented by the students. After reading and dramatizing such a story the students can be set to find clues in a situation suggested by a picture. If they can use the present perfects appropriately in doing that, they will have learned to handle the forms. But they will arrive at the capacity to do so only by a course of contextualized examples and exercises graded so as to reduce the guidance to selection of the forms little by little.

Vol 3 No 2 Jun 1969

Providing for ESL Pupils During the Total School Day

Ruth Perlman Klebaner

When second language learners are interspersed among native English speakers in a regular classroom, time for special ESL instruction is necessarily limited. This precious time can be used to greatest advantage when teachers use the ever-increasing sources and resources of the TESOL field. But, for the greater part of the school day, the small minority of ESL learners, some of whom are probably more advanced than others, will have to get along without the benefit of intensive, individual ESL instruction. Do they just sit in linguistic isolation and stare about them? Do they provide for their own entertainment by roving about and finding things of interest within the room? Do they lose a little ground each day—academically, socially emotionally—because the are unable to participate in mathematics, social studies, science, and other subjects? Are they relegated to electronic isolation where schools supply tape recorders, cartridge-loading self-instructional projects, phonographs, and programs which can sidetrack a child to an entirely independent track while his "classmates" live through entirely different experiences? This article is concerned with how English language learners might participate in a classroom during the course of the school day at times when they are not receiving specific ESL instruction.

As teachers plan for daily instruction, they must ask themselves the same question in relation to each curriculum area: "What is there in this lesson that could somehow be adapted to the comprehension level of the non-English speakers, the partial English speakers, and the fluent English speakers in the class?"

One must keep in mind that second language learners are neither deaf nor stupid—they merely lack facility to communicate freely in the language. They do not know certain cultural clues and symbols, but they have logic, life experience, previous educational experience, emotions, preferences, prejudices, problems, and skills. To harness all of these elements upon which learning may be based, the teacher must be a mime and an actor; a knowledgeable analyst and arranger of content; a wise selector and user of quality audio and visual material; a competent designer of teaching, testing and practice material appropriate for the multiple ability levels found in any regular classroom; and a skilled practitioner of the best in human relations.

The average teacher has too much to do under ordinary circumstances; the admission of a few ESL children may dismay her at first. But with a little research and imagination she will find an unlimited number of language-

---

Mrs. Klebaner, Assistant Professor of Education, Brooklyn College, The City University of New York, has published articles in *The National Elementary Principal* and *The Grade Teacher.*

teaching opportunities throughout the school day. Some specific suggestions follow.

First and foremost, a language learner must be an observer of language. Therefore, in a class containing language learners it is a good idea for teachers to try to use the same words and phrases each day in giving standard directions. There are phrases used by teachers which are important: "The bell has rung. Please get ready for the day's work." "Put away your social studies books and take out your math workbooks and your crayons." In time, without direct instruction, the learner will recognize the patterns, interpret their meanings, and do what is asked.

In order to participate in instruction in various curriculum areas children must know the names of basic tools: the chalkboard, chalk and eraser, the screen, the bulletin board, the map and globe, the ruler, pencil, crayon, pen, the counting frame, scale, yardstick. As a teacher begins a lesson and produces certain materials, she can provide instruction. "Before we begin our lesson, let's see what we will use. We will use the chalkboard (Teacher points and asks one of the language learners to repeat), the counting frame (same procedure), these rods (same procedure) . ." Such a procedure takes only a few seconds but, with daily repetition, teaches effectively and gives ESL pupils a sense of participating.

Children are aware of each other's strengths and weaknesses; they know exactly who lacks ability to speak English. Quality teaching will create a class-community climate in which all children develop a patient acceptance of the fact that one child in the class is learning to say "wind" while another is working out problems of wind velocity and the ground speed of jets.

At the end of many lessons children should be able to identify what they have learned. During this evaluation-recapitulation period, there will be at least one more opportunity to involve the language learner. In a mathematics lesson, for example, a child may have learned how to regroup six into three groups of two on a manipulative level, although he cannot as yet formulate the oral symbolization for this computation. He can demonstrate what he has learned, and an English-speaking child can describe what he is doing. This type of experience does as much for the learner's self-image as someone capable of succeeding as it does for his academic development.

Simple, well-chosen indoor games can often include language learners. "I flew to Puerto Rico and I took along my hat" can start off the familiar game in which children add the names of objects after repeating the basic formula. In games like Buzz, instead of just saying "1-2-3-4-5-6-Buzz:' flash cards are used with the spoken numbers. Of course, any multiple of 7 can be Buzz—35, for example. This gives children who know number facts in another language a chance to participate and practice. Games that have repetitive phrases—like Simple Simon, the Farmer in Dell— are enjoyed by all and are of special value to language learners.

Excellent opportunities are afforded in curriculum areas such as social studies, music, and physical education. In social studies a child can learn the

names of things: "This is a map," "This is a globe: "This is north," "This is a mailman," and other simple phrases that he can be asked to repeat as the teacher initiates a lesson. The ESL child may also be paired with an English speaker and go with him when he locates things on a map or globe, sand table, or chart. A quiet child paired with a gregarious one provides a stimulating combination within a committee.

In the grades where there is map study, a productive project is dual-map study in which a child receives an outline map of the country, state, or territory he comes from and one of the country, state, or territory he has moved to. He locates parallel features—main locations, products, industries, climate, and so forth—and studies differences visually.[1]

Similar projects can be tried with songs which can be learned in two languages or in regional versions. "Are You Sleeping, Brother John?" can be taught to a newcomer, and in return he can teach his version. On the other hand, Westerners have some versions of "She'll Be Coming 'round the Mountain" which differ from Eastern versions.

Much language and culture is learned by comparing and contrasting games, celebrations, birthday lore, and fashions.

A sensitive teacher can find many opportunities for language teaching in science experiences where pupils see materials, identify, handle, and describe them as well as hypothesize about them, experiment with them, and make inferences. Scientific experiments carried on in an atmosphere of discovery should provide an excellent participatory experience for the ESL child.

In this article it has been suggested that learners of English as a second language can and must profit from every minute of the school day. It is essential for their emotional and social development, for the development of a positive self-image as potentially successful users of the new language, that they be active participating members of their class groups at times when they are not set apart for the purpose of receiving direct language instruction. Full use of the school day is important for their total education since ESL children cannot afford to lie fallow in academic areas other than language until they develop adequate communication skills. Thoughtful teachers must evaluate each curriculum area in planning the lesson every day in order to identify specific ways of involving ESL pupils who can learn a great deal of content on a non-verbal level while also coming in contact with specialized vocabulary and classroom routines.

---

1 Frequently children are able to bring pictures of themselves to school to share or to incorporate into a class bulletin board. Such family photographs help children to learn more about each other and can also show that, regardless of the setting, the stages of childhood are universal

Vol 3 No 2 Jun 1969

Songs in Language Learning[1]

Jack Richards

Most children enjoy singing, and songs are often a welcome change from the routine of classroom activity in learning a language. Pleasure for its own sake is an important part of language learning, a fact which is often overlooked by the teacher in his quest for teaching points, or by the course designer focussing on presentation or repetition. Songs make the experience of learning English a child-centered and enjoyable one. Yet the accessibility of songs should not encourage us to be indiscriminate in our use of them, for they may help or hinder the learner in a number of different ways. They *help* when they reinforce the teaching. In this way they can be a useful aid in the learning of vocabulary, pronunciation, structures, and sentence patterns. They *hinder* when they interfere with learning, when they establish irregular sentence or stress patterns which have to be corrected when used in conversation. These facts should be kept in mind when considering the role of songs in language learning.

1. HOW SONGS CAN TEACH

Learning takes place not merely through good presentation, but through meaningful, spaced repetition of the learning items. Since many course-books do not provide sufficient meaningful repetition of the teaching points, the careful teacher is constantly looking for occasions to use words and sentences from previous lessons, before they fade from the learner's memory. But repetition by itself does not greatly improve learning. Rote repetition induces boredom. The teacher's task is to see that repetition is meaningful, and songs provide a means of increasing the amount of repetition possible without losing the learner's interest. Songs can thus help the teacher by consolidating his teaching. They may be used to help establish (1) sounds; (2) rhythm and stress; (3) formulae; (4) syntactical items; (5) vocabulary.

1.1 How Songs Can Help Teach Sounds

Children enjoy trying to produce new sounds, and learning new sounds takes practice. Yet the minimal-pair drills sometimes provided for such practice rarely interest children. A carefully chosen song on the other hand, allows the child to practice a new sound or sound position without producing boredom. A song like *Bounce the Ball,* for example, gives an opportunity to practise the diphthongs /ou/ and /au/, and the final /l/.[2]

Mr. Richards, formerly Lecturer at the English Language Institute, University of Wellington, New Zealand and currently a Research Fellow at the International Centre for Research on Bilingualism Laval University, Québec, has published articles on teaching English to speakers of Maori and Thai.

1 I am grateful to Professor W. F. Mackey for commenting on an earlier version of this paper.

2 Music for all of the songs mentioned here will be found in an appendix at the end of the article.

Bounce the ball, bounce the ball,
Bounce the ball high,
Bounce the ball, bounce the ball,
Let the ball fall.

Blow the whistle, blow the whistle,
Blow, blow, blow,
Blow it hard, blow it loud,
Blow, blow, blow.

1.2 How Songs Can Help Teach Rhythm and Stress

Learners whose mother tongue has a syllable-timed rhythm, not a stress-timed rhythm as in English, will tend to stress English syllables more or less equally, acquiring one of the characteristics of a foreign accent. The natural rhythm of songs, with a regular recurring beat between which are a varying number of unstressed syllables, happens to be the stress pattern of spoken English. Songs can thus help establish a feeling for the rhythm and stressing spoken English. *Girls and Boys Come Out and Play gives* a useful lesson in English rhythm and stressing.

Girls and boys come out and play,
The sun above is bright today,
Leave your work and leave your sleep,
Come and join us in the street,
Come with a shout and come with a call,
Come with a smile and bring your ball,
Down the steps and up the path,
All the fun will make you laugh.

1.3 How Songs Can Help Teach Polite Formulae

Some songs contain everyday expressions which are useful in conversation. A song such as *How Are You Today?* gives practice in the pronunciation and stressing of a frequent and useful phrase.

How are you, yes how are you, how are you today?
I have come to visit you from many miles away,
I have got a gift for you,
I have got a song for you,
How are you, yes how are you, how are you today?

1.4 How Songs Can Help Teach Sentence Patterns and Syntax

Sometimes a structure or sentence pattern can be fixed in the mind of the learner through a song. The following song can be used to give repetition to such patterns as *This is a pencil, Point to the pencil, Is this a pencil? Yes it's a pencil,* and so on.

This is a pencil, this is a book,
This is a pencil, this is a book,

This is a pencil, this is a book,
This is a pencil, this is a book.

1.5 How Songs Can Help Teach Vocabulary

Every song is an opportunity for vocabulary review, provided that it uses the vocabulary of the school course. Some songs offer a pleasant way of giving repetition to words of a particular center of interest or situation. *Head, Shoulders, Knees and Toes* is useful for reviewing the names of parts of the body, and is accompanied by actions.

Head, shoulders, knees and toes, knees and toes,
Head, shoulders, knees and toes,
Knees and toes and eyes and ears and mouth and nose,
Head, shoulders, knees and toes, knees and toes.

2. HOW SONGS CAN UNTEACH

We have looked at five ways in which songs can be useful to the teacher. Let us now consider some of the problems presented by traditional and popular English songs. The main difficulties are caused not by their music but by their language, for the language of the songs which native speakers of English sing is quite different from the language of ordinary English. We find words of low frequency, sometimes archaic and dialect words, and sentences of irregular structure and stressing. This may be a reflection of the history of the song or of the poetic license of the song writer. Surprisingly, children learn songs readily despite their irregularities, yet a thoughtful teacher is likely to raise several objections to the use of many traditional songs.

Should he teach songs that put stress on syllables which are normally unstressed in speech? These songs give practice in incorrect stress patterns which will have to be corrected later. Should he use songs containing words and sentence patterns which do not occur elsewhere in the course and which cannot be used by the learner in conversation? Should he encourage his class to memorize irregular sentence patterns which can interfere with the normal sentence patterns of English? In a recently published first-year English course for example, we find a song with these words:

My hat it has three corners,
Three corners has my hat,
If it has not three corners,
Then it is not my hat.

This song is not likely to help with the learning of the normal use of has. In fact, by using this song, the course designer has encouraged, if not taught, *My father he has a car,* and *A bicycle has my brother.*

Vocabulary, pronunciation, and grammatical control must be applied to the language of songs just as to any other part of the English course. The words we sing should be frequent and useful words, syllables should be

stressed or unstressed according to the patterns of spoken English, and the grammar of the songs should be that of normal English. Most English songs do not meet these requirements, and cannot be recommended for use in teaching English to speakers of other languages. Yet this need not deny our learners the chance of singing. What we need are specially written songs, and songs which have been adapted for learners of English. To provide songs like these the teacher must be prepared to try his hand at writing songs. Two sources for songs will make this task easier.

3. ADAPTING TRADITIONAL SONGS

Popular and traditional English songs are a useful source of classroom songs. With a little initiative, we can put the vocabulary, grammar, and rhythm of a traditional song into natural English. We may try to incorporate one particular language feature into the song—an item of vocabulary, syntax, phonology, or a conversational expression—or else we may simply choose to build up a collection of songs which we can use when the need arises. Before illustrating how this can be done, let us consider briefly, an objection which is sometimes made against adapting traditional songs.

It is said that English songs are part of the English-speaking culture and should be taught *despite* their often peculiar language because the chance to experience the cultural background of English is all too rare in school courses. Such opportunities may indeed be rare, yet songs can hardly be expected to make a major contribution in this direction. A course cannot *give* cultural content if it is not *thought out* in terms of cultural content. The development of cultural awareness is something which should be handled directly by the course designer, not indirectly by the teacher. The inclusion of an occasional 'genuine' English song is not going to substantially alter the cultural content of a course that was thought out in terms of grammar and vocabulary.

Here are some examples of what can be attempted. A song like *Auld Lang Syne,* requiring substantial alteration because of its archaic vocabulary, can be preserved in a version like this:

We never will forget our friends,
Or lose the ones we know,
We never will forget our friends,
Or the days of long ago.

chorus A long time ago my dear,
A long time ago,
Let's think about the things we did,
In the days of long ago.

So here's my hand my faithful friend,
Let's sing of friends we know,
Let's think about the things we did,
In the days of long ago.

With a song like *Bobby Shaftoe,* a few changes produce:

Bobby Shaftoe's on the sea,
I'll be glad when he is free,
He'll come back and marry me,
Hurry Bobby Shaftoe.

Bobby Shaftoe's tall and fair,
He's got lovely yellow hair,
He gave me a ring to wear,
Hurry Bobby Shaftoe.

At Christmas time we can turn to a familiar Christmas carol.

Oh Christmas tree, Oh Christmas tree,
You never change your color,
Oh Christmas tree, Oh Christmas tree,
You never change your color,
You're always green in summer time,
And still you're green in winter time,
Oh Christmas tree, Oh Christmas tree,
You never change your color.

Oh Christmas tree, Oh Christmas tree,
You fill our hearts with music,
Oh Christmas tree, Oh Christmas tree,
You fill our hearts with music,
We think of you on Christmas day,
When summer joy has gone away,
Oh Christmas tree, Oh Christmas tree,
You fill our hearts with music.

When a child leaves, we might introduce:

Now is the hour,
For us to say goodby,
Soon you'll be sailing,
Far across the sea,
When you're away,
Oh please remember me,
When you return, you'll find me
Waiting here.

Younger children enjoy rounds and rhymes, such as *Three Blind Mice.*

Three blind mice,
Three blind mice,
Why did they run?
Why did they run?
They all ran after the farmer's wife,
Who cut off their tails with the kitchen knife,

They never had such a fright in their life,
Those three blind mice.

Here is a version of the old favorite *Clementine,* used with older children:

In a valley, by a river,
There was gold inside a mine,
Living near there was a miner,
And his daughter Clementine.

Chorus: Oh my darling, oh my darling, oh my darling Clementine,
You are gone and I have lost you,
Oh I'm sorry Clementine.

She was pretty, like a flower,
And her skin was soft and fine,
She had cheeks as soft as roses,
All the men loved Clementine.

CHORUS

Every morning, by the river,
You could hear a lovely sound,
But one day as she was singing,
She fell in and quickly drowned.

CHORUS

As she lay beneath the water,
No one saw that girl of mine,
Oh I wish I could have saved her,
But I lost my Clementine.

CHORUS

4. SONGS FROM THE MOTHER TONGUE

A second source for songs is found in the music of our students' mother-tongue culture. Songs which the children know can be put into suitable English, or utilizing the vocabulary and structures which are known, we can write new words to familiar indigenous music. Indian teacher trainees for example, produced *Bounce the Ball (see* 1.1) and songs like the following:[3]

(1) It's cold in the evening,
It's cold in the day,
From October to February,
Winter comes to stay.

It's warm in the summer,
It's warm in the day,

3 For these songs I am grateful to Mr. H. V. George, of the University of Wellington.

From May to September,
We go out and play.

(2) The fields are fresh, the grass is green,
The flowers are all around,
The spring has come, the spring has come,
The spring has come all around.

The sky is clear, the sun is hot,
It's dusty all around,
The summer has come, the summer has come,
The summer has come all around.

The moon has gone, the stars have gone,
The clouds are all around,
The rain has come, the rain has come,
The rain has come all around.

The water is cold, the water is cold,
The plants are cold in the ground
The winter has come, the winter has come,
The winter has come all around.

(3) I like to skip,
I like to jump,
I like to run about,
I like to play,
I like to swim,
I like to laugh and shout.

5. CLASSROOM PRESENTATION OF SONGS

Before using a song in the classroom it is important to make sure that the words and sentence patterns in it have been already taught. Songs soon cease to be enjoyable if they are a mere excuse for the introduction of new words and structures. The rhythm and music of the song should be established before the words are sung. To teach the rhythm, we use the blackboard, underlining the words which carry the beat, then clapping the rhythm of the song. The music can be taught by singing the song to *la.* Finally the song is sung through, line at a time to begin with, until the class can sing it with confidence.

APPENDIX

Music for the songs appearing in the text

BOUNCE THE BALL

Bounce the ball, bounce the ball, bounce the ba - ll high,
bounce the ball, bounce the ball, let the ba - ll fall.

GIRLS AND BOYS COME OUT AND PLAY

Girls and boys come out and play, the sun a - bove is
bright to - day, Leave your work and leave your sleep,
Come and join us in the street, Come with a
shout and come with a call, come with a smile and
bring your ball, Down the steps and up the path,
All the f - un will make you laugh.

HOW ARE YOU TODAY

How are you yes how are you, How are you to - day?
I have come to vis - it you from ma - ny miles a - way,
I have got a gift for you, I have got a
song for you,. How are you yes how are you,
How are you to - day?

THIS IS A PENCIL

This is a pen- cil, this is a book, This is a pen-cil,
This is a book This is a pen- cil, This is a book,
This is a pen - cil, This is a book.

HEAD SHOULDERS KNEES AND TOES

Head, shoulders, knees and toes, knees and toes

head, shoulders, knees and toes, knees and toes and

eyes and ears and mouth and nose, Head, shoulders,

Knees and toes, Knees and toes.

AULD LANG SYNE

We ne - ver will for - get our friends, or lose the ones we

know, We ne - ver will for - get our friends, or the

days of long a - go. CHORUS: A lo - ng time a -

go my dear, A lo - ng time a - go, Let's

think a - bout the things we did, In the days of long a -

go.

BOBBY SHAFTOE

BRIGHTLY

Bo-bby Shaft-oe's on the se-a, I'll be glad when he is fr-ee, He'll come back and ma-rry m-e, Hu-rry Bo-bby Shaft-oe. Bo-bby Shaft-oe's tall and fair, He's got love-ly ye-llow hair, He gave me a ring to wear, Hu-rry Bo-bby Shaft-oe.

CHRISTMAS TREE

Not too fast.

Oh Christmas tree, oh Christmas tree, You ne-ver change your co-lour oh christmas tree oh christ-mas tree, You ne-ver change your co-lour. You're always green in summer time, And still you're green in winter time, Oh christmas tree, oh christmas tree, You never change your co-lour.

NOW IS THE HOUR

SADLY

Now is the hour, for us to say good-bye,

Soon you'll be sail - ing, far a - cross the sea.

When you're a - way, oh please re - memb - er me,

When you re - turn you'll find me wait - ing here.

THREE BLIND MICE

Three blind mice Three blind mice, why did they run?

Why did they run?. They all ran af - ter the farm - er's

wife, who cut off their tails with the kitch - en knife, They

ne - ver had such a fright in their life, Those three blind mice.

CLEMENTINE

Not too fast

In a va - lley, by a ri - ver, There was

gold in - side a mine, Li - ving near there was a

CHORUS:

mi - ner, And his daughter Cle - men - tine. Oh my

dar - ling, Oh my dar - ling, Oh my dar - ling Cle - men -

tine, You are gone and I have lost you, Oh I'm so - rry cle - men -

tine.

WINTER AND SUMMER

It's cold in the even - ing, it's cold in the day, from Oct -

ob - er to Feb - ru - ar - y wint - er comes to stay.

BRIGHTLY

SEASONS

The fields are fresh, The grass is green, The flowers are all a-
round, The spring has come, The spring has come, The
spring has come all a- round.

I LIKE TO SKIP

I like to skip, I like to jump, I like to run a-
bout, I like to play, I like to swim, I like to laugh and shout.

ERIC - TESOL Documents

The following are TESOL documents which have been selected from those processed by the ERIC Clearinghouse for Linguistics and entered in the ERIC system. Articles from *TESOL Quarterly* or materials which have been reviewed in *TESOL Quarterly* have been omitted.

Where indicated, hard copies (HC) and microfiche (MF) of the full text are available through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service, The National Cash Register Company, 4936 Fairmont Avenue, Bethesda, Maryland, 20014. Copies of documents must be ordered by the individual ED numbers. Prices are given for microfiche (MF) and hard copy (HC). Payment must accompany orders totaling less than $5.00. For orders totaling less than $3.00, add $.50 for handling. In the U.S. add sales tax as applicable. Foreign orders must be accompanied by a 25 per cent service charge, calculated to the nearest cent.

ED 024 017 *Language Teaching with Video Tape.* Journal of English Teaching; Vl n2 Nov 1967. F. M. Cammack and E. A. Richter. 7p. November 1967. MF-$0.25 HC$0.36.

Although closed circuit television is in use in many types of educational situations around the world, relatively little experimentation has been done with video tape recorders now being marketed in a number of countries. The experiment described in this article was undertaken at Tokyo Gakugei Daigaku in 1967 under a grant from the U.S. Educational Commission in Japan. The test group was comprised of 25 first-semester college freshmen who were native speakers of Japanese majoring in English. The experiment was designed to try to answer the following questions—(1) Can language-learning material presented with aural and visual stimuli by means of video tape be better learned than material presented with only aural stimuli? (2) Can kinesics be better learned through active role playing? (3) What is the effect of allowing adult language learners to see themselves speaking a foreign language? In answer to the first question, the author reports that the results would indicate a probable positive reply; video tape as a language teaching device could be made superior to audio tape. The second answer is an "unqualified yes: and the third, that it is "beneficial." Further experiments, the authors feel, are "more than justified." Available from British Council, Susuki Building, 13 Samon-cho, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo, Japan,

ED 024 018 *Survey of Language Use and Language Teaching in Eastern Africa.* Clifford H. Prator. 3p. 1966 MF-$0.25 HC$O.20.

This report describes the scope and aims of the Survey of Language Use and Language Teaching in Eastern Africa. An outgrowth of a series of ICSLP conferences (International Conference on Second Language Problems, jointly sponsored by the Center for Applied Linguistics, the British Council, and the Bureau pour l' Enseignement de la Langue et de la Civilisation Francaises a l' Etranger), this Survey is centered in Nairobi, Kenya, with the backing of the Ford Foundation. The areas covered include Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania, Ethiopia, and Zambia. The aims are (1) to assemble basic data on the use and teaching of the major languages in each country, (2) simultaneously to stimu-

late local research in linguistics, sociolinguistics, and language pedagogy, (3) to foster closer and more productive contacts among specialists in different countries and across disciplinary lines, and (4) *to* strengthen the institutional and personnel resources in the language sciences in Eastern Africa. A quarterly "Bulletin" is available to interested readers upon writing to the Survey Office, P.O. Box 30841, Nairobi, Kenya.

(ED 024 030 *Let's Write English, Complete Book; For Students of English as a Second Language.* George E. Wishon and Julia M. Burke. 512p. 1968. (Document not available from EDRS.)

This two-part volume (also published separately as "Let's Write English, Book 1; and "Let's Write English, Book 2") is designed to carry the non-native speaker of English from the beginning stages of writing English to "full competence in fulfilling the writing requirements in university and professional life." The general vocabulary level assumes completion of a 350-400 hour basic course in English (or its equivalent), and "considerable experience" in reading English. Copious exercises provide the teacher with material for guided, semi-controlled, and freer writing practice. The 12 units in the first part begin at sentence level, dealing with simple and expanded forms and the major transformations of those forma. Exercise sections in each unit begin with a "Ditto-Comp" exercise which closely parallels sample paragraphs in the explanatory section of the same unit. These exercises, a feature of the text, are intended to augment oral comprehension and develop the student's ability to write connected discourse. The 12 units in the second part examine characteristics of the major prose forms and provide for practice in writing letters, precis, summaries, news stories, and research papers. Additional materials include work on outlining, use of the library and dictionaries, and note-taking. A section of notes on irregular and difficult grammatical forms, capitalization, and punctuation, and an index are appended. Available from American Book Co., 55 Fifth Ave., New York, New York 10003.

ED 024 033 *English in the Primary School.* 65p.; Papers presented at the Institute Board of Studies in English Meeting, Zaria, Nigeria, March 6, 1968. B. W. Tiffen, ed. MF-$0.50 HC-$2.68.

This publication comprises a collection of papers dealing with the teaching of English as a subject and as a medium of instruction in the elementary grades in Nigeria. Titles and authors are—(1) "The Background to English in the Primary School" by B. W. Tiffen; (2) "The Six Year Primary Course" by S. Gwarzo; (3) "Investigation into the 'Straight for English' Course" by B. W. Tiffen; (4) "Teaching the Use of Primary School Text Books to Method Classes in English in Grade 11 Colleges" by D. Williams; (5) "English-A Tool for Education" by M. Rogers; (6) "Aids for Language Teaching" by A. M. Shaw; and (7) "The Ford Foundation English Language Survey and the Primary School" by B. W. Tiffen. See related document ED 012440 by the same author (abstracted in *TESOL Quarterly,* II, 3, September 1968).

ED 024 034 *Problems of Bilingualism.* Journal of Social Issues; v23 n2 Apr 1967. John Macnamara, ed. 137p. April 1967. (Document not available from EDRS.)

This issue of the Journal of Social Issues is devoted to nine articles on the topic of bilingualism written by authorities in the fields of linguistics, anthropology, sociology, psychology, and education. The authors and their topics are: (1) Dell Hymes, "Models of the Interaction between Language and Social Setting: (2) Joshua A. Fishman, "Bilingualism with and without Diglossia; Diglossia with and without Bilingualism" (3) Heins Kloss, "Bilingual-

ism and Nationalism," (4) John J. Gumperz, "On the Linguistic Markers of Bilingual Communication," (5) John Macnamara, 'The Bilingual's Linguistic Performance—A Psychological Overview," (6) Susan Ervin-Tripp, "An Issei Learns English: (7) Wallace E. Lambert, "A Social Psychology of Bilingualism," (8) A. Bruce Gaarder, "Organization of the Bilingual School," and (9) John Macnamara, "The Effects of Instruction in a Weaker Language." Available from Acme Printing and Reproductions, 611 South Maple Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan ($2.25).

ED 024 039 *The Development of an English Language Proficiency Test of Foreign Students, Using a Clozentropy Procedure. Final Report.* Donald K. Darnell. 73p. October 1968. MF-$0.50 HC-$3.00.

This final report presents a description of a test combining cloze procedure and an entropy analysis (CLOZENTROPY), designed to measure the compatibility of a foreign student's English with that of his peers who are native speakers of English. This test, and the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) were administered to 48 foreign students at the University of Colorado. (The CLOZENTROPY test was also administered to 200 native speakers of English at the same university.) Comparable reliability coefficients of approximately .86 were obtained for the two tests. Correlation between total scores on the two tests was .833. Analysis of variance confirms that content and difficult y of test material, major of subjects, and level and major of native comparison groups have significant influences on the CLOZENTROPY index of English proficiency. A discussion of the advantages over conventional types of tests and the major weakness (dependency on computer assistance in scoring), a sample copy of the test instrument, sample letters to the students, samples of computer output on the scoring program, and other data are included in the report. Department of Speech and Drama, University of Colorado, Boulder.

ED 024 041 *Selected Articles on the Teaching of English as a Foreign Language.* L. A. Hill. 142p. 1967. (Document not available from EDRS.)

The author has compiled a selection of his own articles published in various journals which deal with the problems of teaching English as a foreign or second language. These 15 articles, based on the author's observations from 20 years of English teaching and teacher training in developing countries, have been selected for their practical application for the classroom teacher. Some of the more particular points treated in the first part of the book are noun classes, form classes, subclasses, modifier-modifiers, time and tense, tense sequence with "if" clauses, "some" and "any," and clusters. Subjects of more general nature treated in the second part include English-teaching "myths," attitudes toward English, teaching methods, syllabuses, textbooks, the teaching of tenses, examinations, and the use of tape recorders and color slides. Available from Oxford University Press, Ely House, London, W.1, England.

ED 024 048 *Programming for the Language Laboratory.* John D. Turner, ed. 263p. 1968. (Document not available from EDRS.)

The present book is an attempt to stimulate thinking on the nature of the problems involved in writing material for language laboratory use in relation to the teaching of five languages widely taught in Britain today. All the contributors to this volume are language teachers currently using the language laboratory in their work. The editor notes that, although the general approach of all the contributors is broadly similar, the nature of the particular language with which they are dealing largely determines their approach. The introduc-

tory chapter by Derek Van Abbe deals with the general principles of programming methods for the language laboratory. Chapters following deal with (1) English as a foreign language, by B. Woolrich; (2) French, by T. J. Barling; (3) German, by Eva Paneth; (4) Russian, by P. H. Meades; and (5) Spanish, by Brian Dutton. This book is a companion volume to *Using the Language Laboratory,* university of London Press, 1968. Available from University of London Press, St. Paul's House, Warwick Lane, London EC4, England.

ED 024 053 *A Study of Non-Standard English.* William Labov. 75p. January 1969. MF-$0.50 HC-$3.08.

American education has always considered the non-standard or substandard form of speech used by children to be an imperfect copy of standard English. The defects of this approach have now become a matter of urgent concern in the face of the tremendous educational problems of the urban ghettos. This paper reverses the usual focus and looks directly at non-standard English—not as an isolated object in itself, but as an integral part of the larger sociolinguistic structure of the English language. To do this, the author fist presents some linguistic considerations on the nature of language itself, and then a number of sociolinguistic principles which have emerged in the research of the past ten years. The relation of non-standard dialects to education is reviewed, bearing in mind that the fundamental role of the school is to teach the reading and writing of standard English. Finally, the author turns to the question of what research teachers and educators themselves can do in the classroom—the kind of immediate and applied research which will help them make the best use of teaching materials. The author hopes that this paper will put the teacher directly into touch with the students' language, help him to observe that language more directly and accurately, and enable him to adjust his own teaching to the actual problems that he sees. A 36-item bibliography covering all areas of the paper is included.

ED 025 741 *A Black English Translation of John 3:1-21; With Grammatical Annotations.* Walter A. Wolfram and Ralph W. Fasold. 16p. September 1968. MF-$0.25 HC-$0.90.

Some differences between Standard English (SE) and "Black English" (BE) have important consequences in communication of messages. The authors cite as an example the "habitual" function of the finite verb "be" which has no equivalent in SE. They point out that "simplification" of the English of the Bible may result in a "translation" which is inappropriate for the users for which it is intended. Although unhappy with the conventional spelling, both as representing SE pronunciation rather than BE pronunciation and as incapable of dealing with changes of pronunciation that occur in different style levels, the authors justify standard orthography both linguistically and sociologically. Identification of Afro-Americans with distinctive speech styles and the general adolescent rejection of speech norms may lead to acceptance of this type of translation and its desirability by those involved in ghetto ministry. The actual translation is accompanied by notes giving the linguistic explanation for each variation from SE.

ED 025 749 *Applied Linguistics: A Survey for Language Teachers.* Collier Macmillan Teacher's Library. Monika Kehoe, ed. 154p. 1968. (Document not available from EDRS.)

This book, written for those who have no formal training in linguistics but who have an interest in language or language teaching, is meant as a practical text

for use in introductory courses in Applied Linguistics. Its emphasis is on second language teaching, but it is also of interest to those who teach native speakers because it covers the entire scope of the subject. Contents include the following articles: (1) "Language Learning" by Gaston Saint-Pierre, (2) "The Historical Background of Linguistics" by Estrella Calimag, (3) "Bilingualism and the Teacher of English as a Foreign Language" by L. Bruin Barkman, (4) "Teaching Classical Languages: The Structural Approach" by C. Douglas Ellis, (5) "Teaching and Training: British Experience" by A. V. P. Elliot, and (6) "Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages" by Monika Kehoe. The introduction discusses language and culture, terminology, and schools of linguistics. The conclusion is *a* discussion of technological advances and their relationship to second language learning. Appended are: (1) a diagram of the speech organs, (2) a selected list of publications and materials, and (3) a list of organizations to write to for information on further language training and teaching opportunities. Available from The Macmillan Company, 866 Third Avenue, New York, New York 10022 ($2.50).

ED 025 750 *English Pronunciation: A Manual for Teachers.* Collier-Macmillan Teacher's Library. Kenneth Croft. 97p. 1968. (Document not aavilable from EDRS.)

This book is intended to serve as a practical introduction both to the phonology of English and to the general practices and techniques used in teaching and learning pronunciation. It is written primarily for the teacher who has had little or no formal exposure to the field of linguistics, but who has an interest in becoming acquainted with some of the elements of phonology and the application of linguistic facts to teaching or learning pronunciation. The book begins with one of the common definitions of language, and then proceeds to a general discussion of sounds and symbols and phonetics, and finally to a presentation of the segmental and suprasegmental phonemes and intonation patterns of English. One entire chapter is devoted to techniques of teaching and learning pronunciation and includes several sample drills. A glossary at the end of the book defines many of the technical terms used. Available from The Macmillan Company, 866 Third Avenue, New York, New York 10022

ED 025 765 *From Cree to English. Part One: The Sound System.* Marilylle Soveran. 80p. 1968. MF-$0.50 HC-$4.10.

This study compares the sound systems of Cree and English, with special attention given to identifying the differences between the two systems which are likely to cause interference or confusion. Specific teaching suggestions are provided for those who are teaching the English sound system to students who are more familiar with the Cree system. Facial diagrams illustrating the oral production of difficult sounds and suggestions for making drill sessions interesting are included with each drill. The pronunciation drill is described in some detail in the section "Teaching the Voicing Distinction." A technical knowledge of linguistics is not assumed on the part of the reader. Available from the University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon (Canada), Indian and Northern Curriculum Resources Centre.

ED 025 756 *Doble Research Supplement (Digest of Bilingual Education).* Tomi D. Berney and Anne Eisenberg, eds. 8p. December 1968. MF-$0.25 HC-$0.50.

This bulletin summarizes the arguments for bilingual education in the United States. More than one language is needed as the medium of instruction where the child's mother tongue may not be English. Instruction in a weaker lan-

guage not only retards reading, but arithmetic and other subjects are not as well learned if the child must cope with unfamiliar subject matter in an unfamiliar tongue. In the past, many tests of language proficiency have not been properly designed, resulting in misleading scores. A committee of educators and administrators has suggested that bilingual schooling can result "in superior educational achievement." Experimental projects, using the mother tongue as the medium for instruction at early stages, support this proposition. In addition, bilingual programs tend to improve community involvement in the education process. Three pages of selected bibliography cover Research, Background Information, Selected Programs in Bilingual Education, and Further Information.

ED 025 757 *Curriculum Program for the Apache Language.* 110p. MF-$0.50 HC-$5.60.

These curriculum materials from the Whiteriver (Arizona) Elementary School consist of— (1) an English-Apache word list of some of the most commonly used words in Apache, 29p.; (2) a list of enclitics with approximate or suggested meanings and illustrations of usage, 5p.; (3) an illustrated chart of Apache vowels and consonants, various written sound-recognition tests, a listing of pronouns and numbers, and conversational question and statement patterns, 12p.; (4) mnemonic charts presenting each consonant letter illustrated by a word which contains the sound, 16p.; (5) an Apache Reader which presents all the sounds in simple words and sentences, 24p.; and a story of an Indian boy and his donkey, in English and Apache, with accompanying pages of illustrations, 24p.

ED 025 761 *Teaching Black Children to Read.* Urban Language Series, Number 4. Joan C. Baratz and Roger W. Shuy, eds. 220p. 1969. MF-$1.00.

This fourth book in the Urban Language Series is concerned with the relationship of language to reading. Literacy must be based on the language the child actually uses. In the case of ghetto children, materials in their dialect must be prepared so that their task of associating sounds and words with written symbols is not complicated by lack of correspondence between these sounds and words and the students' normal speech. These materials must include forms the child uses and hears, and exclude forms he does not hear and use. They must avoid complex constructions and ambiguity and make use of natural redundancy. Further, they must use language appropriate to the context in the experience of the child. Examples of the kinds of materials that can be developed are included in two of the articles. Authors of the various papers (written between 1964 and 1968) are Joan Baratz, Ralph Fasold, Kenneth Goodman, William Labov, Raven McDavid, Roger Shuy, William Stewart, and Walter Wolfram. Available from Publications Section, Center for Applied Linguistics, 1717 Massachusetts Ave. NW, Washington, D.C. 20036 ($5.00).

ED 025766 *Formal Correspondence and Translation Equivalence in Contrastive Analysis.* Leonardo Spalatin. 7p. March 1969. MF-$0.25 HC-$0.45.

In this paper the author contends that no useful results can be obtained if contrastive analysis is confined to formal correspondence: it is not enough to compare languages as to the presence or absence of corresponding systems and as to the similarities or dissimilarities in the distribution of the terms of the contrasted systems. Formal correspondence may have a very low translation probability and therefore be of little value in a contrastive analysis. The author feels that the basis for contrastive analysis should be translation rather than formal correspondence. The translation approach has the added advan-

tage of producing a series of low translation probability equivalents as well as one or more high translation probability equivalents. Together they cover the entire semantic field. As with formal correspondence, translation equivalence will not be of great help to contrastive analysis where the equivalence is practically nonexistent. But one of the advantages of the translation method is that absence of translation equivalence is much less frequent than absence of formal correspondence.

ED 025 773 *Reference List of Materials for English as a Second Language. Supplement: 1964–1968.* Dorothy A. Pedtke and Others. 207p. 1969 MF-$1.00.

This annotated bibliography supplements, in one volume, *Reference List of Materials for English as a Second Language*, Part 1 (see ED 014 723, abstracted in *TESOL Quarterly*, II, 3, September, 1968) and *Reference List of Materials for English as a Second Language, Part 2* (see ED 014 724, abtracted in *TESOL Quarterly*, II, 3, September, 1968). Materials are listed under the following categories: (1) Texts—general, pronunciation, grammar and usage, vocabularly, conversation, comprehension and reading skills, composition, handwriting, spelling, specific language backgrounds, specialized fields; (2) American readers; (3) Dictionaries; (4) Tests; (5) Teaching aids; (6) Background—linguistics, the English language, contrastive studies, bibliographies, periodicals; (7) Methodology—language teaching, teaching English, teaching aids; (8) Preparation and Analysis of Materials; (9) Preparation of teachers; (10) Language testing; and (11) Programs in specific geographic areas. An author index concludes the volume. Available from Publications Section, Center for Applied Linguistics, 1717 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 ($5.00).

ED 025 775 *Language Research in Progress: Report No. 7, January 1969; A Cross-Referenced List of Documented Language Research Projects Current April 1968–November 1968.* Alfred S. Hayes and Joan Vis. 45p. January 1969. MF-$0.25 HC-$2.35.

This document is the seventh report in the Language Research in Progress (LRIP) series, and lists a wide variety of language-related research projects current between April 1968 and November 1968. Research projects terminated in the six months prior to publication are included as well. Approximately 250 projects in the U.S. and abroad are cross-indexed by subject, investigator and institution, and LRIP file numbers. Copies of this report and abstracts of particular projects listed in it are available on request from the Language in Education Program, Center for Applied Linguistics, 1717 Massachusetts Ave. NW, Washington, D.C. 20035.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1970 TESOL CONVENTION
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA
March 18–21
SAN FRANCISCO HILTON

Submission of Manuscripts for TESOL Quarterly

Articles and reviews submitted for possible publication in *TESOL Quarterly* should be typewritten, double-spaced, with each footnote typed directly below the line to which it refers.

An abstract of two hundred words or less must accompany all articles submitted. The abstracts of articles which are published will be forwarded to the Modern Language Association for inclusion in the MLA Abstract System.

Authors receive fifty reprints of their articles or reviews free of charge; additional copies may be ordered from the printer at the time of publication.

All articles and reviews should be sent to the Editor:

Professor Betty Wallace Robinett
Department of Linguistics
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

Publications Received

Bowen, J. Donald. *The UCLA-Philippine Language Program.* Department of English, University of California, Los Angeles, 1968.

English for American Indians: A Newsletter of the Office of the Assistant Commissioner for Education, Bureau of Indian Affairs. Spring 1969. Sirarpi Ohannessian, ed. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

ERIC Clearinghouse for Linguistics Bulletin No. 10 (May 1969). Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Imamura, Shigeo and James W. Ney. *Readings on American Society.* Waltham, Massachusetts: Blaisdell Publishing Company, 1969. (Accompanied by Instructor's Manual.)

———. *Readings from Samuel Clemens.* Waltham, Massachusetts: Blaisdell Publishing Company, 1969. (Accompanied by Instructor's Manual.)

———. *Readings in the Philosophy of Science.* Waltham, Massachusetts: Blaisdell Publishing Company, 1969. (Accompanied by Instructor's Manual.)

MLA Guide to Federal Programs: An Analysis of Current Government Financial Assistance Programs for Students, Teachers, Researchers, and Scholars in the Fields of English and Foreign Languages. Kenneth W. Mildenberger, ed. New York: Modern Language Association, 1969.

The Modern Language Journal, LIII, 5 (May, 1969).

Rand, Earl. *Constructing Dialogs.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969.

Survey of Language Use and Language Teaching in Eastern Africa, II, 3 (May 1969).

TESL Reporter, II, 3 (Spring 1969). Laie, Hawaii: English Language Institute, The Church College of Hawaii.

Withers, Sara. *The United Nations in Action: A Structured Reader.* New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1969.

Workpapers in English as a Second Language (May, 1969). University of California, Los Angeles.