

TESOL QUARTERLY

Volume 7

December, 1973

Number 4

Table of Contents

To print, select PDF page nos. in parentheses

Foreword.	354	(3)
Some Suggestions from a Psycholinguist John B. Carroll	355	(4-16)
The Dictionary as an English Teaching Resource Albert H. Marckwardt	369	(17-27)
A Hierarchy of Drills Archibald A. Hill	381	(28-41)
Reading and the Audio-Lingual Method. Muriel Saville-Troike	395	(42-52)
Developing and Evaluating Communication Skills in the Classroom Rebecca M. Valette	407	(53-70)
The Application of Linguistics to TESOL: Once More Betty Wallace Robinett	425	(71-81)
Summary and Discussion	437	
Michael West: 1888-1973 Bruce Pattison	441	
Announcement	443	
Publications Received	445	
ERIC-TESOL Documents	446	

TESOL QUARTERLY

A Journal for Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages

TESOL OFFICERS 1973-1974

President

Betty Wallace Robinett
University of Minnesota

First Vice President

Muriel Saville-Troike
Georgetown University

Second Vice President

Albino Benavidez Baca
Chicano Mobile Institutes
Santa Fe, New Mexico

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The officers and

J. Donald Bowen
University of California, Los Angeles

Russell N. Campbell (ex officio)
University of California, Los Angeles

Beatrice Estrada
Gallup McKinley Public Schools
Gallup, New Mexico

Mary Galvan
East Texas State University
Commerce, Texas

Charles W. Kreidler
Georgetown University

Darlene Larson
New York University

Christina Bratt Paulston
University of Pittsburgh

Alfonso Ramirez
Region One Education Service Center
Edinburg, Texas

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

James E. Alatis
Georgetown University

JOURNAL EDITOR

Ruth Crymes
University of Hawaii

REVIEW EDITOR

Richard L. Light
State University of New York
Albany, New York

EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD

Virginia French Allen
Temple University

Luis Cartagena
New York City
Public Schools

Ralph Fasold
Georgetown University

Mary Galvan
East Texas State University
Commerce, Texas

Harry L. Gradman
Indiana University

Maurice Imhoof
American University
Cairo, Egypt

Kenneth Johnson
University of California, Berkeley

Margaret van Naerssen
Pontiac Adult Education Department
Pontiac, Michigan

William Norris
Georgetown University

John Povey
University of California, Los Angeles

Carol Reed
Brooklyn College

John Upshur
University of Michigan

Membership in TESOL (\$10.00) 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, School of Languages and Linguistics,
Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.

Copyright © 1973

Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages

US ISSN 0039-8322

Foreword

This year the Lackland Lectures are published in the December rather than the March issue of the *TESOL Quarterly*. As in the preceding four years, these constituted a series of six lectures delivered on a contractual basis with the TESOL organization to the staff members of the English Language Branch—Defense Language Institute, Lackland Air Force Base, Texas.* The English Language Branch has a faculty of approximately seventy members and trains about 3000 students a year in the United States, at the same time supporting foreign military schools in some fifty countries whose operations involve as many as 500,000 students a year.

Though the lecture series was established to serve as a basis for a discussion of the state of affairs in teaching English as a second language for the staff members of the DLIELB, it has, since its inception in 1969, served in that role for the profession as a whole through publication of the lectures in the *TESOL Quarterly*.

The lecturers for the fifth series bring several different disciplinary backgrounds to their analyses of how teachers can facilitate the process of second language learning. This diversity of orientation reflects the broadening of the knowledge base of classroom practice that has been advocated in the professional forums of recent years.

The lectures, delivered during the period from January to June, 1973, are printed in order in which they were presented. They are followed by a short summary and discussion. RC

* The papers published in this issue were prepared under Contract No. F41609-73 C-0014, English Language Branch—Defense Language Institute, Lackland Air Force Base, Texas.

Some Suggestions From A Psycholinguist

John B. Carroll

Recent research and theoretical developments suggest some approaches to second language teaching that may have some generality. Several examples are given. First, one study (Postovsky, 1970) indicates that it is a good idea to start foreign language teaching with emphasis on listening comprehension, delaying any requirement for accurate pronunciation or active speech production until listening comprehension has been well established. Foreign language learning is something like the child's acquisition of his native language—for the child learns to listen long before he learns to speak. Second, studies by psychologists of the processes of memory storage and retrieval suggest ways for teachers to help their students become active learners. The act of retrieving information that has been recently stored and then not attended to appears to transfer that information into "truly long-term memory." Finally, the present writer's recent work in developing rules for a performance grammar, rules which build sentences up from "left to right," may suggest sentence construction strategies that teachers can translate into second language instruction.

There is probably nothing new in language teaching, and it is very difficult to suggest directions that will be really novel. One of the most sobering experiences is to take a book by Louis G. Kelly called *Twenty-Five Centuries of Language Teaching* (Kelly, 1969). If you can ignore the the many inaccuracies and ambiguities in this book, as pointed out by Krohn (1969) in a review, you will see that since the time of the Greeks and Romans just about every trick in language teaching has been tried by somebody. Even theories of language teaching that we believe to be very current and contemporary, such as audio-lingual learning, transformational grammar, or situational contexts, turn out to have their counterparts somewhere in the remote history of foreign language teaching.

But the fact that so many approaches have been tried makes it all the more necessary for research and theory to guide us—to tell us, if possible, which of the manifold possibilities are most useful, and under what circumstances. Yet, as soon as one starts looking at research and theory, one finds great diversity and disagreement even there. It is difficult to find any one idea, or any one theory, that is demonstrably valid in any general way. It is difficult to find any particular practice or procedure in language teaching that is universally applicable, probably because the applicability of a teaching procedure depends on many factors, including the age of

Mr. Carroll, Senior Research Psychologist, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey, is the author of numerous publications on psycholinguistics and language teaching, among them *The Study of Language* (Harvard University Press, 1953), *Language and Thought* (Prentice-Hall, 1964), and *Modern Language Aptitude Test* (1959). He was a plenary speaker at the 1971 TESOL Convention in New Orleans.

the learner, the background of the learner, the learner's aptitude, the circumstances of the instruction, the type of teaching materials, and so forth. That is, a procedure that may be very useful for a low-aptitude learner may be hopelessly inefficient for a high-aptitude learner. Or a procedure that would be highly appropriate for a young child may be totally unacceptable to an adult. A procedure that would be useful for individual instruction may be impractical to use in a classroom. A procedure applicable at an early stage of instruction may not necessarily be a sound one for a later stage.

Therefore, if I seem to be making suggestions that you would regard as difficult to put into practice, it may be that the particular kinds of learners you are dealing with, the kinds of text materials you have available, or the stage of instruction at which you receive your students are such as to make those suggestions inapplicable.

Nevertheless, in the hope of giving some guidelines that you may find useful, I would like to talk about several ideas and approaches, stemming from recent research and theoretical developments, that have impressed me for their possible generality.

One of these ideas comes from a finding that was arrived at by one of the instructors in Russian at DLI (Defense Language Institute) West Coast, a Dr. Valerian Postovsky (1970). Postovsky did an experiment in which two procedures were compared in a course in beginning Russian. One procedure was that in current use at DLI West Coast, namely, one in which students had the usual drills in oral and written Russian, being required to try to imitate Russian sounds and sentences from the very beginning. In the experimental procedure, however, the requirement that the student imitate Russian sounds and sentences was considerably relaxed. For at least a month, the students were encouraged just to listen to Russian. They were not to try to *speak* Russian. They heard Russian only from native speakers—thus, in *contrast* to the students in the control groups, they heard no mispronunciations on the part of themselves or their fellow students. Only after this first month were they asked to try to speak Russian. In comparison with the control group, they did very well on tests of morphology and vocabulary, but what was most surprising was that their Russian pronunciation was clearly superior to that of the control group. This suggests that it is a mistake to try to have students pronounce a foreign language at the beginning of language instruction.

I find this result of much interest. It seems that it should have some psychological justification. Perhaps it reflects a process we observe in the way a child learns his own language. Children spend a long time listening to language before they start *producing* very much language. Their comprehension precedes production by at least six months. In fact, there is recent evidence to suggest that even at 3 or 4 months of age the child is already starting to comprehend certain intonation features of a language. Any kind of language teaching that can capitalize on natural human pro-

cesses may be better for that reason. Furthermore, we have evidence that continual listening to some kind of auditory input has some rather special effect on the brain—you might say that it “wears grooves” in the brain. (Here, I don’t mean listening to some particular sequence of sounds over and over again on a particular occasion; I mean listening to some characteristic kind of auditory input—such as a foreign language—over a period of time and on many different occasions, which accommodates one to this type of input.) Perhaps this process of “wearing grooves in the brain” helps in some way in the later production of the sounds to which one has been listening. There is a so-called “motor theory of speech perception” that says that there is a close interconnection between what we perceive and the innervation of our articulatory musculature. That is, we perceive in speech what our speech mechanism has taught us to perceive. So it appears that the continued listening to linguistic material over a period of time would eventually build up whatever kind of innervation of the speech musculature is required to pronounce Russian, or whatever foreign language is being learned.

This finding of Postovsky’s was sufficiently striking to suggest that it ought to be applied quite extensively in the practice of foreign language teaching. I understand that further use of it is in fact being made at DLI West Coast. But as I have already suggested, we cannot apply it necessarily at all stages or under all conditions. It is probably most appropriately applied at the elementary stages of instruction, although later I will mention a possible application at more advanced levels of instruction.

A possible objection to extended listening practice is that it seems to emphasize “passive” learning rather than active learning. Psychologists have long been advising language teachers to emphasize *active* learning, i.e., learning that requires the learner to make active responses, rather than passive learning. But what do we really mean by “active” learning? The responses do not necessarily have to be overt. What we mean is that in the process of learning the student is constantly making active decisions or choices, or retrieving material from memory, or *trying* to retrieve material from memory. In listening practice, he could be making decisions or choices as to the meaning of what he hears. Whether learning is active or passive depends on the mental set of the learner—whether he is actively seeking to make the decisions, choices, and memory retrievals that attentive listening requires. Anything that you can do to encourage this type of mental set is all to the good—requiring the student periodically to answer questions on the material being listened to, for example. In any case, Postovsky’s finding concerning the delay of speaking practice does not necessarily conflict with the principle of active learning.

Moreover, as I mentioned above, I would not necessarily restrict the application of this finding to the elementary levels of instruction. There is a stage of language instruction that you are all familiar with—the stage at which the student seems to reach a “plateau” of learning, such that he

finds it difficult to make progress beyond a certain point. I'm told that here at DLIELB you have students who make consistent progress for a time, but then are unable to get past some particular criterion score on your ECL tests.* What is holding them back? It may be the rather startling variety and diversity of language forms and patterns that they encounter at that stage—the great stock of vocabulary and idiom that we have in English that is not necessarily specifically treated and codified in the textbooks. At this stage of instruction, perhaps what is needed is a massive amount of listening experience, so that the foreign student can to some extent catch up with the native speaker, who after all has had thousands of hours of experience in listening to his language. Try having the foreign student listen to massive amounts of spoken material—news broadcasts, spoken text materials, or anything that may be relevant. Have him listen to selected passages several times, so that each time the amount that he will comprehend will expand. On the first rendition of a passage, perhaps the foreign learner will comprehend only what we might call “islands” of meaning—single words or phrases. But with further listening to the same material these islands of meaning will get connected together—to become peninsulas, and then continents, if I may use this metaphor. To make this kind of listening practice sufficiently demanding, and incidentally to keep the learner awake, periodically introduce questions or other stimuli that will require paying close attention to the material. The most important outcome of this kind of practice is that the learner will become exposed to a wider variety of vocabulary, idiom, and grammatical structure than might otherwise be the case, and will profit from this mysterious process whereby auditory language input gets “worn” into the neurones.

Let's look again at the principle of active learning that I mentioned earlier. This principle seems to be one of the most difficult to implement in practice. In my observations of language teaching procedures, I have often noticed that it fails to be honored. There is too much “teacher talk” that is merely passively received by the student without his being required to make an active response to indicate appropriate mental processing of what he hears. Even when active responses are required, there is too much repetition without comprehension, and without active seeking of meaning. I know how difficult it is to get away from this. Nevertheless, it may help you to think in terms of some recent concepts from psychology. Psychologists now are ever more interested in studying memory. The current fashion, it seems, is to talk about different kinds of memory—often, metaphorically, in terms of various little boxes that contain these kinds of memory. We don't really think that the brain consists of little boxes for different kinds of memory, but it often seems to function as if it were structured this way.

We, have pretty good evidence that we can distinguish between four processes in memory and perception. The first process is what we call a

* English Comprehension Level examinations, used at the Defense Language Institute English Language Branch. *Ed.*)

sensory buffer. When you see or hear a word, that word goes into a sensory buffer that for a very short time holds the image of that word. That image disappears very rapidly, usually because it is replaced by another image from the continuous stream of input. It may be lost forever, in fact, *unless* it is taken into what we call "short-term memory." Whether the contents of a sensory register or buffer are taken into short-term memory apparently depends upon the learner's active attention to the stimulus, and desire to learn or otherwise manipulate the contents of the sensory buffer. But the contents of the short-term memory *also* may disappear very rapidly unless the learner takes active steps to transfer those contents into a longer-term memory, an intermediate memory store that can hold an item for some minutes or even hours. One kind of active process that the learner can perform is to *rehearse* the item, for example, to say it to himself several times, or to try to form some association or connection with something previously learned. At any rate, he seems to pay some kind of active attention to the stimulus (although of course this whole process may be totally unobservable from the outside) such that it gets transferred into the intermediate memory store.

But even something contained in an intermediate memory store can fade away unless something is done to transfer it into permanent memory, or what I like to call TLTM, "truly long-term memory." What can be done to transfer something from intermediate memory to TLTM? I interpret the evidence as suggesting that the *act of retrieving* an item from intermediate memory after an interval of time during which one has not attended to that item (but to something else) is a process that tends to put it into long-term memory. The more such acts of retrieval occur, interspersed with other activities, the better the memory gets stored in permanent memory. At first, such acts of retrieval should be fairly frequent; later, they can occur less often, but they should still occur.

The role of these processes of memory transfer and retrieval in learning is something that I think language instructors should know about, so that they can try to make use of these principles in planning their instruction. As a matter of fact, students themselves could profit by being made aware of how they can make these processes operate. For example, they could be trained to practice retrieving items from intermediate memory—trying to remember the meanings of words, or trying to retrieve some grammatical principle, at a point where these items have been taught to them only fairly recently, and then repeating this process at some later time. What is most important here is that there be active retrieval from memory, rather than merely passive review.

I would like to turn now to discussion of a "Performance Grammar" as a basis for language teaching. In the address I gave at the New Orleans TESOL conference in 1971 on "Current Issues in Psycholinguistics and Second Language Teaching" (Carroll, 1971), one of the points I made was that I didn't feel there is any real conflict between the concept of

“rule” and the concept of “habit” in language performance. The “rules” of language analysis, I felt, can generally be translated into “habits of performance.” Closer analysis of this matter, however, has led me to believe that while “rule” and “habit” can still stand in correspondence, the kinds of rules (or habits) that apply in language performance may be quite different from the rules that are specified in formal language analysis, such as in transformational grammar.

Roughly speaking (for I can't go into a complete exposition of transformational grammar here), one of the basic ideas of transformational grammar is that sentences can be analyzed into their parts, which can in turn be analyzed into smaller parts, and eventually into the terminal elements or words. The parts of a sentence get constructed by “re-write rules” whereby some larger constituent, such as a sentence as a whole, or a verb phrase, gets “rewritten” into smaller constituents. Transformational grammarians often represent these processes by giving the “tree structure” of a sentence; the whole sequence of rewritings is called a “phrase marker” or “P-marker.” “Transformational rules” are introduced to account for the changes in word-order and other matters that attend negation, passivization, and other grammatical processes. This sort of thing is all very well as long as we keep to the level of the formal analysis of a language and the specification of the rules that “generate” (in a special sense) grammatical sentences and none of the ungrammatical ones. I do not object to such efforts to provide formal analyses of languages, but what concerns me is whether there is any connection between such formal analyses and how we actually speak and understand. To me, the connection, if any, is much more tenuous than it is supposed to be by many linguists.

As a possible alternative to formal analysis, I have been trying to develop a “performance grammar,” i.e., grammar of the rules or habits that actually operate when we speak and understand language.

One of my basic assumptions is that in producing speech we start from meaning, or actually from a set of meanings, that we translate or encode into speech according to the conventions of the language we are speaking. This means that we must do two things in constructing a performance grammar: (1) we have to make an analysis of the possible meanings that can be encoded, and (2) we have to specify the rules (or habits) by which those meanings are translated into the “surface structures” of language.

Everyone recognizes that the problem of meaning is very difficult when you get deeply into it. I think I have found a way to shortcut some of the difficulties—simply by assuming that we can identify certain basic meanings that come into play when we generate simple sentences. I can give you only a very general idea of how my system operates, for I am going to exemplify it for a very limited set of English sentences. It is, however, a very important set, for it includes all (or nearly all) simple sentences that involve the relations among what I call the deep subject, the deep verb, and the deep object. The deep subject, deep verb, and deep object are defined in

terms of the logical relations between some agent, some action, and some object of the action. For example, these could be such things as the following:

<i>Deep subject</i>	<i>Deep verb</i>	<i>Deep object</i>
John	catchMary
he.	choose.	she
the gang. . . .	beat up. . .	.the tall boy
a thief who stutters.	steal.	the book
Mayor Lindsay	receive . . .	a letter

Notice that I have listed all the noun-phrase items in the nominative case, but this is just for convenience; under some circumstances these noun phrases go into the accusative or objective case.

The deep subject, deep verb, and deep object are what I call *elements* of an I-marker (an "intention marker"); i.e., they are regarded as elements of some "intention" that exists in the mind of the speaker before he produces an utterance. But the I-marker also contains *variables*. One of these variables has to do with what I call the *theme*. This may be "attached" to either the deep subject or the deep object. Suppose the deep subject, deep verb, and deep object are, respectively, "He," "choose," and "she." Suppose also that another variable is Tense; in all the sentences I will give you, the tense is simple past. Suppose we now attach the theme to the deep subject; we then produce the sentence:

He chose her.

But if we attach the theme to the deep object, we produce the passive sentence:

She was chosen by him.

In traditional terminology, the *theme* becomes the grammatical subject of the sentence.

Another variable is the one that produces the difference between a declarative and an interrogative sentence: what we may call *mode*. The above sentences are declarative; the corresponding interrogative ones are:

Did he choose her?

Was she chosen by him?

A third variable is one that can take three values: positive, negative, and "challenge." The sentences given thus far are positive. The corresponding negative sentences are given below. In setting out the sentences, I have indicated the values of the several variables by three-letter abbreviations, DSB (deep subject), DOB (deep object), DEC (declarative), INT (interrogative), PCN (positive, challenge, negative), etc. Actually these are mnemonics used in a computer program that I have written to generate these sentences, of which I will speak later.

<i>Theme</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>PCN</i>	
DSB	DEC	NEG	He didn't choose her.
DSB	INT	NEG	Did he not choose her?
DOB	DEC	NEG	She wasn't chosen by him.
DOB	INT	NEG	Was she not chosen by him?

The "challenge" value seems to appear only with the interrogative mode, as where we have:

DSB	INT	CHA	Didn't he choose her?
DOB	INT	CHA	Wasn't she chosen by him?

I interpret these sentences as meaning that the speaker "challenges" the hearer to deny the assertion implied in the question, whereas the simple NEG form is more neutral in its intent.

A fourth variable is what I call "query" (QRY); it may be "attached" to any one or more of the elements DSB, DVB, and DOB. The effect of the "query" variable is to change any one of these elements to a "wh" form. Taking the simple interrogative form *Did he choose her?*, which is assumed to contain no "query," and attaching QRY successively to DSB, DVB, and DOB, we get:

<i>QRY</i>			
DSB	Who chose her?		
DVB	What did he do to her?		
DOB	Whom did he choose?		

Or if QRY is attached to both DSB and DOB we get:

Who chose whom?

or (as a possible alternative):

Whom did who choose?

Multiple queries, however, are rare in actual speech.

Still other variables are EMP ("emphasis") and ECH ("echo"), which manifest themselves in differing stress and intonation patterns. EMP can be "attached" to any one of *four* elements, DSB, DOB, DVB, and an element that I label DVT, the "truth value" of the verb, as distinguished from DVB, the "lexical value" of the verb. Applying these values successively to the simple sentence *He chose her*, we get:

DSB	<i>He</i> chose her.
DOB	He chose <i>her</i> .
DVB	He <i>chose</i> her.
DVT	He <i>did</i> choose her.

EMP can be attached to two or more elements; for example, if it is attached to both DSB and DOB, we get:

He chose *her*.

When ECH is present, we get a special question intonation which can be represented by:

?He chose her?

or (for a sentence already in the interrogative mode):

?Did he choose her?

as it might be said by someone who is trying to make sure that he has just heard "Did he choose her?"

Application of all these variables produces a total of 360 sentence types, even without the use of multiple values of QRY or EMP. Certain sentence types are "blocked"; for example, it is impossible to have QRY attached to the theme of a sentence in the declarative mode, since such a sentence automatically goes into the interrogative mode. If we vary only the variables THM (theme), MDE (mode), PCN (positive, challenge, negative), and QRY, we get the 36 sentences arrayed in Table 1. In some cases, I'm not sure there is a difference between alternative nouns. For example, there may be no real difference between:

Who didn't choose her?

and

Who did not choose her?

although the application of EMP to the different elements of these sentences seems to produce different effects.

So far, you may say, we seem to have nothing new: the sentences arrayed in Table 1 are those that transformation grammarians would say are "related." But I have only begun: I have simply laid out the varieties of sentences that my system generates. (Remember, these are only sentence *types*; we could substitute different noun phrases and verbs as elements on which the sentences are based.)

What is different about the system postulated here is the form of the rules that generate the sentences. Transformational grammar would generate these sentences by a series of "rewrite" and "transformational" rules. But since there is real doubt that speakers actually use such rules in producing sentences, I have tried to formulate rules whereby the sentences are built up, in "left-to-right" fashion, from the particular set of elements and variables that are present in the "I-marker," these rules being couched in terms of the conditions under which any particular word is produced. I postulate that speakers generate sentences according to rules of this "conditional" type rather than rules of the phrase-structure and transformational types postulated in transformational grammar.

To illustrate the operation of such "conditional" rules, I write a computer program to generate sentences. By means of this program, I could sit at a Teletype and type in whatever I might want as the deep subject, the deep object, and the deep verb, including the different case forms of the noun

TABLE 1
 Illustrations of Basic Sentence Types Generated by the Performance Grammar
 The mnemonic abbreviations are explained in the text.

Theme	Mode	PCN	QRY	#	Illustrative Sentence
DSB	DEC	POS	QOO	1	He chose her.
DSB	DEC	NEG	QOO	2	He didn't choose her.
DSB	DEC	POS	QDV	3	He did what to her?
DSB	DEC	NEG	QDV	4	He didn't do what to her?
DSB	DEC	POS	QDO	5	He chose whom?
DSB	DEC	NEG	QDO	6	He didn't choose whom?
DSB	INT	POS	QOO	7	Did he choose her?
DSB	INT	CHA	QOO	8	Didn't he choose her?
DSB	INT	NEG	QOO	9	Did he not choose her?
DSB	INT	POS	QDV	10	What did he do to her?
DSB	INT	CHA	QDV	11	What didn't he do to her?
DSB	INT	NEG	QDV	12	What did not he do to her?
DSB	INT	POS	QDS	13	Who chose her?
DSB	INT	CHA	QDS	14	Who didn't choose her?
DSB	INT	NEG	QDS	15	Who did not choose her?
DSB	INT	POS	QDO	16	Whom did he choose?
DSB	INT	CHA	QDO	17	Whom didn't he choose?
DSB	INT	NEG	QDO	18	Whom did he not choose?
DOB	DEC	POS	QOO	19	She was chosen by him.
DOB	DEC	NEG	QOO	20	She wasn't chosen by him.
DOB	DEC	POS	QDV	21	She was what by him?
DOB	DEC	NEG	QDV	22	She wasn't what by him?
DOB	DEC	POS	QDS	23	She was chosen by whom?
DOB	DEC	NEG	QDS	24	She wasn't chosen by whom?
DOB	INT	POS	QOO	25	Was she chosen by him?
DOB	INT	CHA	QOO	26	Wasn't she chosen by him?
DOB	INT	NEG	QOO	27	Was she not chosen by him?
DOB	INT	POS	QDV	28	What was done to her by him?
DOB	INT	CHA	QDV	29	What wasn't done to her by him?
DOB	INT	NEG	QDV	30	What was not done to her by him?
DOB	INT	POS	QDS	31	By whom was she chosen?
DOB	INT	CHA	QDS	32	By whom wasn't she chosen?
DOB	INT	NEG	QDS	33	By whom was she not chosen?
DOB	INT	POS	QDO	34	Who was chosen by by him?
DOB	INT	CHA	QDO	35	Who wasn't chosen by him?
DOB	INT	NEG	QDO	36	Who was not chosen by him?

phrases and the different forms of the verb (infinitive, past, and past participle). I could then give instructions to the computer as to the particular values of each variable (THM, MDE, PCN, QRY, EMP, ECH) that I desire for my sentence, and the machine would then "compute" the desired sentence by following the conditional rules, one by one.

The rules can be represented by a rather complicated flow chart; it is certainly too complicated to explain here. But to illustrate the operation of the rules, suppose I had typed in as the DSB, DVB, and DOB elements (including different case forms and principal parts of the verb):

DSB: the gang (*acc: the gang*)
 DVB : beat up (beat up, beaten up)
 DOB: the tall boy (*acc: the tall boy*)

My instructions to the computer might consist of the following: I want the theme to be the deep object, I want an interrogative sentence, I want a "challenge" sentence, and I want one in which the deep subject is queried. Also, I want emphasis attached to the deep subject, but no "echo."

Computers are so fast in their operation that almost as soon as I have given the last of these instructions, the machine will "compute" the sentence according to the numerous rules that are programmed into it, typing out :

BY WHOM! WASN'T THE TALL BOY BEATEN UP?

(The exclamation mark after WHOM is the machine's way of adding emphasis.)

How does the machine "compute" this sentence? The program is essentially an ordered series of decisions. The first thing the computer has to know is whether we want an interrogative or a declarative sentence—because if it's a declarative sentence, the first word or words to be typed out will be the theme (*the gang*). But we wanted an interrogative sentence, in which the deep object is the theme, and the deep subject is queried. This particular combination of conditions implies that the first phrase must be BY WHOM. The machine computes this, then passes on to the next decision point, which has to do with what auxiliary to use (if any), and whether the negative N'T is to be added here (rather than saving NOT to be added at a later point). The particular combination of conditions causes the machine to output WASN'T, after which the machine passes to still another decision point, where it "finds" that conditions dictate the theme is to be output. And so forth through the sentence.

At some points in the program, the machine has to be instructed to "remember" that it has already "used" a particular element, e.g., the deep object, so that it will not use it again. Otherwise the machine would produce "funny" sentences like "WHAT WAS DONE TO HER BY HIM TO HER BY HIM WAS DONE. . ." In this way there is an analogy with sentence production in the human being: for the human being normally remembers what element has already been used at any point in a sentence. (Sometimes, of course, in producing a very complicated sentence we can "lose our place" and it may be that we will reuse an element unnecessarily.)

In this and other ways, I tried to develop the computer program to simulate actual processes of sentence production in human beings, even if it sometimes meant writing the computer program in a redundant and inefficient manner. I had to use my intuition to tell me what strategies of sentence production the native speaker of English uses. Whether my intuitions in this respect are correct, I do not know; I hope psychological experimentation can tell me whether they are. What I can say now, however, is that I have a program that produces only correct sentences—and (apart from certain stylistic variants that could in the future be provided for) all the possible correct sentences for a given set of elements. In this sense the system is "generative" and even "creative." However, I would insist that

creativity is only relative; actually the shape of the sentence is completely determined by the particular elements and values of variables that are initially set in the "I-marker."

Now, I have been talking about machines and computer programs, but I realize that I'm addressing myself to foreign language teachers, specifically, teachers of English as a foreign language. What's the application, if any? Here I am not really sure of my ground, but I believe there are several possible applications. First, I believe that in teaching the various sentence patterns of English, it would be useful to make students aware of the elements that are manipulated and the variables that apply in the production of sentences. I have indicated only those elements and variables that apply in the production of a limited subset of English sentences—simple sentences involving deep subject, transitive verb, and deep object. As we expand the set of sentences to be generated, doubtless still other elements and variables will be involved. Thus far I have dealt with only some of the simplest and "easiest" sentence constructions—though I realize that some of them are by no means easy for foreign learners. At any rate, it might be possible to develop exercises and drills in which the student is required to construct sentences from a given set of elements and values of variables. This would take much ingenuity, and I cannot go into any details here. It would be important to supply appropriate contexts for the various sentence types. (Speaking of contexts could lead us into another whole topic, namely, the psychological antecedents of the various variables postulated here; for example, under what conditions does one attach the theme to the deep subject, as contrasted to the conditions under which one attaches the theme to the deep object?)

Second, I believe it would be possible to teach rules similar to those in the flow chart for the computer program—rules that would guide the foreign language learner in constructing sentences. In a sense, these rules provide "strategies" for sentence construction. Many of these rules or strategies are already represented in TEFL textbooks, at least in a rudimentary form. For example, if a yes-no question is to be framed, the student is taught that the first thing he has to do is to decide what auxiliary will start the sentence: *was, were, did, can*, etc., and this depends mainly upon the theme, and the type of negation or "PCN" (this abbreviation was explained above). Again, much ingenuity would be required to develop this idea in any detail for practical use, and more work on the form of the grammatical rules themselves would have to be done. I do believe, however, that the type of grammatical rule that I have developed for computer generation of sentences may lend itself to adaptation for pedagogical purposes better than the type of rules developed in transformational grammar and similar systems of formal analysis.

REFERENCES

- Carroll, John B. Current issues in psycholinguistics and second language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 1971, 5, 101-114.

- Kelly, Louis G. *Twenty-five centuries of language teaching*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House Publishers, 1969.
- Krohn, Robert K. Review of Kelly's *Twenty-five centuries of language teaching*. *Language Learning*, 1969, 19, 307-310.
- Postovsky, Valerian. Effects of delay in oral practice at the beginning of second language learning. Unpublished dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1970.

The Dictionary as an English Teaching Resource

Albert H. Marckwardt

Every teacher of English as a foreign language, whether a native speaker or not, inevitably encounters questions of grammaticality or propriety not treated in the textbooks at his disposal. He may be unable to answer such questions with certainty. The reasons for this are: (1) English is not uniform over the vast areas where it is spoken; and (2) no single grammar or grammatical approach has dealt with the entire language. How, then, are the often puzzling and wholly legitimate student questions to be answered? English lexicographers have come closer than grammarians and textbook writers to dealing with English as a totality. Dictionaries often supply information about the language not found elsewhere. The utility of the dictionary as a reliable source for word meanings, spelling, and pronunciation is widely recognized. A good dictionary also contains information about grammar, usage status, synonym discrimination, application of derivative affixes, and distinctions between spoken and written English not generally treated in textbooks, even in a rudimentary fashion. Thus the dictionary becomes an indispensable weapon in the teacher's arsenal. It is the all-English dictionary which furnishes this information, one of collegiate size or larger. But different editorial policies often affect treatments of language matters. The teacher must be able to discriminate among dictionaries, interpreting with linguistic sophistication the information they contain. Preparation for and practice in this should be part of every teacher-training program.

Let us begin with a slightly garbled quotation from *The Pirates of Penzance*: "Ah, take one consideration with another, the teacher's lot is not a happy one." This is an overstatement, of course, but certainly one consideration that makes teachers of English less than sublimely contented with their lot is the never-ending *barrage* of questions about the language to which they are subjected, both inside the classroom and out.

Some of my recent correspondence with teachers of English in various parts of the world will illustrate the point. Here are some inquiries I have received, all over the past year.

1. A recent article in a magazine published in Japan has the sentence, "It is no doubt that the Russians and the Chinese are tired of the expensive effort of supporting North Vietnam." Is *effort of supporting* correct or should it be *effort to support*?

Mr. Marckwardt is Professor Emeritus of English and Linguistics at Princeton University and Visiting Professor of English at the University of Michigan. In addition to numerous publications, among them *American English* (Oxford University Press, 1958), *Linguistics and the Teaching of English* (Indiana University Press, 1966), *A Common Language* (with Randolph Quirk, NCTE, 1963), and *Old English: Language and Literature* (with James Rosier, Norton, 1972), he has been active in language-related national and international committees and organizations, serving as chairman of the Advisory Panel on English Teaching, USIA, and as chairman of the Executive Committee of the Center for Applied Linguistics. He has also served as adviser to many dictionaries. He was honored by TESOL on the occasion of his retirement from Princeton for his many contributions to the field of English king-wage and language teaching with the publication of *Studies in Honor of Albert H. Marckwardt* (TESOL, 1972).

2. In the sentence, "He sank into contemplation with his arms across," is *with his arms across* idiomatic?
3. Which is preferable, "not warm *or* cold" or "not warm *nor* cold"?
4. Suppose someone says, "When Bill dialed 3056, did it get connected at once, or not?" Should the answer be, "It got connected at once," or "Yes, it got connected"? Is *yes* in this sentence necessary?
5. In the following clause, ". . . the fields changed from green to brown, the blossoms to fruit . . ." what does *brown* mean?

These are authentic questions to which I made some kind of response which I hope was reasonably helpful, but I must confess that for three of the five, I felt the necessity of securing some kind of data-based support for the answer I gave, and my natural curiosity led me to see what in the way of information might be found for the other two. But these are a mere five out of dozens. Others include the propriety of the use of a singular verb or pronoun of reference with data, the various connective employed with *different* (*from, to, than*), the acceptability of *graduated from* in the active, voice, a possible justification for the split infinitive, the pronunciation of *falcon*. Those making the inquiries included both native and foreign speakers of English, teachers of the language in a foreign country. The fact that such questions should have been asked at all indicates a considerable degree of uncertainty on the part of a fair number in the profession.

Let us ask first why this is so. Two reasons suggest themselves at once. The first is the lack of uniformity in the language itself, and it takes only a glance at certain factual data to arrive at a reasonable answer. At a conservative estimate, there are some 275,000,000 speakers of English as a first or native language. It would be surprising indeed to find these vast numbers speaking the language in identical fashion, or even the fraction of that number to whom the criterion "cultivated" might reasonably be applied. Moreover, these speakers of English are scattered over five continents of the globe. They live in widely differing circumstances, are subject to varying conditions of education and transmission of their cultural heritage. In situations of this kind there will obviously be certain tendencies making for uniformity and others which will encourage diversity. It would be senseless, therefore, for anyone to insist that the question, "Had you a good time at the cinema?" is either more or less acceptable than, "Did you have a good time at the movies?" They are simply expressions which are likely to occur in different geographical contexts. Consequently, the assumption of a single, rigid, monolithic standard for the entire language is as dubious as the notion that there is only a single, unqualified answer to many of the questions cited earlier in this talk.

At this point one may well ask, "But why should questions such as these create any difficulty for the teacher? Can't he get the answers out of the textbook he uses?" Unfortunately, the answer to this question has

to be "No!" or at the very least, "Not in a satisfactory manner." Again there are several reasons for this. Textbooks are prone to oversimplify complex linguistic issues in the interests of what their authors conceive to be pedagogical effectiveness, and there is surely some justification for that. At other times the information which their linguistic descriptions and judgments reflect is neither wholly correct nor accurate. My favorite illustration of this point is a sentence I once found in an English textbook published in one of our neighboring countries to the south. It read, "He was riding on his automobile through a country road." I can readily understand why and how the errors were made, but this will scarcely condone the misinformation which must have been conveyed to several thousand students. As a consequence of all this, the conscientious and professionally motivated teacher will often feel impelled to go behind the textbook and attempt to search out on his own the kind of primary information about the language on which a reasoned judgment can be based.

But suppose he tries to do just this? Where would he look? I suppose that he would think first of all of the scholarly grammars of English, the works not intended as teaching texts but upon which the textbooks are presumably based. He might find answers to some of the questions, like those quoted at the outset of this discussion, but the chances are equally good that he might not. This assumes, of course, that he has at his disposal the works of Jespersen, Poutsma, Curme, Archibald Hill, Robert Lees, Charles Fillmore—to run the gamut of the twentieth century, from the historical-philological school, through the structuralists, to the generative-transformationalists and the case grammarians. Moreover, despite the extensive, almost gargantuan nature of some of these treatments—witness the seven volumes of Jespersen's *Modern English Grammar*—it is a truism that no single grammar covers the entire structure of the English language in every conceivable contingency. Someone pointed out not long ago that neither the structuralists nor the transformationalists had covered the English subjunctive at all adequately. The same might be said for such a *cause celebre* as the split infinitive, where there has been only counting on the fingers and no real analysis.

But lest I seem only to be preaching a sermon of despair and wanhope—to use a good Middle English term, and I do so intentionally—let me hasten to say that there is one useful source of information about the English language which English teachers often fail to use to its fullest potential, namely the dictionary. I shall explain shortly the kind of dictionary I have in mind.

One must concede that, for a variety of reasons, the English lexicographers have come closer to dealing with the English language in its totality than have the grammarians. It is true that the dictionary organizes and presents its information in a quite different manner, necessarily so of course, but nevertheless it is a constant source of surprise to find out how much information about the language is available to the person who is thoroughly at

home in this linguistic resource, is experienced in searching out the information he needs, and is knowledgeable and sophisticated in interpreting what he finds. To go back to the five questions reported earlier, dictionaries contained relevant information on four of them; grammars, even the most inclusive, dealt adequately with one, and somewhat less so with a second. To be wholly fair, one would have expected from them some enlightenment on only three of the five, but even so this is a score of only fifty percent.

The usefulness of the dictionary as a reliable source of information for word meanings, spelling, and pronunciation is widely recognized, but even in these obvious matters, the information that the dictionary has to offer is not always accurately interpreted. With respect to pronunciation there seem to be two general pitfalls, the interpretation of whatever pronouncing key the dictionary has chosen to employ, and the supposed superior credibility of the first pronunciation.

In general those few dictionaries which use a phonetic alphabet to indicate pronunciation pose no problem, but unfortunately they constitute a minority, especially in the United States. It is the treatment of variant pronunciations that is likely to confuse many users of the dictionary. The word *falcon*, which I referred to earlier, offers an excellent illustration of the difficulties that can arise.

A search of eight dictionaries will produce three broad varieties of pronunciation: (1) a pronunciation like that of *talcum*, with the vowel of *fat* and the *l* sounded; (2) a pronunciation with the vowel of *offer*, also with the *l* sounded; (3) a pronunciation with the vowel of *hawk*, with the *l* silent. As far as interpreting the symbols is concerned, the American dictionaries pose no problem for anyone who has mastered the simple technique of equating the diacritical symbols with their values in the key words given as illustrations. This is not to say that such a practice has my entire approval, but that is a matter I shall not discuss here.

The British dictionaries do present a difficulty for persons whose basic orientation toward pronunciation is American. No British dictionary records the first of the pronunciations I have mentioned, but the transcription of the second pronunciation, with one symbol for the vowel of *offer*, and that of the third, with a different one for the vowel of *hawk*, is likely to puzzle the person who pronounces both words with the same vowel, as most Americans do, but as speakers of British Received Pronunciation do not. Their vowel in *hawk* is made with the jaw higher and the lips more rounded than for their vowel in *offer*. Thus, to extract the ultimate in information from the lexicographical record requires a sophistication somewhat beyond that of the average user, but which a well-trained teacher might be expected to develop, if he does not possess it already.

It is even more worthwhile and informative to note the way in which the variants are recorded. The pronunciation without the *l* usually comes last. Two dictionaries, one English and one American, indicate that it is the usual pronunciation among those who practice the sport of *falconry*.

At best this is no more than a minute sector of the population, cherishing what is clearly an in-group pronunciation. For anyone on the outside to imitate it would smack of affectation. Although this tidbit of information is pleasant to add to one's store of knowledge, especially since it helps to account for the pronunciation of the personal name *Faulkner*, it will scarcely go beyond that.

We are left then with the first two pronunciations, the vowel of *fat* and the vowel of *offer*, with the following consonant sounded in both instances. Since the first of these is absent from the British dictionaries, it is reasonably safe to assume that the pronunciation does not occur in England. Consequently, if the general orientation of one's students is toward British English, as it clearly is in some countries, this is not a pronunciation to be recommended.

With American English the problem is quite different and much more complex. The 1961 Webster and the 1969 *American Heritage Dictionary* list [fælkən] first and [fɔlkən] second. The 1966 *Random House Dictionary* has them in reverse order. The 1934 Webster does not record [fælkən] at all. What is to be learned from this? First of all, let me say that there is little or no validity in the myth of the preferred status of the first pronunciation. As Clarence Barnhart so aptly wrote in the General Introduction to the *American College Dictionary* (p. vii), "Any pronunciation in this dictionary is a good pronunciation and may be safely used. If the second or third pronunciation is your natural pronunciation, it is the one to use."

This solves the problem for the teacher who is a native speaker of American English; it is less helpful for the nonnative. But there is more information lurking beneath the surface. From the total dictionary record, as it has been presented, it is quite evident that *falcon*, with the vowel of *talc*, is a recent development and constitutes what is in effect a spelling pronunciation, stimulated, or more probably hastened, some years ago by the appearance on the motorcar market of a model with that name, resulting in thousands of people pronouncing the word who had never used it before. The question, then, is whether this was sufficiently ephemeral so that the spelling pronunciation will ultimately disappear, to be replaced again by the older one. What the future holds here is anyone's guess, but given the tenacity with which Americans have held to spelling pronunciations in the past, it is a reasonable assumption that [fælkən] will remain with us and probably increase in incidence, although the path of discretion might lead the nonnative speaker with no habitual commitment to either pronunciation to employ [fɔlkən]. I have no vested interest in the matter, no strong degree of preference. I have dealt with matter only as an illustration of how much a close and perceptive use of dictionaries can teach anyone.

I have mentioned the explanation of word meanings as one of the obvious services that a dictionary performs. Here much depends upon the range and scope of the dictionary. Just as no dictionary can hope to record every word that is in the language, it is impossible to expect that

every word treatment can hope to cover all the uses and applications of the words that it does record. And on occasion, some of the information is fairly well hidden. Yet, had the person who inquired about the meaning of *brown* in "The fields changed from green to brown," consulted the *Oxford English Dictionary*, he would have found, in the second definition given for the word, withered leaves given as an example of where the color can occur. And among the citations given for that definition, he would have found a line from Sir Walter Scott, "land of brown heath and shaggy wood." This does highlight the value of citations in a dictionary, a feature all too often ignored by those who consult it.

I must mention here another matter in connection with dictionary treatments of word meaning, little understood and appreciated even by teachers of English, namely the order in which definitions are given. Again, a concrete illustration will be helpful. There has been in the past and still is some objection to the use of the word *disinterested* to indicate 'lack of interest, uninterested.' The objectors generally maintain that the only proper use of the word is in the sense, 'not influenced by regard to personal advantage.' I have both heard and read objections to the treatment in the third edition of Webster's dictionary where the 'uninterested' definition comes first. What the critics did not know is that the Webster dictionaries have for years been committed by editorial policy to presenting meanings in the order in which they appeared in the English language. In this particular instance, the facts are that the first recorded use of *disinterested* in English was by John Donne in 1612, and that here the word was used in the sense of 'not interested; and that the other meaning did not appear until almost fifty years later. This is clearly evident from the citations in the *Oxford English Dictionary*, which gives the two definitions in precisely the same order, though it labels the first 'obsolete.' Apparently the Webster files show a current revival of the first meaning.

Again I have no vested interest in the word, nor, as matter of fact, in the chronological ordering of definitions. There are other ways to arrange them. Some dictionaries adopt what they believe to be an order of semantic frequency, and arguments in favor of this practice can be adduced, although firm evidence on the frequency of meaning is hard to come by. Still others seem to employ a core and marginal meaning principle, placing first a central meaning around which the other senses can be organized. I hold no brief for any of these schemes; each has its virtues and its pitfalls. What does disturb me, however, is the innocence on the part of so many vocal critics of the obvious necessity of a general editorial policy with respect to meaning arrangements, to say nothing of their readiness to single out a particular dictionary for criticism without taking the trouble to ascertain what other dictionaries were doing with respect to precisely the same word.

So far we have dealt with those aspects of the language which are generally conceded to fall within the province of the dictionary, and for which, as

surveys in both England and America have shown, the dictionary is frequently consulted. By no means is this a complete inventory of the information which the reliable and carefully compiled dictionaries will contain.

With respect to such inflectional forms as noun plurals and verb past tenses, the textbook grammar can only offer general statements about the major or regular patterns and give typical instances of the minor or deviant forms. In a sense, the dictionary has an obligation to give this information for every member of the form class in question. This is a highly valuable contribution, for it is the irregularities, the members of minor inflectional categories which constitute the greatest difficulty for the learner, causing him to appeal to the teacher for help. It is from the dictionary rather than from the grammar that one is likely to learn that the loanword *antenna* retains its Latin plural ending only when it is used in its zoological sense and that it has conformed to the native *-s* plural pattern when it refers to a radio or television aerial. And to the alert user of the dictionary, this may help to suggest a broader truth about the language, namely what is likely to occur morphologically when a learned word transfers to a popular context.

Without going into details, I shall simply say that the dictionary is likely to contain fuller information than the school grammar (not necessarily the scholarly survey) about the variant status of the past tense and past participle forms of such verbs as *thrive*, *dream*, *prove* (past participle), *awake*, *swing*, *eat*, *shine*—to mention only a few. Some of these, the last two in particular, reflect differences between British and American usage; others show the verbs to be in the process of transition from irregular to regular status.

It was the *Oxford English Dictionary* and not the textbooks which as early as 1907 made it known that the use of *none* with a plural verb had been current in the English language from the time of King Alfred on. It took the textbooks some four decades to catch up with this significant feature of English, namely that in a negation the distinction between one and more than one is of far less importance than it is in a positive statement. It was again the dictionaries which anticipated the textbooks in the observation that the noun *data* had in essence become a collective and accordingly might quite as readily govern the singular as the plural.

In order to deal competently with many of these problems, however, it is not only the quantitative data about usage which are important but some indication of the attitude toward new developments in the language as well. In this connection, the *American Heritage Dictionary* has made an interesting contribution to lexicography by collecting the views of a panel of approximately one hundred persons, competent in their employment of the language, on certain moot questions of usage. The way in which the entire operation was carried out was open to criticism, but nevertheless it made the point that the attitude toward a word, word form, syntactical development, etc., is quite as important as the record of usage itself. Any number

of arguments, historical, logical, and otherwise, could be adduced to justify the form *ain't I?* in the first person, negative interrogative—and only there—but the simple fact is that the verb form *ain't*, no matter where or how it is used, generates a host of negative reactions (from 84 to 99 percent as far as the panel was concerned), and this is indication enough that emotion will continue to counter logic and history in this instance.

The same irrational reaction is evident with respect to the derivative form *finalize*. It is by no means a newcomer to the language, having a history of some fifty years of reputable use. The reputability can be ascertained by looking at the authors of the citations in the Webster dictionary entry. Moreover, the addition of the suffix *-ize* to adjectives is not only a widespread practice in English (witness *brutalize*, *fertilize*, *solemnize*, *sterilize*, *spiritualize*) but one of long standing, going back to the beginning of the seventeenth century. The *Random House Dictionary* in a usage note recognized the fifty-year life of the word in an attempt to refute the myth that it was of recent bureaucratic coinage. Despite all of this, it turned out to be unacceptable to ninety percent of the *American Heritage* usage panel. Ultimately it may turn out to acquire a wholly respectable status in the language, but the collective opinion of the panel suggests that the time is not yet at hand. But it is the dictionary rather than the grammar where this information is available.

This matter of the application of derivative suffixes is one of the very features of English which is scantily glossed over in many of the textbooks of English for foreigners. There are, for example, several ways of converting adjectives into abstract nouns—the addition of *-ness* and *-ity* being just two of them. A person with a native feeling for the language knows that *brutality* and *fertility* seem plausible formations, whereas *brutalness* and *fertileness* do not. The nonnative teacher of English, aware of the existence of both of these devices in the language, is not so likely to possess this *Sprachgewühl*. Where is he to acquire it? As I have indicated, the textbooks and grammars are not likely to deal with the matter in any detail, but all reliable English dictionaries have separate entries for each of the derivative suffixes, and in the Oxford at least, the application that is made of them is presented in considerable detail.

This brings to mind another useful and highly innovative feature to be found in just one dictionary of the American vocabulary. As all of us know, the facility of the English language in forming compound words is extraordinary, but for the most part, one can find out what they are only in terms of the first element of the combination. Thus, it is easy to be impressed by the fifteen compounds with the word *beaver* as the first element listed in the current Webster, beginning with *beaver board* and ending with *beaver-wood*, but where is one to find out about the combinations with *board* and *wood* as the last element. The answer is the *Dictionary of Americanisms* which furnishes this kind of index as part of its regular apparatus, and in these particular instances lists 71 combinations for first and 48 for the second.

Synonym discrimination is another important service which most dictionaries perform. Confusion here is likely to arise from two sources. Bilingual dictionaries can do little more than list the most obvious equivalents, which often falls short of suggesting the restrictions on the use of words with closely related meanings. For example, a French-English dictionary will give *absorber* and *armortir* as French equivalents of English *absorb*, but this falls far short of indicating the contexts where *absorb* may be used synonymously with *monopolize*, *consume*, *engross*, *take up*, *deaden* and when they cannot. One can easily *absorb* or *take up* someone's time or attention; a blotter can *absorb* or *take up* the water from a glass that has been overturned, but one can scarcely *absorb* the next topic in a list to be considered.

A further difficulty arises from the fact that a host of English words have cognates in a number of Western European languages. Returning to *absorb* as a case in point, we find that the French cognate *absorber* is often used in the sense of 'drink' or 'imbibe,' and that Spanish *absorber* may mean 'to eat' as well as 'to drink.' In English the meaning of *absorb* does intersect with the meaning of *consume*, but only in the extended sense of a *consuming* or *absorbing* interest or curiosity. I have met people who might be said to absorb their martinis at a cocktail party, but I would find it considerably more difficult to speak, even in jest, of their absorbing steak smothered with onions. The point is, however, that reputable dictionaries, through a well-devised scheme of cross-referencing, do deal with synonym discrimination in considerable detail.

I must not leave this subject without calling attention to the various kinds of usage labels which dictionaries employ. These may refer to the national varieties of English in which a word or meaning is current, whether or not it is obsolete or archaic, whether it is a scientific, technical, or occupational term, and finally to the degree of acceptability of a particular word or construction—the so-called status labels. Earlier in this essay I used an old word *wanhope*, meaning 'despair.' It is recorded as obsolete in the second (1934) edition of Webster's New *International Dictionary* and is not even entered in the third (1961) edition. A resourceful teacher should be able to discover the nature of the editorial policy which eliminated the word in the third edition, and then by consulting the citations in the *Oxford English Dictionary* treatment of the word, to conclude that the editors of Webster III had made a mistake.

Included among the status labels are such terms as *colloquial*, *informed*, *illiterate*, *dialect*, *substandard*, *nonstandard*, and *slang*. To begin with, no one using a dictionary should ever accept as conclusive the application of any of these labels in one dictionary without verifying it in two or three others: The criteria for applying these labels are so hazy and inconsistent that uncritical acceptance of the judgment of one dictionary is perilous indeed.

The label which merits the most attention here because it is so often misinterpreted is *colloquial*. Unfortunately, despite the best efforts of the

lexicographers, it has come to be taken as a term of condemnation. The original intent was merely to indicate that a word so marked was characteristic of conversation and not usually found in formal or literary style. In order to correct this general misapprehension, the second edition of Webster's *New International Dictionary* (1934) went so far as to conclude its definition of the word with the statement, "Colloquial speech may be as correct as formal speech." The attempt was fruitless; the public misinterpretation of the label continued unabated, and recently a number of dictionaries have substituted the term *informal* for it. This does have the advantage of focussing upon the style or atmosphere of the language rather than the mode of communication, speech or writing, but the new practice is not yet universal, and the teacher should not be misled when he encounters *colloquial* as a label.

A word remains to be said about the kind of dictionary I have been concerned with in the course of this discussion. It is the dictionary written entirely in English, not the bilingual dictionary. It is not the stringently abridged dictionary, but one which aims at a fairly comprehensive coverage of the entire language. Bilingual dictionaries, as I have already suggested, are usually content to give only the most obvious lexical equivalents, without troubling to indicate where the equivalence no longer applies. This is especially true of the abbreviated or vest-pocket variety.

One of the favorite Sunday comic-strip characters of my youth was Dictionary Jacques, a French immigrant employed as a man of all work by an American family, whose devotion to his inadequate bilingual dictionary was responsible for a misadventure every week. One which I still recall was on the occasion when his employer asked him to trim the Christmas tree. Obviously his dictionary supplied, for English *trim*, only the French word *émonder*, 'to cut close,' but did not include *ornier*, 'to adorn.' He worked away cheerfully at what he thought he had been told to do, but the result was scarcely what the family had anticipated.

Certainly, every teacher of English should possess, as part of his personal library, a dictionary of at least collegiate size, the kind which contains approximately 125,000 entries, but additionally, every teacher of English should have access to no less than three or four more extensive works: the Webster's *Third New International*, the *Random House*, the *American Heritage*, and now that it is available in two volumes with a magnifying glass as an accessory, the microprint *Oxford English Dictionary* as well. It is the responsibility of any English teaching agency or institution to supply these to its staff as part of a generally accessible professional resource library.

But having access to dictionaries is by no means the whole solution; the information they offer must be soundly interpreted as well, and when they differ, such differences must be considered in the light of their differences in editorial policy and practice. I have already given an illustration of how this applies, with respect to the ordering of definitions, but this is by no means an end to the matter.

It must be recognized, for example, that the Webster Third considered its primary function to be an impartial recorder of the language. Its citations are drawn from every kind of writing, from the very popular and casual to the literary and technical. The editors set out to record the facts of the language rather than to prescribe or dictate how the language should be used. On some points, especially in its usage notes, the Random House policy was that the dictionary editor must do more than record usage; he must also teach. As a consequence, its notes are designed to reflect the opinion of educated users of English. At the other end of the scale, the American Heritage editors viewed the language as under constant challenge, from the scientist, the bureaucrat, the broadcaster, the inventor of every stripe, even the voyager in space. They felt even more strongly than the Random House editors that it was the duty of the lexicographer to add an essential dimension of guidance toward what they consider to be grace and precision in the use of language.

Naturally these differences in attitude, in the concept of the function of a dictionary, are reflected not only in the usage notes, but very often in what is recorded and what is omitted, in the grammatical information that is given, in what is considered formal and what informal, to mention only a few matters. It is scarcely ever sufficient, therefore, to limit one's investigation of any language problem to the information contained in a single dictionary, and what is extracted from each must then be viewed in the light of its general editorial policy.

How does one learn about policy and practice? The answer is very simple. These matters are always set forth with admirable fullness and clarity in the dictionary prefaces and introductions, but unfortunately those are the parts of the dictionary which people seldom read. It goes without saying that a thorough acquaintance with these *terrae incognitae* is part of the professional responsibility of every English teacher; equally so, a complete familiarity with all of the kinds of information a dictionary has to offer, and the requisite skill in being able to find it. I believe, moreover, that training in full and resourceful use of dictionaries should be an important part of the formal preparation of every English teacher.

There is a quaint sentence in one of DeQuincey's essays in which he says, "I enjoy wandering among a library." Today we would use the word *browse*, but this was a new use of the word in DeQuincey's time. Browsing in libraries is delightful; it offers the fullest opportunity for serendipity, the finding of valuable or agreeable things not sought for. So too does browsing in dictionaries, among the incomparably rich resources of the language. But one must know how to find the nuggets, and when he has them in hand, to be able to distinguish diamonds from glass, real gold from fool's gold. It is my firm conviction that, in order to discharge his professional potential, every teacher of English, whether as a native or foreign language, must become an inveterate, an ingenious, a critical and sophisticated dictionary browser.

A Hierarchy of Drills

Archibald A. Hill

The O'Connor-Twaddell formulation of the stages of language teaching and drill sets up five stages—recognition, imitation, repetition, variation, and selection—a pentad that has been widely accepted and used. This paper presents the view that the pentad should be considerably elaborated. The stages proposed are: (1) Discrimination, in which the students are asked only to say whether 'That's a big cut,' and 'That's a big cot' are the same or different. (2) Identification, in which they are expected to identify which of the above types of sentence is occurring. (3) Explanation of how sounds are made. (4) Imitation of sounds as they occur in sentences. (5) Repeated imitation, with variation as in 'That's a book,' 'That's an eraser,' 'That's chalk.' This stage should also be preceded by grammatical explanation. (6) Controlled choice. After full explanation of the difference between 'shaves every day,' and 'is shaving now' the students are expected to repeat sentences with the proper verb forms where the kind of action is clearly defined. Stages (5) and (6) are repeated until all the favorite sentence types of simple sentences have been drilled on. (7) Manipulation, in which the students are given rules of change and combination of sentences, as in 'Little green trees grow in spring' and 'Little green trees come from acorns.' These are then combined to give 'Little green trees that come from acorns grow in the spring.' (8) The last stage is selection, as when the students learn on which occasions an active sentence should be used instead of the corresponding passive.

I think it is safe to say that the activity of teaching second languages is a good deal like bringing up children—there are as many systems as there are teachers, or parents, and people learn languages fairly well or children grow up as decent citizens under all the systems, or for that matter fail to learn languages or turn out as ne'er-do-wells under all the systems. In the years of World War II, there emerged a system of language teaching based on structural linguistics administered in massive dosages of drill, of the so-called mim-mem (mimicry-memory) type. The system swept all before it for more than two decades, but is now under violent attack. The structuralist teachers assumed that if students memorized (or as the jargon had it, 'over-learned') a sufficient number of sentences they would set up habits of communicating in the target language. The current objection to this approach is that language and communication are not simply matters of habit, since any articulate speaker can easily create a sentence which he has never heard before, and which therefore cannot be a habitual response. For instance, a sentence I have never heard is 'Napoleon the third loved spa-

Mr. Hill, Professor Emeritus of English and Linguistics at the University of Texas at Austin, has published widely in the fields of language and language teaching. Among his publications are *Introduction to Linguistic Structures* (Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1958), *Oral Approach to English*, 2 vols. (Tokyo, 1961), and *Linguistics Today* (editor, Basic Books, Inc., 1969). For nineteen years he served as Secretary-Treasurer of the Linguistic Society of America.

ghetti and sonnets,' It is grammatical, I am sure, and the fact that it may not be true is another matter, as is the fact that it has a certain stylistic incongruity. Perhaps a more serious objection to a view of language as no more than habit is that if it were, it would be totally predictable, therefore totally redundant, and therefore totally useless. But now with a swing right to the other extreme, one current view of how to teach a foreign language is that the teacher explains the rules by which sentences are created, and the further rules which describe the relation of sentences to each other. The student then relies on the underlying similarities in all communication systems and applies the rules to produce sentences in the new language. That is, all languages have names for roses, cabbages, kings, and lovers. Once the learner knows how to put the names together in the target language, he can then be expected to talk. This approach, too, has weaknesses, as I think all approaches have. For one thing, understanding the rules of sentence creation does not guarantee fluency any more than understanding harmony guarantees ability to play the piano. I shall try, then, in what follows to describe what seems to me a sensible approach to language teaching, though I hasten to say that it is a *sensible approach*, not the *sensible approach*. Furthermore it will be a synthetic approach, in which the basis is structural, though with modifications from other approaches, and all, I hope, considered in the light of the proper aims of the language teacher.

Some years ago two respected colleagues, Patricia O'Connor and W. Freeman Twaddell, formulated the stages of language teaching as five, namely recognition, imitation, repetition, variation, and selection. These stages have come to be called the Pentad, and they are the basis of what follows, as well as of the essay by my present colleague, David DeCamp, 'Linguistics and Teaching Foreign Languages,' in *Linguistics Today*. But whereas previous scholars have set up five stages, I find it worthwhile to elaborate, partly by means of subdivision, but at least in one instance by addition. The O'Connor-Twaddell formulation sets up three which are primarily concerned with pronunciation, namely recognition, imitation, and repetition. They also, of course, apply to the learning of other elements of language than the sounds, but if the sounds are properly recognized and imitated, recognition of grammatical and lexical structures is greatly aided. In the elaborated enumeration of stages which I am giving, pronunciation is the first general stage, and it is divided into four substages: discrimination, recognition, explanation, and finally imitation. All these stages are taught much as they would have been in the heyday of structuralism.

One facet of structural linguistics which remains undestroyed by transformational attack is the notion of contrast. That is, that sounds identify utterances (as Bloomfield had it) as 'sames' or 'differents.' The smallest of the sentence or utterance identifiers were called by the name phoneme, a name which I think it is well to abandon, since it has grown increasingly difficult to define or isolate the concept with anything like convergence. As long as that is true, the name (though not necessarily the thing) can only

confuse students. The sound signals which identify sentences vary from language to language, at least in detail, and therefore have to be taught. Here at any rate, I think it is incontrovertible that there is a habitual base of recognition, which can and must be taught by drill.

For instance, for speakers of Japanese, sentences like 'He's watching the gulls,' and 'He's watching the girls,' will or may be heard as a pair of sames, just as for speakers of Spanish 'It's a big state,' and 'It's a big estate,' may be heard as sames. Or to turn the statement around, for speakers of English, the Spanish sentences 'Is that your name' *es su nombre* and 'Are you a man' *es un hombre* may well be heard as the same, as once happened to me with at least mildly amusing results.

Thus then, the first drills are discrimination drills. That is, the students are presented with pairs of sentences, sometimes the same, sometimes different, and the students are to respond only with a statement that the pairs are pairs of sames, or a pair of different. At this point, I think it is worth giving a small dose of theory. I am convinced after a longish teaching career that the human ear can readily hear whether sounds are same or different if they are placed side by side with only a short space between them, but that the human ear does not do nearly so well as an instrument for identifying sounds in isolation. Thus, for learning to hear exactly what sound occurs in cut there must first be a longish build-up of habitual recognition that *cut* is different from *cot*, from *cat*, and from *caught*—the last with the proviso that *cot* and *caught* are not different in all English dialects. How is such a discrimination drill designed and administered? It consists of a set of minimally paired sentences, such as

He's watching the gulls.
He's watching the girls.

Or

That's a big cut.
That's a big cot.

Each sentence should be presented both visually and auditorially. For the visual presentation, there should be a written form in conventional spelling, a second form which is a systematic respelling (that is, some type of phonetic notation), and finally, if the class has some language in common, a translation. None of these forms are recited on; they are presented primarily to show the students that it is a real language they are studying.

For auditory presentation, the teacher says a pair of sentences several times, until the students have had ample opportunity to hear. Then he says the paired sentences, sometimes different, sometimes the same, and calls for joint responses from the students, 'same' or 'different.' The paired sentences must be arranged in a genuinely random order of same and different, since one of the things which all teachers learn very quickly, is that students will be clever enough to guess any sequential pattern which the teacher falls into.

There are several details which can be mentioned here. One is that the sentences selected for teaching the distinctions of English should ideally be different for learners of various language backgrounds. For instance, *sheep* and *ship* is a real difficulty for speakers of Spanish, not at all for speakers of German. On the other hand, a pair like *dear* and *tier* will be much harder for Germans than for Spaniards. In the situation in which most of us find ourselves as second language teachers in this country, however, it is not usually possible to segregate speakers according to native language background. As a result, the best we can do is to try to give drill sentences which cover the whole of English sound structure, without worrying over whether all the sentences are equally difficult for all the students.

A second detail is a theoretical question which may have occurred to some of you. Are there distinctions in sound which are genuinely harder to hear than others? That is, are there pairs such as the well-known tone pairs of Chinese which are necessarily harder than the stress pairs of English? I think that there is no such real distinction in difficulty. That is, what is hard for us is basically a matter of familiarity—I find pairs like *billow* and *below* easy because I am a speaker of English. Arabic pharyngealized sounds are hard for me, but not hard for my Arabic students. There is, however, a second factor which affects difficulty and ease differently. This is the number of distinctive qualities which occur in the pair of sounds. For instance, *bit* and *sit* are easy to hear as different, since at least three distinguishing qualities separate the initial consonants from each other. *Free* and *three* on the other hand are hard to hear, since only one distinguishing quality marks them. Incidentally, also, the ease or difficulty of the sound structure of the totality of a language is affected by the number of distinctions it makes. English is hard in pronunciation because it has a relatively high number of distinctions—approximately fifty, in some systems of counting, whereas Hawaiian has less than half that number, and is thus easier.

It must be emphasized that distinctions in stress, in pause, and in pitch should not be forgotten. For instance, here are several pairs involving differences in stress, in pause, and finally in pitch.

Turn left at the greenhouse.
Turn left at the green house.

I gave it to Pa Price.
I gave it to Pop Rice.

We're going blind.

We're going blĭnd.

How hard is it to teach a discrimination foreign to the students? My experience is that it is relatively easy to produce 100 per cent correct responses to any single distinction within minutes, ten minutes, say, at the

outside. The distinctions must be genuine, however, not illusory. A typical illusory distinction might be 'he wants *esprit*,' and 'he wants *a spree*.' This statement means that the teacher has to spend a lot of time testing his own distinctions on a native jury to find out if they are real. I am sure that if I had started out teaching minimal sentence pairs when I was fresh from Graduate School, I would have used a pair like 'Let's make Mary,' and 'Let's make merry,' (if it were not for the very faintly improper connotation of the first, the one with a proper name)—I would have used them, I say, under the mistaken impression that they were different. Somewhere along the line, jury testing convinced me that the two sentences are exactly alike in my speech. It will be noted, by the way, that I have presented my minimal pairs always in sentences. Though occasionally minimal sentence pairs cannot be found for a pair of words which are minimally different, forcing the teacher to rely on word pairs only, it is still generally true that since by and large language consists of sentences, and only sentences have full meaning, the minimal pairs should be presented as far as possible in sentences. Only by using sentences can the teacher be reasonably sure that he has avoided unnaturally slow and bookish pronunciation, like the /áy wónt éy kóp áv kófy/ which has become notorious.

As well as avoiding mere word pairs as far as possible, there is another tempting practice which I think should be avoided altogether. This is the practice, sometimes resorted to by teachers whom I otherwise respect, of using nonsense words, if there is some gap in English which seems to be merely accidental. If there is a real pair 'It's a big sheep,' and 'It's a big ship,' this pair is not justification for introducing a nonsense pair like 'It's a big *sheeb,' and 'It's a big *shib.' The reason nonsense forms are to be avoided is simply that students must be continually reminded that the target language is a system of communication, used by real persons, for real activities. I remember from my own experience a situation which illustrates the attitude which students can fall into. My first acquaintance with Holland and the Dutch was through the child's book *Hans Brinker*. The first largish group of Hollanders that I came in contact with were sailors-big, and beefy, and not at all like Hans Brinker. The attitude persisted for me, unfortunately, so that for long I found Dutch words, like *tweeklank* for 'diphthong,' somehow funny.

All the drills that I have been describing are those of the first stage, in which the students are not asked to do more than discriminate sames and different. This first drill stage is then to be followed by a second which uses much the same material but in which the students are expected to identify the utterances in detail. In administering this kind of drill I once again present the students with two utterances, both presented visually in ordinary spelling, in whatever form of phonetic respelling one prefers, and finally with a translation. We might once again use the pair

1. He's watching the gulls.
2. He's watching the girls.

The students respond this time by indicating whether the teacher said number one, or number two. Once more, the teacher should stay with this form of drill until there is 100 per cent accuracy in joint responses. The two stages of discrimination and recognition drills should be given until all the distinctions of the target language which cause any trouble to the students have been covered. Incidentally, what causes difficulty is not always perfectly easy to predict. If speakers of Spanish background hear distinctions like final /*ŋ*/ of *un hombre* in contrast with the initial /*n*/ of *nombre*, it would seem reasonable to expect them to hear a distinction like the final /*ŋ*/ of *thing* in contrast with the final /*n*/ of *thin*. Unfortunately, they do not. That is, a distinction which is easy in one position is not necessarily easy in another, as I remember from a Jesuit friend who startled me by saying 'I like to sin.' In Spanish the distinction between /*n*/ and /*ŋ*/ occurs only as a mark of syllable boundary. In syllable final position, the distinction is lost. I can only emphasize once more that it is the teacher's never ending task to investigate not only what is hard for students to hear, but why it is hard. With that knowledge, he has some chance of being able to design effective drills to overcome the difficulty.

You will notice that I have said nothing yet about having the students imitate the sounds of English. The reason is that imitation should always be put off until it has some chance of being successful. The first stage of preparation of imitation of sounds is the discrimination and recognition drills I have described. The theoretical reason is that while ability to hear a sound does not guarantee ability to imitate it, inability to hear a sound certainly guarantees inability to imitate it also. The third stage of preparation for imitation should be explanation and demonstration of how the sound is made, with full use of diagrams, pictures, and any auditory or visual aid which is helpful. The principle is that if the right articulation is performed, the right sound will inevitably result. I shall not go into articulations which are necessarily difficult, but stick to one which will illustrate the principle effectively. I once had a French acquaintance who had not learned to make the distinction between *three* and *free*. She had ample auditory practice, but it had never been directed to hearing the distinction between /*f*/ and /*θ*/, with the result that she at least once heard a sentence in a movie in the nonsensical form 'I'll marry you when I'm *three*.' I told her that all she had to do to produce a proper /*θ*/ was put her tongue between her teeth and blow. I don't know if she ever overcame the habitual confusion which she had fallen into in the two sounds, but at least she had what was necessary for proper learning. I am, however, aware that there are sounds which cannot so easily be imitated after explanation. It is true, for instance, that the French and German back or uvular /*r*/ can be imitated by starting from a snore. But one of the sounds which for many people seems easy, a tongue-tip trill, is almost impossible to imitate until the speaker has previously learned it in some form in his native speech.

Another point about discrimination and imitation drills. Some drill on

discrimination should be given for all, or very nearly all, the distinctions of the target language. There are, however, some distinctions which are less important than others, because they distinguish only very rare pairs of utterances. Such distinctions can be left out of imitation drills with no real harm to the student. One such distinction is that between pairs 'I want the latter,' and 'I want the ladder.' The intervocalic /t/ (distinct from /d/ in my speech, though not in the speech of all Americans) will by most foreigners be heard as some kind of /r/. The learner should be drilled on hearing the distinction between 'I like *Betty's*' and 'I like *berries*,' but I see no reason why he should be taught to make the variety of intervocalic /t/ which I happen to use. Any variety which will be understood as a /t/ is satisfactory. The sounds to be imitated should be those which distinguish large numbers of words, and incidentally, those sounds like /iy/ and /i/ should be drilled early and often, since not only does this distinction identify many different word-pairs, it also marks the difference between a number of innocent and common words, and some which are very strongly tabooed.

How should imitation drills be constructed and administered? First of all, I believe that there should be only a minimum of use of sounds in isolation, and that isolated sounds are particularly ineffective in drilling on vowel distinctions. With distinctions in consonants like /θ/ and /f/ they are helpful enough to be used in introductory stages. But the heart of imitation drill should be the imitation of sentences. Only in sentences can the intonation pattern, so often at least as important as the vowels and consonants that make up the individual words, be given so that meaning is really communicated. But while the utterances to be imitated should always be sentences, there should also be careful attention to the words of which the sentence is made up. For this purpose a modification of the so-called 'build-up' given for sentence drills in the textbook *El Inglés Hablado* is necessary. Suppose the sentence is one written as 'I would like a cup of coffee.' The way this sentence comes out in ordinary conversation is /áydlaykə kəpə kəfiy#/. No student is going to be able to communicate in English if the only form he can understand is that with each word pronounced separately as if it were a complete phrase. The build-up should, I think, be given in some such form as this:

I would /ay wUd/> /ayd/

I would like /ay wUd layk/>/aydlayk/
 a cup /ey kəp/> /ə kəp/

I would like a cup /aydlaykə kəp/
 of coffee /av kəfiy/> /ə kəfiy/

Notice that this drill is really a sort of build-down, rather than a build-up. Its purpose is to set up a relatively easy understanding of the relation between words in isolation, and the forms those words assume in actual utter-^{ante}. I wish to be emphatic in saying that neither the isolated form, nor the

sentence form, is right or better than the other. Each is appropriate and necessary in its own sphere. All that can be called wrong is to use the isolation-forms in the actually spoken sentence. It is sometimes thought that to use the isolation-forms in sentences makes for greater clarity and that for that reason they are right. In fact, however, isolation-forms often make for misunderstanding. A former colleague supplied me with an example from a radio announcement. The sentence as spoken was 'This program will be heard on this station from one/tuw/three.' What should have been said was the weak form /tə/ which identifies the preposition. The overly distinct form made the preposition seem like the numeral. As a result, the broadcasting station received many calls as to when the program would take place.

The drills just described consists of complete sentences, and these are to be repeated by the students until they have been thoroughly memorized. While I shall return to spelling later, it seems to me that these sentences for memorization should always consist not only of the auditory material presented by the teacher's pronunciation, but by three forms of material presented visually. The first of these is some form of systematic respelling, in which the relation between sound and visual symbols for sound is consistent. I happen to prefer a system which is a good deal like that in *El Inglés Hablado*, and is based on the phonetic analysis of Trager and Smith. Other systems, however, may be equally effective as long as they are equally consistent and complete. The second form of visual presentation should be the ordinary spelling of the English sentence. Note that neither the phonetic notation, nor the relation between words and English spelling should be taught at this stage. They should always be presented for the students to use if they wish, however, since unless the writing system is constantly present, students are apt to consider English as a simple, and even simple-minded, tongue without a proper spelling system. This is particularly true if the phonetic respelling is presented without the ordinary orthography. There is a lamentable history of use of a book, the so-called 'General Form,' which was meant as directions for authors of textbooks, not teaching materials. The 'General Form' did not present its sentences in ordinary spelling, and the unhappy students for whom it was improperly used, complained that they first had to spend months on learning phonetics before they could begin to learn English.

The last of the three forms of visual material should be translation of the sentence into the student's native language. The reason for this, of course, is once more to convince the students that the target language is a real and human system of communication. The type of translation used is of some importance, however. In my estimation it should always be the social equivalent of the target sentence, not a literal or etymological equivalent. I probably do not need to dwell on the point; a single illustration will do. If the English sentence is a parent's command to a child, 'Be good!' the proper French equivalent for good is *sage*, (which to English speakers suggests

wise) rather than the literal *bon*. Also it is at this stage, the preparation of sentences for memorization, that special care should be exercised to see that the sentences are genuinely natural, and convincingly likely to occur. On the other hand, in earlier stages, where what is being taught is distinction in sounds and sound sequences, sentences can be somewhat improbable on occasion, though not unnatural. For instance, in drilling on the English consonant cluster /st-/, which speakers of Japanese find difficult unless they can break it up by insertion of a vowel, I have used the contrast 'That's a big *station*,' and 'That's a big *cetacean*.' The last sentence is improbable since I don't use the word *cetacean* in ordinary conversation, but it is not unnatural. What I am objecting to at this stage is the well-known 'This is the pen of my aunt' syndrome. Incidentally, also, unnaturalness includes using the sentence out of context. Many drills make at least a slight error by having the teacher hold up a book and saying 'What's this?' The proper reply for students should then be 'That's a book.' If the response uses *this*, the reply becomes unnatural.

Up to this point we have been concerned primarily with pronunciation, but having reached the stage of imitation, we reach a stage at which it is easy to make the transition to lexicon and syntax. In imitation, each sentence presented for the students to imitate and memorize, should be thought of as a substitution frame. That is, after the sentence has been thoroughly learned, the student is presented with a list of new words with which he is to replace one of the words in the original sentence. Let us suppose that our frame is the question and response just mentioned—'What's this? That's a book.' The teacher continues with a series of nouns to replace *book*. They may be presented orally, or by means of pictures, or even the actual objects. It must be strongly emphasized that the students must be forced to respond with the complete sentence, 'That's a pencil,' or the like. Human nature being what it is, the students are all too apt to respond by merely repeating the new noun, not the whole frame. The drill is set up to enforce proper imitation by combining it with repetition, so that it properly represents both the stage of imitation and the one which follows, namely repetition. The real point of the drill is not simply to introduce new vocabulary, but to habituate the distinction between *this* for near objects, and *that* for those not near. The introduction of various vocabulary items is, so to speak, a bit of lagniappe, since certainly the learning of vocabulary is important, and unfortunately, endless. It does do one additional thing, however, in that it teaches the student, by repetition, what things fit into the substitution frame the teacher has set up. In order to make the drill work, however, the teacher has to be careful to see that he does not introduce irregularities before he is ready for them. Thus in this frame, he cannot introduce the uncountable *chalk*, or any plural, since his frame calls for the indefinite article in preconsonantal form, *a*, not either *an* or *zero*.

This combined stage of imitation and repetition should be followed by another stage of explanation. Sticking to the frame of 'What's this?' and

response, one of the difficulties it introduces is variation in the indefinite article, with differing forms when the following word begins with consonant or vowel, or when the following noun is a countable (like *book*) or an uncountable, like *chalk*. The teacher gives a full explanation, putting on the board a list of forms which take *a* /ə/, *an* /ən/, or zero. The blackboard then contains three columns of lists. Under /a/ there are such forms as *book*, *pencil*, *eraser*, *desk*, *window*, and so on. Under /ən/ there are forms like *eraser*, *elbow*, *eye*, *elevator*, *apple*, and so on. Under zero, there are forms like *chalk*, *money*, *water*, *wine*, *gasoline*, and so on. Of these forms, *chalk* is perhaps the most interesting, since one would expect it to be a countable, as it is in many languages. But for historical reasons, it is uncountable in English, even though it comes in chunks. This stage, in which the students are to respond with 'That's a pencil,' 'That's an eraser,' and 'That's chalk,' constitutes the stage of variation, combined of course, with the earlier stage of repetition.

The stage of variation leads naturally to a more advanced one—that of controlled choice. Let us suppose that what the teacher wishes to drill on is the distinction between 'John is speaking English,' and 'John speaks English.' The teacher must begin once more, with explanation, and the explanation should, as usual, be in the native language. Also as usual, it should be a workable and realistic explanation. That is, it should state at least these facts—*speak* is one of the verbs which has a nonhabitual form, and which uses the simple form for action which is permanent, habitual, or repeated, as in 'John speaks English every day.' The form with *be* and *-ing*, on the other hand, is used for any action not specifically defined as habitual or permanent. Once the distinction has been fully explained, the teacher adopts a device for setting up a substitution frame. The one I usually use is to make a sentence in which the verb is replaced by the syllable *blank* like this, 'Our teacher *blank* every day.' The students are then told to replace with verbs like *shave*, *swim*, *sing*, *exercise*, and so on. All are verbs which make the distinction between habitual and nonhabitual action, so that all take the simple present, plus the proper ending. The next frame is 'Our teacher *blank* right now.' The same set of verbs can be used, and the proper response gives 'is shaving,' 'is swimming,' etc. The drill at this point is still mere repetition with variation. But now controlled choice can be introduced. What the teacher does is introduce a series of frames which define the action as permanent or nonpermanent, then asking the students to fill the blanks with the proper verb form. Such a frame might be 'The sun *blank* in the east.' The students are asked to fill the blank with *rise* and are expected to give the simple, habitual form. A second frame might be 'The teacher *blank* the papers this morning.' Since the action *is* defined as not necessarily habitual, such a verb as *correct* must be put into the form 'is correcting' in order to fit into the blank.

At this stage, where students are learning sentences for memorization by means of such processes as imitation, repetition, variation and controlled

choice, there should be a careful selection of sentence types of the target language. Here is a list of some favorite types, though the list is minimal. Subject-verb 'William disappeared.' For this, perhaps the simplest type of articulated sentence in English, about all that is necessary by way of variation is to give ample practice in building up the noun phrases that can stand in subject position. That is, I think a useful type of expansion for this sentence type can be what is often called a pyramid drill for memorization:

Trees grow.
 Green trees grow.
 Little green trees grow.
 All little green trees grow.

In this drill I should avoid embedding relative sentences—that is, a sentence like 'All little green trees that come from acorns, grow.' It belongs to a considerably later stage, since it embeds an independent sentence '(trees) come from acorns.' The verb element can also be expanded in pyramid fashion.

'Trees grow. Trees usually grow. Trees usually grow quickly.' These pyramids acquaint the student with the members of the subject position (one type of jargon calls it the subject tagmeme), and in addition, teach him something about the order classes of English modifiers, something not necessarily the same in other languages. For instance, 'little green trees' in Spanish is 'little trees green.'

From this simplest of sentence types, the teacher should proceed to subject-verb-object, and subject-verb-complement types. For this purpose, there is little difference in English (no matter what the difference may be in other languages) between 'A clumsy waiter spilled the dinner,' and 'A clumsy waiter is a nuisance.' Notice, further, that the treatment of the build-up of the subject-phrases applies equally well to the build-up of object and complement phrases.

A much more important distinction in sentence types is that between simple subject-verb-object sentences, and double object sentences. That is, the distinction between 'A wealthy man built the library,' and 'A wealthy man built the University a library.' These sentences are familiar under the names direct and indirect object, and in many languages the two nouns would have different case endings. The sentence type oilers a number of difficulties in English—one of which happens to interest me. At least in my speech, substitution of pronouns for the two objects is rather strictly limited. I can of course say 'John gave Mary a book,' or 'John gave her a book,' but not 'John gave her it,' or 'John gave Mary it.' The rules show variation, since an older and British type is 'John gave it me,' which shows order that I cannot use, as well as two pronouns. Not that it matters very greatly, but you can all have a bit of fun finding out what your own pronoun substitution rules for double object sentences actually are.

Another sentence type consists of one of the preceding plus adverbial modification with a prepositional phrase. That is subject-verb-object-prepositional phrase as in

My father paid the bill with a check.

or with two prepositional phrases—

My father paid the bill with a check on last Tuesday.

At this point a reasonable way of varying the presentation of sentence types is to introduce the negative types. Negatives are often enough thought of as essentially simple, but I do not find them so. Actually each one of the parts of the sentence can be negated, and in addition, the sentence as a whole can also be so treated.

No dogs chase cats. (negation of subject)

Dogs chase no cats. (negation of object)

Dogs don't chase cats. (negation of whole sentence, or of verb)

Notice that there is a difficulty, in that there is no perfectly clear way of negating the verb alone—the construction leaves negation placed before the verb somewhat ambiguous, since it may negate either the whole sentence or the verbal part of it alone. Actually, the distinction is carried fairly clearly in speech by the position of the sentence stress. If *chase is* the recipient of the heaviest stress, it becomes the peak of information, and suggests a contrast with some other activity as in—

Dogs don't *chase* cats, they bark at them.

Notice also that if the subject construction or the object construction is expanded by the addition of modifiers, there is a somewhat similar trouble, in that the negative in such a position negates only the modifier, and cannot modify the total subject construction. Thus note:

No wise dog chases cats.

The sentence immediately suggests that foolish dogs engage in the sport, and the sentence is different in meaning from such an utterance as

Dogs are wise. Dogs don't chase cats.

I don't think I need to pursue the difficulty further, since there are complexities enough, without going into that positive horror for the learner of English, the positive-negative, and negative-positive tag questions. I can allow myself to point out one very curious irregularity, not usually noticed in grammars. The double negative is frowned on, of course, though it continues to exist, in spite of frowns. There is an unexpected irregularity in the construction when it does occur. The negatives go on verb and object, as in the dialectal

'Dogs don't chase no cats.'

So far as I know the following two sentences are rare or nonoccurring—‘No dogs don’t chase no cats,’ and ‘No dogs don’t chase cats.’ I find myself wondering if a sentence like ‘Dogs don’t chase no cats’ is a solution of the difficulty about negation of the whole sentence versus negation of the verb alone. The double negative sentence must be negation of more than the verb, so one wonders, then, if such dialects then interpret ‘Dogs don’t chase cats,’ as being negation only of the verb. Such speculations are more or less off our subject, but are interesting none the less, and have at least a little bearing on the TESOL classroom, in that many other languages permit the double negative, so that production of it can be expected to appear in student utterances. Also, for the TESOL teacher, as well as for other kinds of English teachers, it is well to remember that dialects have structure as well as Standard English.

I shall hurry over the rest of the favorite sentence patterns, by mentioning only three. The first is the subjectless, or apparently subjectless, sentence used for command. I say apparently subjectless, since the subject is often restored, as in ‘Open the door, won’t you?’ where the tagged on question reintroduces the *you* which is absent in the bare command. The second sentence type is the question, which is really two types, leaving out of account the echo-question which makes a third. The two question types that need drilling on as models for construction are the question by order-shift, as in the pair

John is a teacher, which becomes Is John a teacher?

And the question by splitting the verb phrase and shifting the first verb, as in

John can drive a car which becomes Can John drive a car?

The third type, the echo-question mentioned above, merely repeats a statement given by another speaker, and makes a question out of it by a rising pitch at the end. An example would be:

‘John went to the store.’ (statement)

‘John went to the store?’ (question)

‘Yes, he did.’ (answer)

The last sentence type which I shall mention at this time is the passive, which like the question type, has a number of subtypes. For our purposes, however, we can content ourselves with the simple passive, as in ‘Cats are chased by dogs’ which is derived from ‘Dogs chase cats,’ and the negative passive as in ‘Cats aren’t chased by dogs.’ This set of sentences constitutes, I think, a sufficient number of types so that a good deal of the structure of English will be mastered, if they are imitated repeatedly, and if furthermore they are extensively varied by substitution of new words for their various parts. And I think, also, that completion of mim-mem drill on these sentence types concludes all the material that should be presented by imitation, repetition, variation, and controlled choice. The next stage is more

complex, and is that which is most clearly best done in accord with transformational theory. I shall illustrate it with only one kind of exercise. The stage is that which I shall call manipulation, and it involves the changing and combinations of sentences. For instance, it was said above that the sentence

Little green trees that come from acorns grow quickly

is best described as containing a so-called embedded sentence, and is thus in some sense a combination of two sentences—

Little green trees grow.

Little green trees come from acorns.

The combination involves replacement of the second occurrence of the subject construction by 'that,' and insertion of the resultant 'that come from acorns' before the verb which corresponds to the overtly mentioned subject construction. As a drill, students are given a series of separate sentences which they are to combine according to the model just given.

The last stage of the O'Connor-Twaddell pentad is selection. This, it seems to me, is appropriate on the stylistic level, and is something that the students can only be given a start at. That is, we as native speakers spend most of our adult lives trying to learn to talk with the highest degree of emotional, informational, and artistic congruity, and for this we select with increasing care, as practice makes us perfect. I hope, for instance, that I can say 'thank you for the pleasure of talking to an attentive audience,' and that I do not have to say 'good gentles all, this humble person giveth ye all much thank.'

REFERENCES

- Agard, Frederick B. et al. 1953. *El Inglés Hablado*. New York: Henry Holt and Company.
- American Council of Learned Societies. 1952. *Structural Notes and Corpus: A Basis for the Preparation of Materials to Teach English as a Foreign Language*. Washington, D.C.: American Council of Learned Societies. (This is the 'General Form'.)
- DeCamp, David. 1969. "Linguistics and Teaching Foreign Languages," in *Linguistics Today*, edited by Archibald A. Hill. New York: Basic Books, Inc.
- O'Connor, Patricia and W. F. Twaddell. 1960. "Intensive Training for an Oral Approach in Language Teaching," *The Modern Language Journal*, XLIV, Number 2, Part 2, 1-42.
- Trager, George L. and Henry Lee Smith, Jr. 1951. *Outline of English Structure*. Studies in Linguistics Occasional Paper No. 2. Norman, Oklahoma: Battenberg Press.
- Wilmers, William E. 1953. *Spoken English as a Foreign Language* (Instructor's Manual). Washington, D.C.: American Council of Learned Societies.

Reading and the Audio-Lingual Method

Muriel Saville-Troike

The audio-lingual approach, while valid for developing oral fluency, has been over-applied to the detriment of developing fluency in reading. Yet as a tool for learning, reading is often more important to students than understanding the spoken language. Attempts to design adequate reading programs for advanced students in ESL classes should take into account recent findings in reading research, and current attention to the characteristics of written vs. spoken English is necessary, as is an awareness of culture and semantic pitfalls for the non-native reader.

Linguists these days sometimes enjoy taking pokes at the audio-lingual method, and I admit to being no exception. I considered calling this talk "The R-ful/oral Method," and a colleague of mine at Georgetown University will be speaking at the International Reading Association Conference next month on 'The R in TESOL.' The fact that there isn't any R in TESOL is *not* merely incidental to this presentation. In spite of its crucial role in advanced English language learning contexts, such as those the students in the DLI English Language Program are being prepared for, fluent reading has seldom been a product of the audio-lingual method.

I would like to spend our time today exploring reasons for this weakness, defining "the state of the art" in teaching reading today, and suggesting changes in our TEFL methodology in the light of current pedagogy which may improve the reading competence of our more advanced students.

The primary reason for our neglect of this area seems to be a historical one. Older teaching methods emphasized the written forms of language, largely ignoring speech, and the audio-lingual approach was a reaction to this book-centered orientation. In addition, the schools of behaviorist psychology and structuralist linguistics were in vogue at the time, and their respective views of language learning as a process of habit formation and of language itself as speech, provided a rationale for the new methodology.

In the resulting shift of emphasis in foreign language teaching to the acquisition of oral skills (listening and speaking), reading and writing have been sadly neglected or even ignored. This has occurred in spite of the fact that transformational grammar for more than a decade has insisted that language is a mental phenomenon, and that speech and writing are two separate manifestations of language. Similar developments in cog-

Ms. Saville-Troike, Professorial Lecturer in the Department of Linguistics at Georgetown University, is co-author, with Rudolph C. Troike, of *A Handbook of Bilingual Education* (TESOL, 1971) and is editor of *Classroom Practices in TESOL and Bilingual Education*, Vol. 1 (TESOL, 1973). Forthcoming is her book *Teaching English as a Second Language to Children* (Prentice-Hall). During 1973-74 Ms. Saville-Troike is serving as chairman of the Publications Committee and as first vice-president of TESOL.

nitive psychology have emphasized the same view. The fact that reading instruction in TESOL has been so neglected can only be attributed to the long isolation of the field from continuing developments in linguistics, so that many people in TESOL who are still basing their practices on the theories of the '50s are unaware that these are no longer all equally valid in the '70s.

History tells us that people can learn foreign languages in many different ways, but the choice of methods usually determines which teaching objectives are most satisfactorily realized.

The audio-lingual method has placed a high priority, and rightly, on oral communication, and *good* audio-lingual programs have succeeded in producing fluent speakers of English and other foreign languages. But these programs must additionally recognize reading as a skill in and of itself instead of as merely reinforcement for orally introduced structures and vocabulary if they are to produce fluent readers as well.

It is a cliché of reading instruction that one first learns to read and then reads to learn. All advanced students preparing to *use* English as a *tool in learning*, as are those being prepared here by DLI, must:

1. Understand the vocabulary and structures unique to the milieu of college texts, technical manuals, and other written material required in their professional training and its realization;
2. read at a rate which will not be a handicap to learning; and
3. process deeper levels of interpretive meaning within English-speaking cultural contexts.

These skills, while quite teachable, do not coincide with the audio-lingual goals of instruction, and to expect students to "catch" them in their contact with English much as they would a communicable disease is inefficient, unfair, and unrealistic. We can do better.

Reading is sometimes referred to as a "passive" skill, but there is in fact relatively little about the reading process which can be classified as habitual response. Left to right directionality would come in this category, as would the recognition of letter shapes, punctuation marks, and common patterns of arrangement.

Sound/symbol correspondences may also be classified as habits, but while "sounding out" words may be considered a good habit in beginning stages of reading instruction, learners must evidently shift from phonetic to lexical interpretation of spelling patterns before they can be said to be fluent readers.¹ Some educators are suggesting that reading out loud may be detrimental to a beginning reader by impeding the shift,² and all reading experts agree that subvocalization during silent reading is a *bad* habit calling for remediation.

¹ Carol Chomsky, "Reading, Writing and Phonology," *Harvard Educational Review*, 1970, Vol. 40, pp. 287-309.

² Courtney B. Cazden, *Child Language and Education*, 1972, Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

In contrast, I would like to quote from a well-known text on teaching English as a second language:

In reading, and this happens in reading our native tongue, too, we subvocalize; that is, we make sounds in our throat. We read faster, therefore, if we know how to make the sounds without stumbling over them and if we have learned to read in thought groups.

We in TESOL have insisted that reading is based on oral language, and I will still maintain that reading content at beginning levels should be first introduced in meaningful oral contexts, but we do our more advanced students a disservice by not recognizing and providing for the extensive differences between oral and written language and its processing, as well as for the similarities.

Reading, like listening, is a receptive skill. Like listening, reading involves the use of incomplete data input in predicting and anticipating what probably follows—what the receiver has not yet heard or seen. Input is phonetic for the listener and graphic for the reader, but for the good reader there seems to be no intermediate phonological level of processing. Psycholinguists do not know precisely how we read, but they do tell us there isn't nearly enough time in the process for the fluent reader to make sound/symbol connections, and that "the immediate memory span is virtually identical for words of one to four syllables."³ We must conclude that whatever the form of written language stored for recognition, it cannot be in phonological or phonemic segments. Additional evidence for the independent processing of speech and writing can be found with the many graduate students who have learned to read a foreign language, such as French, without being able to understand a spoken sentence, or with the deaf who learn to read, but never hear language.

It is true that most readers can encode the graphic symbols into phonemic representations and read out loud what is written on a page, but this is not the same process as either speaking or reading and may be learned by someone who does not speak the language at all, or even understand it. Goodman's example for this case is the bar-mitzvah boy who has learned to recode Hebrew script as chanted oral Hebrew but has no understanding of what he is chanting.⁴ Most of us can read a story out loud to our children while planning our schedule for the remainder of the evening or thinking about a problem that arose at the office during the day. Although reading is dependent on graphic input, I wish to limit the term "reading" here to reconstructing the meaning of the writer, to processing the semantic content.

³ Philip B. Gough, "One Second of Reading," in *Language by Ear and by Eye: The Relationships between Speech and Reading*, ed. by James F. Kavanagh and Ignatius G. Mattingly, 1972, MIT Press. Gough is reporting on the research of F. I. M. Craik, "Two Components in Free Recall," *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 1968, Vol. 7, pp. 996-1004.

⁴ Kenneth S. Goodman, "Reading: A Psycholinguistic Guessing Game," in *Individualizing Reading Instruction: A Reader*, ed. By Larry A. Harris and Carl B. Smith, 1972, Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

As in listening, reading involves the use of syntactic information in determining meaning, and both listeners and readers should process words in groups rather than as single lexical items. While oral language is necessarily decoded in the same order as the sequence of speech, however, a good reader is by no means limited to a string of words as they pass in front of his nose. His eyes will jump back and forth, taking in just enough cues to anticipate what's coming next, skipping back for more if a tentative decision on meaning has to be rejected or refined. The span of his glance increases with the predictability of the grammatical form, becoming quite large in such constrained contexts as the end of a passive sentence where "by the (agent)" almost *has* to occur. His eyes will check back frequently in a complex sentence in which much has been inserted between the beginning of the subject and the verb, what linguists call "left embedding."⁵

It is, in fact, this very characteristic of writing that leads to its differentiation from spoken language. Writing is not simply "talk written down," but rather once a society becomes literate, the written variety of the language comes to lead a life of its own. The fact that we do not have to rely on short-term aural memory for processing sentences frees writers from the limits of aural memory and permits them to construct sentences whose length, density, and complexity would be unlikely or impossible in a purely oral mode.

Such complex sentences are quite common in college texts and technical manuals, but ordinary oral drills can never prepare readers for them, since they are practically nonexistent in colloquial speech. Structures unique to written English should be introduced and analyzed in written contexts, as should technical or literary terms students will only need to recognize and never have to produce. The structure of written English should be approached as systematically with our more advanced students as the structure of spoken English hopefully was when they were beginners.

We have been focusing first on the structure or grammar of written language, the order of words and their interrelationship, but of course they do carry meaning which must be decoded during the reading process. We have all seen nonsense sentences such as "The wiltish toffs slocked rumbly" used to illustrate structural meaning, but no one suggests that this is all there is to language. The semantic content of individual words and expressions remain essential building blocks in our structures, and studies show us there is a higher correlation between reading achievement and the recognition of individual lexical items than between reading achievement and knowledge of grammar, speaking fluency, or any other linguistic skill. I will have more to say about this with regard to methodology, but I would first like to call attention to yet another level of meaning in reading—essential

⁵ James F. Kavanagh, ed., *The Reading Process: Proceedings of the Conference on Communicating by Language*, 1968, HEW: National Institutes of Health. This resource also contains relevant comments on the differences between written and colloquial speech by William Labov and other conference participants.

for teaching English as a foreign language, but seldom (if ever) given adequate consideration. It may be called "sociocultural meaning."

Speech is usually considered as preeminently a social activity, while reading, on the other hand, is often viewed as a nonsocial activity which someone can do by himself in a corner. But this distinction is misleading for our purposes, since written, as well as spoken, language has sociocultural content often unrecognized by native speakers of the language because it operates at an unconscious level. This content is essential for foreign students to understand if they are to interpret the meaning of an English sentence (or longer construction) as intended by the English-speaking writer.

The significance of sociocultural information is most important in imaginative writing, probably reaching its zenith in satire, while it is probably least significant in technical and scientific writing, though even here allusive intrusions may occasionally interfere with comprehension, particularly in less formal prose. *To shrug something off* may puzzle a Chinese who has never seen this gesture or *to receive a nod* may confuse a Turk for whom this is usually a sign of negation.

One of the most important sociocultural features of meaning is the "value" or connotation we attach to words, which are usually culture-specific and not easily translatable from language to language. An example is the humorous paradigm

He is old.
You are middle-aged.
I am mature.

Words that appear to be synonyms when looked up in a bilingual dictionary often have vastly different meanings in usage. Many of these so-called "loaded" words have at one time been quite emotionally neutral, and then taken on negative cultural connotations and been replaced by euphemisms, as *hoarding* has been replaced by *stockpiling* in recent years. Understanding the culturally different values assigned to referentially synonymous pairs *smile* and *leer*, *intercede* and *interfere*, *conciliation* and *appeasement*, *attorney* and *shyster*, is essential if an advanced student of English as a foreign language is to understand the tone and intent of much of what he reads. The Spanish speaker for whom the word *propaganda* is completely neutral will be badly misled if he does not recognize its negative connotation in English.

It also seems important for language students to be able to separate what is asserted by the writer from what is *presupposed*. In the sentence "King Charles of France drove a white Mercedes" the writer asserts:

1. King Charles drove.
2. He drove a Mercedes.
3. The Mercedes was white.

The writer additionally presupposes that France, at the time of writing, had a king named Charles, that he could drive, and that at the time the personage lived, Mercedeses existed. These presuppositions are taken to be shared between writer and reader and not new information. It seems profitable for advanced students to pursue such analyses, although all languages seem to have similar conditions on assertions and presuppositions, and cultural interference is not much of a problem at this point.

Current references to "King Richard," however, contain many implications which depend on presupposed information common only to our culture, as uniquely American as our collective attitude toward monarchies and our recent legislative hassles.

It is probably at this level of sociocultural meaning that most misunderstandings occur. Much confusion may result from allusions to "the patience of Job" or a character from Greek mythology, as in the recent headline "Wounded Knee Is McGovern's Achilles' Heel," if the student is from an Eastern culture; and such common expressions as "to kick the bucket" or "to keep tabs on" are meaningless if one is limited to a literal interpretation. Very commonly, students are misled in their interpretation by previous cultural experience, a type of interference which frequently goes unnoted and uncorrected by either student or teacher.

Improving the reading skill of any student begins with identifying his weaknesses, and then implementing appropriate methods for strengthening these skills. Students in an advanced English program will vary greatly in their needs, depending on prior reading methods used with them and on the nature of their native-language reading skills.

Except for calling attention to its primary function in the teaching of reading, I will not take time on this occasion to discuss diagnostic testing. Suffice it to say that knowing what reading skills to teach, and where to begin, depends largely on the use of adequate diagnostic measures.

The first level to test for is word recognition. Students should recognize many words on sight, be able to "sound out" most new words presented in isolation, be able to identify morphemic and contextual clues to meaning, and be aware of the various meanings a word may have, including figurative meanings.

Although reading aloud is usually recommended for establishing the sound/symbol relation which is beneficial in decoding new words, research has indicated that enough potentially bad side-effects may occur for me to discourage this practice. Listening while looking may be a better way of achieving the same objective. I would suggest providing students deficient in this skill with tape recordings of their reading assignments and supplemental material so that the two receptive language skills (listening and reading) can be correlated. The intonation of the taped native English-speaker will provide additional clues for the syntactic and semantic interpretation of more complex sentences not yet within the students' competence. Listening to inaccurate peer models reading aloud in the classroom

is at least as doubtful in value as reading aloud itself, and it must be remembered that the process of attaching sound to symbol is only a temporary state in learning to read. It should be used by advanced readers only when they encounter a new and difficult word which they cannot decode from the context. Having students read aloud, if done at all, should be seen as a testing device rather than a teaching procedure.

Morphemic clues, listed above as part of word-recognition skills, are those within the form of words which signal part of the meaning. These include plural and possessive suffixes, verb inflections, comparative forms, and derivational affixes. Students first need to identify each as they develop word recognition skills, understand the function of each in context, and then practice for quick recognition of such structural clues. Using flash cards, transparencies, or some other technique which limits the visual image to only a second or two for each sentence, students should learn to distinguish signs of tense, possession, or negation, locate words that tell *how many* or *what kind*, or identify the sentence as a statement, question, or command.

Contextual clues allow good readers to deduce the meaning of unfamiliar words. Too much emphasis can be placed on this skill at beginning and intermediate levels to the detriment of fluency. Unfamiliar words often cause the less advanced reader to come to a screeching halt. Even if told just to guess at new words, most students will look them up if the opportunity arises and write a translation "equivalent" above the line in their text. The unnatural eye movements and bilingual processing then required in subsequent reading of the page should be avoided. All students still having difficulties at the level of word recognition should have the new words in a passage introduced *in advance of reading it*. They can look them up in a dictionary, use them in original sentences, and, if desired, enter each on a 3 x 5 index card to have handy for reference when they need it in reading and for vocabulary review. When the words are encountered in the text at this level, only the structural and semantic context should be new.

In the direction of deducing the meaning of words from context, students should be taught to recognize and interpret such explicit clues as actual definition, explanation, comparison, or contrast in the text. Guessing word meanings from structural and semantic probability should not be required in a foreign language until all words within the understanding of students are easily recognized in print.

A final skill at this level is recognizing figurative meanings as such. I do not suggest trying to teach what all the expressions mean—there are far too many—but just their identification and the understanding that they must be interpreted differently from other words.

The second level to test for is phrase-reading skill, the ability to process meaningful groups of words at a glance instead of word-by-word decipherment. To read at this level of proficiency, students must be able to recognize meaningful grammatical units, predict what will follow from

incomplete linguistic input, and be selective in their perception of what elements are most important to meaning.

Students deficient at the phrase-reading level of reading competence may either perceive only words as meaning-bearing units or they may visually group words in meaningless combinations. It is important for students to recognize the function words which mark sentence elements: noun markers, such as *a, the, any,* and *few*; verb markers, such as *is, have, had*; phrase markers, such as *up, down, below*; clause markers, such as *if, because, when*; and question markers, such as *who, what,* and *why*.⁶ The grammatical analysis of basic sentences will help, at least to the extent of discovering how a particular unit is recognized as the subject, how it relates to the rest of the sentence, and where it occurs in normal sentence order. Other units are perhaps best brought in focus as answers to questions: What did they do? How many did it? Where? When? Such questions should be asked of sentences reflecting normal English word order until students can respond without hesitation. Common inversions should then be added in the question drills, such as sentences with initial adverbial and passive constructions. Needless to say, perhaps, the recognition of these components of relatively simple sentences is an essential prerequisite to processing the complex structures often encountered in written English.

Recognizing meaningful groups of words is a big step in the direction of recognizing redundancies in the language and using them to predict what follows. This is an essential step to fluent reading, but one which some students never take if merely left to their own devices. The recognition of both semantic and syntactic redundancy can be taught.

Intermediate students should be able to use their knowledge of the structure of English to know which words are most important in a sentence. They should recognize punctuation as a clue to meaning and have some idea of what kind of information they can anticipate after a comma, dash, colon, or semicolon. They should recognize such logical indicators as *but, if . . . then,* and *therefore,* and understand how they relate parts of a sentence. Students can best be forced to practice the expectancy task in reading through writing: the instructor can duplicate passages from fairly easy material, leaving a blank space for at least one word in each sentence which has a low information load. Students should fill in the blanks with words they think the original writer would have used. A slightly more difficult task involves completing sentences with appropriate phrases or clauses.

Advanced students additionally profit from techniques traditionally used in beginning courses in composition for native English speakers: as they are reading, have students note only the main ideas; have them note how often they are repeated, recognizing paraphrases; point out the patterns of organization in paragraphs, how the ideas go together. (Handbooks

⁶ Carl A. Lefevre, *Linguistics and the Teaching of Reading*, 1964. McGraw-Hill.

for composition are often good sources for such reading material.) Students should recognize such relationships among sentences as time order, comparison and contrast, enumeration, or cause and effect. They need these skills to decode such sentences as the following, a fairly common type in the DLI Specialized Phase texts: "If the gasoline supply is shut off, there is no gasoline in the charge to ignite and therefore no power event occurs and the engine stops."

This is a point where a contrastive analysis of discourse structure in English and the learner's language would be useful. Many of the rhetorical principles which guide (often quite unconsciously) the structuring of writing in English are not used or are used quite differently in other languages. Since an awareness, again unconscious, of these principles serves to guide our reading like a compass which gives us our bearings, it elevates the redundancy of what is read by increasing the expectancy of what is to come. By making students sensitive to the structure of discourse, especially where it differs from that in their own language, we can help them to gain an overview in this reading and avoid getting bogged down in sentence-by-sentence decoding.

Selectiveness in perception is also an important factor in fluent reading. As in listening, students must learn to recognize the important meaning-carrying elements at a glance and not give each word equal attention.

It is difficult to say whether a slow pace of reading is just symptomatic of word-by-word processing, or whether it also causes it. Besides the fact that a faster pace generally improves comprehension and of course facilitates learning *through* English, it also guarantees that a phrase level of reading must be taking place. Increased speed can be encouraged through flash card techniques which require seeing an entire phrase at a glance, and through regular timed reading exercises followed by comprehension questions. Such drills can be highly frustrating to students not yet able to process phrases as syntactic units, but beneficial to those who have reached this level of competence.

Even most who qualify as advanced students of English as a foreign language have difficulty processing some of the more complex sentence structures which seldom, if ever, occur in speech. (Take, for example, the preceding sentence!) Common problems include ellipsis, complex noun phrases, relative clause and participial modifiers, and cleft and pseudo-cleft inversions.

The first step as instructor is to make sure the previously mentioned skills of word recognition and phrase reading are under control, for the processing of complex syntactic structures requires these as a base. Several different approaches may be taken from that point.

One, from a syntactic perspective, is to work up from simple sentences to the complex structures.⁷ A complex sentence is read from the text, then

⁷ See specific examples in David Eskey, "A New Technique for the Teaching of Reading to Advanced Students," *TESOL Quarterly*, 1970, Vol. 4, No. 4.

one or more simpler sentences with similar meaning are supplied by the instructor. Students are asked to inductively relate the simpler to the more complex with regard to differences in form and meaning. This essentially amounts to paraphrasing a complex sentence in simpler form.

Take this complex sentence as an example: That John was believed by Mary to have been bitten by the dog is not true. It might be paraphrased: It is not true that Mary believed the dog bit John. The differences in meaning which would be noted should include the shift in focus as the word order is changed.

A semantic perspective on instruction would have students tackle complex sentences as combinations of propositions. They would read the sentence, and then say or list the different propositions included in it. This procedure is similar to the identification of *assertions* and *presuppositions* discussed earlier.

The following sentence occurs in an intermediate level DLI reading lesson: "Of course, the weather is quite important to people who work outdoors, such as farmers or house painters." From this semantic point of view, this sentence could be broken down into its basic propositions.

1. The weather is important to some people.
2. It is important to people who work outdoors.
3. Farmers work outdoors.
4. House painters work outdoors.

The initial phrase "of course" means that the writer feels the information which is to follow should not be new to the reader.

Another syntactic approach is to begin with simple sentences and teach students how to combine them in more complex structures. This technique, which was common in the 19th century, is called "sentence synthesis." Students, on encountering complex sentences in texts, should then be better able to break them down into multiple simpler sentences. They would need to recognize different types of transformations in English and be able to reconstruct more basic forms.

An advanced assignment using this technique might call for students to combine the following sentences into a single complex sentence:

1. Proponents are expressing fears in Texas.
2. They are proponents of education.
3. The education is equal.
4. They fear something.
5. The Rodriguez decision may cause something.
6. The legislature would not act on proposals.
7. The proposals would equalize tax burdens throughout the state.
8. The proposals would equalize education throughout the state.
9. The state is big.

The resulting synthesis would be: Proponents of equal education in Texas are expressing fears that the Rodriguez decision may cause the legislature not to act on proposals which would equalize tax burdens and education throughout the big state.

The processing of complex sentences can be guided with questions (Who? What? Where? When? How?), and students should be taught to use this procedure independently.

An inductive contrast between the complex English structure and the student's native language may be additionally helpful at this point in insuring comprehension.

Finally, a pervasive goal of instruction through all levels of reading proficiency is improved comprehension. I would like to offer some specific suggestions in this general area.

1. Provide advance guidelines for reading, including questions to be answered and points to look for.
2. Continually have students use information from their reading in class discussions and written assignments.
3. Test only on important points in the reading, and not on minor details.
4. Encourage students to read extensively at a level which is easy and enjoyable for them.
5. Select reading material which is relevant to students' experiences, interests, and needs.

I have tried to indicate that the audio-lingual method, by focusing so exclusively on the productive aspect of language in the oral mode, has in its own way distorted the emphasis of language teaching as much as did the much-maligned grammar and translation method. Except for the restricted purpose of person-to-person communication, training in oral production to the exclusion of other modes is of limited value. For the person outside an English-speaking environment who wishes to use the language as a tool for acquiring information, fluent reading ability is probably the most important single skill he can acquire. It has been more than a decade since the linguistic and psychological theories on which the audio-lingual method was based were first called into question, and the method itself is now undergoing intensive reassessment. It is my belief that out of this reassessment, which is long overdue, the role of reading will assume a more significant place than it has had in the recent past.

Developing and Evaluating Communication Skills in the Classroom

Rebecca M. Valette

Testing and evaluation are integral parts of the learning process, and foreign language learning is no exception. The tests which are given in the classroom reflect better than any lengthy statement of aims and purposes the true objective of instruction. Where communication is an objective, it must be taught and tested. Yet, there has been confusion in the classroom between the techniques of skill-getting, that is, the acquisition of the elements of language, and the ability to communicate. Instruction and evaluation which are purported to meet the goals of communicative competence are in fact often directed to objectives like pronunciation and spelling, or vocabulary and grammar. Though such work on the elements of language is necessary, so is work on communication skills. To acquire communicative competence students must engage in communication activities including listening comprehension, reading comprehension, and self-expression in speaking and writing. To evaluate communicative competence the teacher must test student ability to communicate in these modes. In such testing, the student must be directed to display his communicative competence, not his acquisition of the elements of language. Many communication activities which are used in teaching can also be used in testing.

In his introduction to the Lackland lectures of 1972 (as they appear in the March issue of the *TESOL Quarterly*), Maurice Imhoof stresses that "all [papers] concern themselves with the creation of a classroom environment in which genuine communication takes place."¹ The two key elements of his statement, namely "classroom environment" and "genuine communication" seem contradictory at first glance. The foreign language classroom is by its nature an artificial environment in which traditionally only artificial communication has taken place. Genuine communication in a foreign language, on the other hand, has generally occurred outside the classroom, and most frequently in the country where the language is spoken. In the language classroom, the evaluation techniques were developed to test the student's control of structure, vocabulary and phonology, and at best to measure his proficiency in artificial communication situations. In the real

Ms. Valette, Professor of Romance Languages and Director of the Language Laboratory at Boston College, specializes in teacher preparation and the teaching of conversation courses. Her books include *Modern Language Testing* (Harcourt, Brace and World, 1967), *Modern Language Performance Objectives and Individualization* (Harcourt, Brace and Jovanovich, 1972) and *Modern Language Classroom Techniques* (with Edward D. Allen; Harcourt, Brace and Jovanovich, 1972). She is currently a board member of the Northeast Conference. She received a Fulbright Senior Lectureship for Freiburg Germany (Department of English) Pädagogische Hochschule for 1973-74.

¹ Maurice Imhoof, 1973. "Foreword," *TESOL Quarterly* 7:1, 2.

out-of-the-room environment, where the student was engaged in genuine communication, he himself was usually the only one evaluating his ability to understand and to express himself in the new languages. "Yes, I can understand that sportscaster." Or "No, I only get about half of what he is saying." Often we hear adults say: "I had three years of Spanish in school but never learned to speak it." What they are saying is that although they received respectable grades for their classroom performances, these grades, at best, reflected artificial communication activities. Genuine communication was either totally lacking in the curriculum or so lightly touched on as to seem nonexistent in retrospect. In any case it was probably not at all tested.

This brings us to a key aspect of the classroom environment, namely formal evaluation. In the classroom this evaluation is carried out directly by the teacher or indirectly by some measuring device ranging from the formal standardized test to the built-in steps of a programmed course. The nature of this evaluation, that is, the content of the tests and the method in which grades are assigned, reflects more accurately than any lengthy statement of aims and purposes, the real objectives of instruction. The way in which the tests are administered, the manner in which test results are used and interpreted, and the basis on which grades or evaluations are prepared, in short, the evaluation technique, sets the tone for the foreign language class. In this paper I should like to suggest some means for developing and evaluating the communication skills in the classroom.

All of us know what is meant by communication in a foreign language, namely, the ability to understand what one hears or reads, and the ability to express oneself in speaking and writing. The problem over the centuries has been *how* to inculcate in students this ability to communicate in a second language, given the constraints of a classroom environment and, most often, a classroom which was not located in the country where the language was spoken. The big fallacy has been the conviction of many language teachers that the student by mastering the elements of language (patterns, words, phonemes) would eventually acquire skill in communication. Some students did indeed make the jump, either because they were "natural" learners, or because they had the opportunity to visit or reside in the country where the language was used. Most did not.

Let me draw a quick analogy between language learning and the act of skiing. We were in the French Alps last year, within easy driving distance of the ski resorts. Thanks to much reading, I could easily explain how to do various turns and could pick out those skiers who did them well. It was quite another thing when I myself was coming down the slope. My natural reflexes were not those of a skier and in the tricky situations, for example when I was accelerating faster than I wanted to, I would do all the wrong things, even though in my mind I could have explained what all the right things were. When faced with a free conversation or a free composition, our language students are frequently in the same position that I found myself in on the slope. They are accelerating, that is they know

what they want to say or write and are in a hurry to express themselves, and they come out with constructions that reflect their native language, rather than the language they are trying to use. These students are usually able afterwards to point out many of their mistakes. What they need is not remedial grammar review but rather additional opportunities for free expression, just as my skiing would improve if I spent more time on the slopes. Of course, there are times when the students cannot remedy the errors without the help of the teacher, just as the novice skier benefits from the advice of the instructor. But on the whole, one learns to communicate in a foreign language by communicating, to state the obvious fact.

The nature of second language learning has long intrigued the theoreticians. Simon Belasco, for example, divides the language learning process into three stages: pre-nucleation, post-nucleation and mastery.² In the first phase, that of pre-nucleation, the student acquires elements of language: the sound structure, the syntactic structure and the sandhi variations. When the student can systematize these elements, that is, when he can create and understand sentences built of these elements, he has reached the stage of nucleation. In the post-nucleation stage he gradually develops the communication skills, hopefully arriving at the level of language mastery.

Wilga Rivers, in her 1971 Lackland lecture, presented a model of the essential processes in language teaching which contains two major stages: skill-getting (subdivided into cognition and production or pseudo-communication) and skill-using.³ The cognition refers to the knowledge of units, categories and functions in the areas of phonology, structure and lexicon, whereas the production of pseudo-communication stage refers to the student manipulation of the language via learning sequences such as drills, exercises and other guided activities. At the level of skill-using the student is motivated to communicate, that is, he is acting as an autonomous individual interacting with other individuals.

In several of my writings, I have been developing a taxonomy of language learning objectives adapted from the Bloom taxonomies.⁴ The first three stages are Mechanical Skills, Knowledge, and Transfer. Mechanical Skills refer to phonology and spelling. Knowledge subsumes the learning of vocabulary, sentence patterns, grammatical rules. Transfer is the stage at which the student manipulates these "bite and pieces" of language in new ways, under the guidance of the teacher of the learning materials. The

² Simon Belasco. 1965. "Nucleation and the audio-lingual approach," *Modern Language Journal* XLIX: 8, 482-91.

³ Wilga M. Rivers, 1972. "Talking off the tops of their heads," *TESOL Quarterly* 6:1, 71-61. Also reprinted in Rivers, *Speaking in Many Tongues: Essays in Foreign-Language Teaching*. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House, 1972.

⁴ For the most recent taxonomy see Rebecca M. Valette and Rence S. Discick, 1972. *Modern Language Performance Objectives and Individualization: A Handbook*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, chapter 2.

fourth stage is Communication in which the student actually uses the language to express himself and to understand things said and written in that language.

If you compare these three models, you will notice that Belasco's prenucleation phase may be equated with Rivers' skill-getting activities and with my first three taxonomical stages: Mechanical Skills, Knowledge and Transfer. And just as Belasco points out the need of developing courses at the post-nucleation level which stress audio-comprehension and reading which in turn lead towards proficiency in speaking and writing,⁵ so Rivers in her second Lackland lecture stresses classroom activities which would lead the students from pseudo-communication to communicative competence.⁶ I, too, in my book, *Modern Language Performance Objectives and Individualization*, insist that teachers set communication goals for their classes, rather than focusing uniquely on goals in the Taxonomic stages of Mechanical Skills, Knowledge and Transfer. (See Figure 1.)

Three Models of Language Acquisition

Belasco	Rivers		Valette
Pre-nucleation	Skill-Getting:	Cognition	I. Mechanical Skills II. Knowledge
nucleation		Production (Pseudo-Communication)	III. Transfer
post-nucleation	Skill-Using:	Interaction	IV. Communication
mastery			

FIGURE 1

You may wonder why, if such unanimity of purpose exists among certain foreign language theoreticians, a problem exists. Most teachers, if asked whether they were teaching vocabulary, pronunciation, grammar or communication skills, would invariably answer that they were teaching communication. But are they?

One problem here is that of semantics: the expression "communication

⁵ Simon Belasco, 1967. "The Plateau; or the case for comprehension: the 'Concept' Approach," *Modern Language Journal* LI: 2, pp. 82-88.

⁶ Wilga M. Rivers, 1973. "From linguistic competence to communicative competence," *TESOL Quarterly* 7:1, pp. 25-34.

skills” has lost its original meaning. This occurrence can be traced back to the 1960s when the proponents of the audio-lingual approach stressed the need for teaching four skills: listening, speaking, reading and writing. They were, I believe, correct in their emphasis. But what happened was that teachers began to equate the perception of phonemic differences with listening, the recitation of dialogs with speaking, the deciphering of printed characters and the mastery of sound-symbol correspondences with reading, and prepared dictations and written drills with writing. In other words, skill-getting techniques were confused with the ability to use skills. The mode by which the elements of language were mastered—receptively through hearing and seeing the printed word; productively through vocalizing and copying or putting these elements on paper—was not distinguished from communicative competence or the ability to use the foreign language for interaction.

As I mentioned earlier, the best way of verifying what goes on in a classroom is to look at the testing system used by the teachers. The purpose of the taxonomy of objectives which I briefly sketched for you is to enable the teacher to analyze the types of items he used on his tests. Our standard tests, by their very nature, measure almost uniquely activities in the areas of Mechanical Skills, Knowledge and Transfer. This is because test items in which there is one correct predictable answer are mainly measures of phonology, vocabulary and structure. Certain listening and reading comprehension tests do measure the student’s ability to understand authentic materials, but all too often the items based on these passages show a heavy vocabulary bias, that is, the student who knows the meaning of a specific word will answer the item correctly, whereas the student who does not, cannot from the context discover the meaning of that word. Since free speaking and free writing tests cannot be scored with 100% reliability, they usually do not figure on standard tests.

Our classroom tests reveal similar preoccupations: we check the students pronunciation and spelling, we give vocabulary and grammar quizzes of various sorts. What happens to communication? All too often it is paid mere lip service: what really “counts” is student performance on tests in the areas of “pre-nucleation” or “skill-getting.”

There seem to be two interrelated explanations why students who study a foreign language in the classroom environment generally fail to reach the goal of “genuine communication” which Imhoof so heavily stressed. The first is that teachers do not teach it and the second is that teachers do not test it. And the reason most teachers do not teach or test communication is that they do not know how to do it. Some of them never really learned how to communicate themselves. And those who do feel comfortable with the language they teach, generally acquired this communication by residing in the country where that language is spoken, or else speak it natively. I am convinced that most teachers tend to teach the way they themselves were taught, and hence it is not at all surprising that since the teachers were never

formally taught communication skills in the classroom, they themselves are poorly equipped to do so now.

What I propose to do today, is to make some specific suggestions about how to teach and test communication skills. Although my official topic is evaluation, one can hardly speak meaningfully about the classroom testing of communication skills without touching on the matter of teaching techniques. The form which the skills tests take are self-evident: to test whether a student can talk in a foreign language, you have him talk. To test whether he can understand a newscast, you play a newscast for him. To test whether he can read a newspaper article, you, give him a newspaper article. What is tricky is bringing him to the point where he can indeed perform, and then evaluating the quality of his performance. Actually, these two things often go together.

First let me go back to an experience of my own. Several years ago I was assigned a class in a multi-section course entitled "Composition and Conversation." Our basic materials were an audio-lingual review grammar and a reader. The trouble with the review grammar was that it focused on the complexities of the language, whereas many of my students were unsure of the basics. But the oral drills were lively and the class responded well. The reader contained stories so abstract that most students would have had trouble understanding them in their native language, and most of our "conversation" consisted of my asking factual questions and the students answering them to the best of their ability. At the end of the semester I gave a "speaking" test. Each student stood in front of the class and gave a prepared talk—without notes—about a topic of his choice. I have not forgotten the ensuing scene, which, with a couple or rare exceptions, went like this: The "victim" stood at the front of the room, head bowed, and rapidly muttered his talk. I patiently strained my ears to try to grasp what he was saying and judge its grammaticality. No one else was paying attention. Why should they have? The "talks" were quite incomprehensible, for the students were not trying to communicate. Those who had already spoken were bored. Those whose turn was approaching were nervous. I realized then that these students were *unable* to communicate in the foreign language, but also that the failure was mine for I had not taught them that skill. The course emphasis had been on pre-nucleation aspects of learning, on skill-getting and not skill-using, on mechanical skills, acquisition of knowledge and transfer activities in the forms of drills and exercises. Genuine communication was neither taught, nor tested.

Performance on the "composition" part of the examination, though less trying on the students from a psychological point of view, was equally lamentable. But here, too, I was to blame, for we surely had not concentrated on written self-expression in the class either. In fact, I had fallen into a rather common trap which consists of spending classtime in teacher directed question-answer activities, assigning some written exercises and drills for homework, and then expecting, quite naively, that the skill of

writing paragraphs or essays has mysteriously entered the students' heads so that they can produce effectively a short composition on a final examination.

As for the skills of reading and listening, I am sure my students could hardly do either. Not only did I not train them how to read material or how to understand the spoken language (aside from having them plow laboriously through the aforementioned stories and listen to my statements or the models on the exercise tapes in the laboratory), but I never tested it.

Let me share with you now some of my subsequent experiences in teaching and testing communication.⁷

Speaking. It is self-evident that if the teacher wants the students to learn to speak another language, he must give them the opportunity to do so and must motivate them so that they will indeed wish to do so. This means that the teacher must learn to listen and must devise a variety of small-group activities for the students. If you have 24 students and a period of 50 minutes and if, as a teacher, you ask questions and the students respond, then you are talking half of the time (or more, if you elaborate on your questions, which most teachers are wont to do). At best, the students have 25 minutes to talk, which averages out to one minute per student. This you will readily admit is not very much. However, if you divide your class into groups of four students, then each student will have an average of ten minutes to talk, and moreover he will be actively listening for the rest of the time, since in a group of four people he cannot very well let his mind wander. As a teacher, you move from group to group, listening in, occasionally answering questions, and taking notes on the kind of mistakes the students are making. If you then use ten minutes at the end of the period to go over some of these errors, the students will be receptive, for you are treating precisely those aspects of phonology, vocabulary and syntax which were troubling them.

The speaking activities must of course be structured, especially at first when students feel quite hesitant about expressing themselves orally. With my more advanced classes, the point of departure is usually a provocative essay. The outside preparation consists of two parts. First the student must write down three new words or expressions, define them in the foreign language (preferably with the help of a dictionary), and use each in an original sentence. This is to encourage him to build his personal vocabulary. Second, he prepares two or three questions based on the reading. When we first begin this type of activity, I have the entire class move their chairs into a circle. Then I have one student read a question. He is directed to ask this question of someone in the class. That person at first usually responds with "Could you please repeat the question?" When all those who want to re-

⁷ See also Rebecca M. Valette, 1967. *Modern Language Testing: A Handbook*. New York: Harcourt Brace & World; and Edward D. Allen and Rebecca M. Valette, 1972. *Modern Language Classroom Techniques: A Handbook*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich.

spend to the questions have, another student is called on to ask the following question. During this full-class activity, the students review the interrogative forms, and also learn that opinion questions are much more likely to arouse reactions than simple factual questions. As the teacher, I do not correct mistakes, since I do not want to inhibit their responses. Nor do I answer their questions about "How do you say this or that?" but rather have them ask a classmate for help or work out a paraphrase in the foreign language. After two or three class periods, I find that I can break up the class into small groups and that each group can easily maintain a discussion for half an hour. Students also feel freer in the small groups and are less hesitant about expressing themselves than they were before a large group. At the end of the term the student's ability to discuss a prepared text is tested in an interview session. His performance is rated on a scale of 1 to 5 in areas such as comprehensibility, ability to respond to questions, and fluency, as well as appropriateness of vocabulary, accuracy in use of structure, and pronunciation.

In the conversation class, the self-expression activities are not solely limited to small group discussion of texts. We also engage in full-class debates, impromptu skits based on listening materials heard in the lab, round-robin activities in which one group prepares a question which the next group has to answer, etc.

During the term, the students are graded on the regularity of their classroom preparation and their degree of participation in conversation activities. By placing the emphasis on communication rather than accuracy, I find the students are more motivated to speak. The ensuing increase in amount of speaking usually leads of itself to a higher degree of accuracy in expression.

In addition to communication activities, it is necessary that the course include means of improving the student's command of the elements of the language (skill-getting activities).

a. Pronunciation. The students work on their own with laboratory tapes. As a test, they record fifteen sentences. I listen to each recording and grade it as follows: Two or fewer pronunciation mistakes on the entire group of sentences: A; three or more mistakes: F. The students retake the test until they pass it. Since all students are given the opportunity of attaining an A, there is a certain motivation to retake the test until they can pronounce the sentences accurately. While there is not necessarily an immediate carry-over into the conversation activities (that is, students can correct a pronunciation problem on the tape while they are concentrating on it, but will make the same mistakes once more in a free conversation where their attention is on what they are saying rather than how they are saying it), the students do all realize that by the end of the course they indeed control the phonology of the language they are learning.

b. Verb forms. Although all of my French students know that a singular subject takes a singular verb and a plural subject takes a plural verb, many

tend to use a singular verb with a plural subject. For regular *-er* verbs, the singular and plural forms generally sound the same, but for most other verbs there is a difference in pronunciation. I have discovered that many students do not "hear" the difference between singular and plural forms, and hence do not make the distinctions when they speak. Here again, their effort is concentrated on the content of the message they are trying to get across, and not on its form. As an exercise, I frequently read lists of sentences which the students must identify as being singular or plural. This type of selective listening can easily be tested in the same way it is taught. Retest opportunities should be made available to the students.

c. Vocabulary. Vocabulary building activities grow out of the readings and the discussion topics. Since the words selected are immediately used in conversation, the students tend to retain them. Vocabulary growth can be tested in a traditional way, again allowing students to take tests over to improve their grades.

d. Grammatical patterns. During the speaking activities, I, as the teacher, note those structures which prove difficult. If the problem is generalized, I present the structure to the full class. If only certain students have difficulty with a structure, I have those students review it outside of class, or I take them aside. A good deal of structure review takes place as a result of the student's written preparation for class. In addition, my students are assigned pattern-type grammar exercises in the laboratory. Several times during the term, I give oral grammar tests based on these recorded exercises. The quizzes consist of four vocabulary words to be defined and four items from the exercises. If the student defines a word correctly, he receives 2 points. If he defines that word incorrectly but can give the right meaning on the second try, he gets 1 point. If he fails the second time, he receives 0. For each drill item, I read the model and then the cue sentence. If the student answers correctly, he gets 4 points. If he gets the grammatical transformation right, but makes some minor error, or hesitates a great deal, he gets 3 points. If he gives the wrong response, and can correct it easily, he receives 2 points. If he corrects his error but makes some minor mistake or hesitates a great deal, he receives 1 point. If he does not produce the right answer on the second try, he gets 0. The maximum score for each quiz is 24 points. Grades are awarded as follows: 22 to 24 points, A; 20-21 points, B; 17-19 points, C; 15-16 points, D; 14 or below, F. The student may take the test over to improve his grade.

You will have noted that the tests and activities in the conversation class I have been describing are of two sorts: those at the taxonomical stage of communication, which corresponds to Rivers' skill-using level, and those at the lower taxonomical stages which correspond to the skill-getting level.

For the communication activities, the main concerns are developing student motivation to speak and increasing fluency and ease of expression. Immediate correction of errors is avoided for it might inhibit student desire to speak. Student performance is simply evaluated in terms of participation and general comprehensibility.

For the activities which focus on the improvement of pronunciation, the development of vocabulary and the accuracy of structure, the teacher's concern is to improve the student's command of the elements of the language. The traditional testing and grading system in which a test is given only once and students are graded A, B, C, etc. tends to favor those students with a good grammar background. The students who most need the help, that is, those with a weak background, are discouraged, because they quickly realize that even if they work very hard, the better students with hardly any studying will get the good grades. A test-retest system in which several retests are available and in which only the student's highest grade is recorded encourages all students to study seriously. An A or B is within reach of everyone who is willing to expend the effort. I have found, in fact, that although I have raised my standards for honor marks, the students attain these grades in greater numbers because now the system rewards their efforts.

Writing. In many ways, the teaching and testing of the written skill and of the speaking skill are similar. In order to teach written self-expression, the majority of the classroom time should be spent on the writing and analysis of paragraphs and essays, while development of vocabulary and the mastery of structure and spelling should be relegated outside the regular classroom via programmed materials, review grammars, self-correcting workbooks, and the like. Specific or lexical problems which come up in the context of a particular writing activity can, of course, be treated in the classroom. The testing of spelling, vocabulary and structure can be carried out with short quizzes given on a test-retest basis: this approach parallels that described with respect to speaking. Most teachers have a variety of means of testing these aspects of language learning. Standard tests, teaching programs and handbooks abound in examples of item types.

Let us concentrate on the communication aspect of writing. As was the case in the teaching of speaking, there are two features which must be kept in mind. First, the student must be motivated to wish to express himself in writing. Second, he needs sufficient practice in written self-expression. Traditionally, teachers have killed off student motivation by using red pencil to mark every minor spelling error. The emphasis on form took all attention away from the content of the writing. Students also quickly learned that simple but accurate sentences were more acceptable than more complex sentences into which some errors might creep. In other words, creativity was usually stifled. The writing skill has further suffered from lack of training. Now it is obvious to any practicing teacher that if thirty students write essays every day, this represents many hours per night spent in correcting them. Furthermore, if a teacher has four or five classes of thirty students each, the ensuing preparation time is overwhelming. What might the teacher do to improve the writing skill of his students, while at the same time preserving his sanity?

One way of giving students opportunity to write a great deal and yet to reduce the correcting time is to assign group compositions. If twenty-five students each write for half an hour, they produce twenty-five rather long compositions. But if these students work in groups of five, they produce only five compositions. (Each student, however, writes out his own copy, so that all group members are directly involved in the activity.) The first advantage is that the class produces only one-fifth the number of papers. Secondly, it usually happens that what one student has forgotten, another student still remembers: hence the resulting group composition will be more accurate than a composition written by any of its members individually. Third, since the teacher moves around the class during the writing, he answers some questions and corrects some faulty structures before they are written down in the final draft. Fourth, since students discuss each sentence before writing it, within a thirty-minute period they will write less than an individual working alone would have produced. Finally, the students will have been talking to each other in the foreign language: an added bonus in the area of oral expression. At the end of the hour, each group could write its composition on a ditto master. At the next class meeting, each student would receive the five compositions produced by the class. These could then be evaluated by the students themselves. Since no individual's work is being dissected (group work breeds anonymity) the students do not fear being critical and objective in expressing their opinions. The class might be asked to rank the compositions in order of preference. Next, the students would be asked to describe which qualities they think characterize a good composition. The class might come up with categories such as: organization, good opening sentence, appropriate use of vocabulary, original imagery, etc. Once this list of characteristics has been established (and is written on the board or on an overhead transparency), the class looks over each composition once more and rates it on the scale. Let us suppose that for each category 5 points means very good, 3 points average, and 1 point poor. After this evaluation, the total points for each composition are tallied. Hopefully, the composition rated "best" by the class has the highest number of points, while the poorest composition has the lowest number. If this is indeed the case, then the rating scale has been unofficially "validated." If not, the class might discuss whether they wish to modify their original ranking or whether they feel that some important characteristics have been omitted from their rating scale. Maybe they think that some characteristics on their scale are more important than others and they would like to assign them twice or three times the number of points: for example, 15 points for very good; 9 points for average, and 3 points for poor. By the end of the period, the class will have worked out an acceptable rating grid.

At a later date, when an actual writing test is given, the teacher could use the rating scale established by the class to grade the papers. This technique is of motivational value for several reasons. The students find the

system to be more objective, and hence fairer, since they have participated in its design and modification. Secondly, each student knows on which basis his essay will be graded and can try to improve it along specified guidelines.

As in the case of speaking activities, not all written work must be graded. Much benefit is derived from the practice of writing. One technique is to have the students keep a daily logbook. They would be graded simply on the regularity of the entries or perhaps, if necessary, on the variety of structures and sentence types used. This latter restriction will encourage students to write more than simply "Nothing happened today."

Another technique is to have students, either singly or in pairs, compose their own answers to "Dear Abby" or similar requests for advice. This type of activity could be combined with conversation practice in which each group reads its answers aloud to the others.

Another combined writing-speaking activity consists in the preparation of short skits. Students in pairs or in groups of three or four prepare a script of two pages or so. For example, they may prepare a commercial for an imaginary product or a travelogue designed to induce the listener to visit an area where the language is spoken. The teacher circulates to help groups with their projects. At the end, each group can give its skit in front of the class. If facilities permit, the skits may be videotaped. In the latter case, a special script must be prepared with the text in one column and the directions to the camera crew in a facing column. Once each group has videotaped their presentation, the entire class sees the composite videotape. As an additional writing project, the tape may be viewed a second time during which each student takes notes. These notes are then written up in the form of short resumés for the next class meeting.

The creative teacher can think up a variety of writing projects at the level of communication. In writing, as in speaking, the main aim of instruction is to create an open environment where students feel free to express themselves. Grades would be given for participation and creative use of language.

Listening. Of the four communication skills, that of listening comprehension is probably least taught in the classroom and least tested. Although a certain amount of time is devoted to skill-getting activities, such as sound discrimination, (mechanical skills), oral vocabulary and structure drills (knowledge), and listening to the teacher and classmates using the known forms in new combinations (transfer), very little time is spent training the students to understand the language as it is spoken in the "real world." Of course, in small group conversation activities, the students do pay attention to what their classmates are saying, and this is, in a sense, the first step in listening comprehension. But we usually do not teach them how to understand foreign language radio programs, television shows, films, lectures, rapid conversations among speakers of the language. We almost never give classroom tests of listening comprehension, although the wide availability

of tapes, videotapes and films would make it easy to do so. In fact, listening comprehension seems to be the one communication skill that teachers feel is best taught in the foreign environment and has no place in the classroom. The native teacher of the foreign language has been brought up to believe that reading and writing are the important skills and tends to slight listening comprehension. The nonnative teacher of the language has perhaps not acquired a high level of listening comprehension himself and feels uneasy in front of a rapid flow of language.

The teaching of listening comprehension and the testing of that skill are closely linked. Listening comprehension is an activity which takes place within the head of the student. In order to determine whether the student has understood what he has heard, the teacher must resort to indirect evaluation: questions on what has been heard (true-false items, multiple-choice questions, open-ended questions), oral or written resumés by the student, native language equivalents, or written transcriptions. The type of techniques used will, of course, vary depending on the aims of the teacher and the level of the class.

It seems to be at the beginning levels of language learning that listening comprehension activities are most needed, and usually omitted. altogether. If students are only presented with slow, carefully enunciated forms of the foreign language, they feel completely lost when they later come into contact with normal speech. They do not know how to cope with the rapid flow of unfamiliar language. In our beginning classes we can let students spend a few minutes each period hearing language they do not entirely understand. At first, the teacher might relate incidents that happened to him or narrate a story using pictures. (It is often possible to find a folk tale that is common to the student's native language and retell it in the foreign language.) Newscasts of current events may be introduced early in the course. At first students will only grasp a few words, but gradually their comprehension will increase. Newscasts may also be assigned as listening comprehension work in the language laboratory.

At the intermediate level, students may listen to radio plays or dramatizations, for which no script is made available. This semester at Boston College in our French conversation classes we used a James-Bond type dramatization in 24 episodes entitled *Suivez la Piste*.⁸ The students listened to the series in the laboratory as homework and answered true-false questions on each episode in their notebooks. False statements had to be rectified. As a follow-up speaking activity, we occasionally did impromptu skits in class based on the episodes they had been listening to. Sometimes the student gave oral resumés! The final episode of the series can be considered at test, and the students graded on their performance in the recorded true-false test. As a more precise comprehension check, the teacher can play portions

⁸ Distributed by EMC Corporation, 180 East 6th Street, St. Paul, Minnesota 55101. Produced by British Broadcasting Corporation.

of the tape in class, stopping it after each sentence, and asking students to give a rapid native-language equivalent. This type of activity forces students to listen more carefully to exactly what is being said. When the students are trying to get the gist of the recording, they first listen for the content words: the nouns, verbs, adjectives. When forced to provide native-language equivalents, the students must pay attention to structural markers: Was the subject singular or plural? Did the action take place in the present or the past? etc. As a testing device, students may be asked to write down the native-language equivalent, or to choose the best among three possible native-language equivalents in a multiple-choice format.

The most demanding type of listening-comprehension activity is that of written transcriptions.⁹The recordings can be radio broadcasts, speeches, recorded conversations, or the sound tracks of films or television programs. The student works independently with a tape or a cassette at a machine which allows him to stop and replay segments he wants to hear again. As out-of-class preparation, he writes down in the foreign language exactly what he hears. In class, each student puts a different sentence on the board and the period is spent having the students themselves correct the text as best they can. The lexical, phonological and syntactical problems of the text are discussed. The students do many of these transcriptions during the course, and thereby prepare themselves for the test which is an unfamiliar transcription. I usually let the students do the test transcriptions over the period of a week and allow them to use whatever reference books they wish to. The only restriction is that they not talk to each other about their work.

There are many possible variations on the transcription technique. For example, the teacher may distribute a list of difficult words and expressions which occur in the text. The teacher may prepare two or three forms of the transcriptions for students of varying abilities: the best student must write the entire transcription. The average student receives a ditto sheet in which some of the key expressions are listed in the order in which they occur. The weaker students may be given a partial text in which they fill in the blanks.

Our language laboratory permits two sets of headphones to be jacked into each cassette recorder. This means that those students who so desire can prepare the transcription in pairs. In a recent article, Paul Carstens describes a technique for group transcriptions.¹⁰Five or six students listen to the same tape via headphones and a jack box. On each sentence they must come to a complete consensus before each person writes it out and are only allowed to speak the foreign language during this activity. In arriving at a consensus, group dynamics play an important role. As the case for group speaking activities described earlier, grades, if they must be as-

⁹ See Belasco, "The Plateau . . ." pp. 87-88.

¹⁰ Paul Carstens, 1973. "Small-group listening-transcription: path to a new dimension in foreign language learning?", *American Foreign Language Teacher* 3:3, 32-33.

signed, should be awarded on the basis of participation as well as on the accuracy of the resulting transcription.

Reading. There is a great deal of literature available on the teaching of the reading skill, and the field is much too vast for me to presume to review it in a few minutes. The standard tests in foreign languages all contain reading selections of the following general format: an unfamiliar reading followed by multiple-choice comprehension questions. Although some of these tests suffer from a vocabulary bias, that is, although many of these tests have a high proportion of items which measure whether or not the student knows a specific word or expression, it is none the less true that many items test general comprehension, and inference techniques.

Our concern here is how the teacher can best test reading in the classroom. As was the case with listening, reading comprehension is also an activity which takes place within the head of the students and which the teacher measures indirectly through questions, resumés, and translations. Yet while all teachers know how to read with some degree of fluency, and although they all know what forms reading tests can take, very few teachers actually give reading tests in class. Generally the teacher gives a written test of some sort (questions, resumés, interpretations) *based* on a prior reading selection which has been read and discussed in class. Although reading has occurred in preparation for the test, the skill of reading is not measured in such a test. Rather, the student demonstrates his ability to retain facts and to organize them appropriately.

To measure how well a student can *read* a foreign language, we must give him an unfamiliar passage as part of the test. It is most appropriate if this passage is similar in style and content to material he has been reading in class. For example, if students of English have been reading articles in *Time* magazine, then the reading on the test should be a new article from an unfamiliar issue of *Time*. Comprehension can be checked with short-answer questions. Before closing, let me briefly describe one way of preparing students for standard reading tests by using the sample materials which appear in the books designed to prepare students for such tests. The reading passage and its items are put on three overhead transparencies. The first contains the reading passage. The second contains the stem or the opening line of the test items. The third contains the four multiple-choice options. The three transparencies are prepared so that if placed one on top of the other they reconstitute the reading test as it appears in the book. These transparencies are used as follows. First the students are shown only the passage. The teacher asks questions about the difficult expressions, the general theme, and the information contained in the reading. Then he puts the second transparency on the overhead, so that the students can see the passage and the stems of the questions. Students offer completions and responses to these stems. Finally the multiple-choice options are placed on the overhead projector, and the students determine which option is the most appropriate choice. Through this type of classroom practice, the

students learn how to read a passage, how to infer meanings of words from context, and how to determine the appropriate answers to reading comprehension questions.

Developing genuine communication skills within the constraints of the classroom environment is the foremost challenge to the language teacher. The elements of language, the phonology, the lexicon and the structures, can be acquired from books, tapes, programmed materials and the like. But their acquisition does not automatically lead to communicative competence. Communication must be nurtured and taught. By stressing listening comprehension, reading comprehension, and self-expression via speaking and writing, and by evaluating student progress in these skills, the teacher will strengthen his language program while satisfying the needs of his students.

Postscript. After the Lackland lecture one particular question was asked which deserves a reply here.

Question: If you test communicative competence by having the students actually engage in a conversation or write an essay, the scoring is not 100% reliable because there is always an element of scorer subjectivity. Furthermore, such evaluation methods require a great deal of scorer time and are impractical with large numbers of students. Are there any more objective and more economical ways of measuring student ability to communicate?

Answer: First, let me clarify one point. In my talk I was stressing the development and evaluation of communication skills in the classroom, and was not concerned with large-scale testing techniques for screening hundreds of students. The methods I have suggested are quite feasible with classes of, let us say, thirty students. Moreover, in the classroom the motivating factor provided by communication tests far outweighs the lower reliability of the scoring. (And since only the teacher is doing the scoring, the reliability is still much higher than it would be on a large-scale test where several scorers are involved.)

What about large-scale testing? Since a test of self-expression will elicit different responses from different individuals, it is impossible to cast such a test into the mold of totally objective format. What testers have been experimenting with over the years has been the development of indirect measures of communicative skills. Briefly, the technique is the following: A short objective language test is developed. This test is then administered to candidates who are also given more complete test which often includes a self-expression component that is longer and more expensive to score. If the results on the short objective test correlate highly with the scores on the longer test, one may conclude that the shorter test would be just as valid an instrument as the longer test, and would be much more economical to administer.

In one experiment, performance on a short dictation correlated highly

with performance on a three-hour language test. Rate of delivery has been shown to correlate highly with general speaking ability. Length of sentences has been found to correlate highly with writing ability.¹¹

Can one conclude, then, that the longer language test could be abandoned in favor of the more economical dictation? Can we score speaking tests simply by listening to them with a stopwatch in hand? Can we evaluate written compositions merely by averaging out the number of words per sentence? Unfortunately not, for if the students become aware of the "system," the short test loses much of its validity. It has been shown that students who work on dictation will improve their dictation scores without showing a commensurate improvement in overall language skills. It is easy to imagine that a student who knows that his speaking test is being scored only on the rate of delivery will force himself to speak more quickly and to forget about accuracy. Similarly, the student writing a composition will tend to concoct long sentences without worrying about appropriateness of vocabulary or grammar.

The ECL test* is one such indirect measure of general student ability in English. As a written multiple-choice objective test it is easy to administer and reliable to score. With dozens of alternate forms, the test maintains a high security. The ECL test was designed as a predictor of future success in specialized military training, and as such it has been highly effective. As new forms are prepared, the items are pretested and statistically equated with existing items.

Raw scores on the various forms of the test are translated into standard scores on 0-100 scale. Hence a score of 65 on one form of the test is the equivalent of a score of 65 on another form of the test, even though students taking the two forms might not have exactly the same raw score.

The items on the ECL test measure vocabulary and grammar, with by far the greatest emphasis placed on the former. Hence, a student who crams vocabulary for a few weeks, will be able to raise his ECL score higher than another student who spends the same amount of time developing overall ability in English communicative skills. But whereas the ECL score of the second student will probably be a rather accurate predictor of that student's success in further training, the first student will have a deceptively high score and will be less well prepared than his test performance would indicate. In other words, as long as the English classes at Lackland and in military establishments around the world stress the acquisition of all language skills, the ECL should remain a reliable predictive instrument.

¹¹ For more details on the experiments mentioned and other experiments of this nature, see Rebecca M. Valette, 1969. *Directions in Foreign Language Testing*. New York: MLA/ERIC. Available from MLA Publications Center, 62 Fifth Avenue, New York City 10011. Publication number: D300.

* English Comprehension Level examination, used at the Defense Language Institute, English Language Branch. *Ed.*)

It should also be noted in closing that the ECL was developed to measure the competence of beginning and intermediate students. It was not designed to evaluate the progress of the more advanced students. Thus, although a certain ECL score might be the prerequisite for *entrance* into the English Teacher Training program, further language proficiency tests should be developed to measure these students' progress in English once they are enrolled in that program.

The Application of Linguistics to TESOL: Once More

Betty Wallace Robinett

Strong pleas have been made for the application of linguistics to teaching English to speakers of other languages; this paper supports this point of view but with the stipulation that it be a broadly based, flexible approach, not necessarily following one stated theory. Examples are given of insights into English grammar from such diverse points of view as those held by Jespersen, Fillmore, Gleason, and others, none of which seems to be found in ESL textbooks to date. Some of the grammatical items discussed are the common sex pronoun *they*; sentences such as *The potatoes are cooking* and *Mother is cooking*; the negative of modals; the count or non-count usage of nouns; and contrastive points of view with *bring-take*, *lend-borrow*, and *sell-buy*. Many of the items involve some form of situational or contextual ambiguity which can be resolved through the introduction of presupposition into their interpretation. Thus, the conclusion is reached that the pedagogical emphasis on the use of context in teaching ESL is often necessitated by the actual language item itself.

There is today an ambivalent attitude toward the application of linguistics to second language teaching. The skepticism expressed by Chomsky in his famous statement at the Northeast Conference on The Teaching of Foreign Languages (1966) "about the significance, for teaching languages, of such insights and understanding as have been attained in linguistics and psychology" and by John T. Lamendela in an article (1969), whose title bespeaks the attitude within—"The Irrelevance of Transformational Grammar to Second Language Pedagogy"—has been tempered somewhat by cautious but optimistic statements on the part of Dwight Bolinger (1972), David DeCamp (1968), and Charles Fillmore (1973), among others. For those who are more positive than negative in their attitude toward the application of linguistics, Bolinger cautions:

It is sobering to remember that human beings are capable of learning a second language with no formal guidance whatever, and linguistics is as capable of being dispensed with as anything else if it cannot make a reasonable bid for attention.

In this paper I shall discuss the linguistic analysis of several aspects of English grammar which were included in a class required of majors in the M.A. Program in English as a Second Language at our institution. The purpose of this class, *The Linguistic Description of Modern English*, is to study fairly thoroughly those aspects of English grammar which have to be taught in classes in ESL. One of the major thrusts of the class is to pro-

Ms. Robinett, Professor of Linguistics and Director of the Program in English as a Second Language at the University of Minnesota, most recently has had published "The Domains of TESOL," in the *TESOL Quarterly*, and *Manual of American English Pronunciation* (with Clifford H. Prator; Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972). She was first editor of the *TESOL Quarterly*, serving from 1967-72, and in 1973-74 is serving as president of TESOL.

vide the students with opportunities to delve into various aspects of English grammar on their own. The linguistic description of items such as those which are to be discussed here have certainly given my students a better understanding of English grammar; and whether empirically proveable or not, I believe that the better a teacher understands the functioning of the language he teaches, the better are his chances of imparting this understanding to others. Because no one theoretical base is used, insights from many "schools" of linguistics are discussed. This seems inevitable because, as Jarvis (1972) points out, "general theories are frequently nonspecific about areas of grammar important to the language teacher."

An example of this nonspecificity is in the description of the use of *in*, *on*, and *at* in expressions of time and place. English reference grammars for native speakers of English do not describe the difference in the use of these prepositions for the very simple reason that native speakers have no difficulty with them. However, prospective teachers of ESL are required to have this kind of analytical knowledge; and, as a matter of fact, most texts in ESL contain some statement about their use.

This paper will not discuss the application of linguistics to the teaching of the phonological system of English. I agree with Bolinger (1972) that structural linguistics probably made its greatest contribution to language teaching in the area of pronunciation. The careful emphasis upon the articulatory description of sounds and the emphasis upon intonation and stress patterns certainly was an improvement over the assumption that a one-lesson discussion of the segmental features was all that was required in teaching the sound system of a language.

Although this paper will also not be concerned with pedagogical theory, let me say that I favor John Carroll's (1971) "cognitive habit-formation" approach toward language teaching, which accepts the use of practice drills but combines it with the intellectual processes associated with the acquisition of rules.

The particular grammatical items which are included here were chosen because they are illustrative of the kinds of things that have to be taught in a language class. They are also indicative of a variety of linguistic viewpoints from which insights may be gained. It is the content of what linguists say that we are concerned with, not so much the form. Unhappily, too often it has been the form of what linguists say that appears in texts or that is taken directly to the students by the teacher without being adapted to the stringent requirements of good pedagogy that material be simple enough for students to grasp and pertinent enough for them to put to use.

If there is one principle that has guided my search for better information about the grammar of English it is whether or not it contributes to the understanding of the meaning of utterances. In other words, I applaud the emphasis upon the semantic input in the new grammars as providing, if you will excuse the pun, more "meaningful" insights for the second language teacher.

The grammatical points to be discussed are the common-sex pronoun *they*, noun classification, the negative of the modal auxiliaries, case, and several grammatical examples related to paraphrase, presupposition, and sentence negation.

A. The Common-Sex Pronoun THEY

Let's begin with an item from Otto Jespersen, whose works are probably cited today more often than any "traditional" grammarian. He, like so many of the good traditional grammarians, was not a native speaker of English; he tended to look at English from an ESL point of view. Perhaps that is why his insights continue to be so pertinent for second language teachers.

Jespersen (1965) was intrigued with the possibility of language universals, and his "notional categories" were an attempt at providing a basis for the closest he could come to universal characteristics of language. In his description of some of these categories he happened upon some interesting concepts. One of these has to do with gender and the use of a "common-sex" pronoun. There is gender distinction in the singular pronouns in English (*he, she*). In the plural this gender distinction is lost, and the plural pronoun *they* can refer to both genders. Semantic items in the sentence sometimes designate clearly which is meant, as in the following sentences:¹

- (1) If you know whose bow tie this is, tell *them (him)* to come and get it.
- (2) If you know whose handbag this is, tell *them (her)* to come and get it.

In other cases, the use of *they, their, them* has to be thought of as having a common sex, i.e. capable of referring to either gender.

- (3) If you know whose book this is, tell *them (him or her)* to come and get it.
- (4) Somebody left *their (his or her)* keys on my desk.

In English language textbooks the pronoun *they* is taught as that which refers to more than one person or thing. No reference is usually made to gender. If the student's native language is one in which the plural pronoun is gender specific, as in the Romance languages, the English habit of using one pronoun for both (or either) genders may need some explanation and practice.

It is interesting to note that while this use of the pronoun *they* is not usually pointed out, the use of *he* to refer to both genders is often mentioned.

B. Noun Classification

A basic part of English grammar is noun classification. Most texts discuss

¹ With fewer and fewer distinctions between the sexes, many semantic items are no longer gender specific: If you know whose *boots (pants, pipes, cigars, cigarettes, helmets, motorbikes, etc.)* these are, tell *them (him or her)* to come and get them.

nouns as being of two types, count and noncount (or mass); but, because of the possibility of saying, "I'd like two milks, please," we often find statements like the following: "In certain special situations, noncount nouns are sometimes used as count nouns (or count nouns as noncount nouns)" (Krohn, 1971).

Let's look at the following nouns:

- (5) basket(s), iron(s), grocery(s)
- (6) pebble(s), gravel
- (7) an egg, eggs, egg (on your tie)

The nouns in (5) can all be used in the plural. *Basket* is a typical count noun: *one basket, two baskets*. *Iron* as a noncount noun (not generally used in the plural) refers to the metal; its usual meaning in the plural is that of "appliances for pressing clothes." The plural of *grocery* results in a different referent: "We buy groceries in a grocery." Thus, a change from singular to plural can result in clearly different meanings.

The *nouns* in (6) are mentioned by Gleason (1965) as being semantically similar but syntactically different: *pebbles* operates as a count noun and *gravel* as noncount. We say "pebbles are" but "gravel is."

The noun *egg* in (7) is used by Gleason as an example of the potentiality in forms for all English nouns: singular-count, plural-count, and noncount. He suggests that since this range is potentially possible for all nouns, we should perhaps reclassify nouns. Instead of a two-way classification (count and noncount, with a singular and plural subset of count nouns), he recommends a three-category classification: singular-plural-noncount. In this system the possibility of all three forms is immediately revealed. The fact that some nouns occur most frequently in one or more categories would have to be pointed out, but at least this would be a truer representation of the English noun system and would avoid the necessity of having to list "exceptions to the rule."

Because the use or nonuse of the article is tied so closely to the concept of count and noncount nouns, this reclassification might also help solve the problem which arises when a student who has learned that *coffee* is noncount hears someone in a restaurant order "a coffee" or "two coffees." The student would have been made aware that all nouns have the potential of being used either as singular, plural, or noncount with the appropriate article usage which goes with these categories.

C. Modal Auxiliaries and the Speaker's Attitude

Jarvis (1972) discusses the concept of sentences as made up of two underlying constituents identified as "modality" and "proposition" (S—> M + P). With this as a starting point, we can expect that changes can occur in either of these two constituents. Compare the following pairs of sentences:

- (8) You must work tomorrow.

- (9) You have to work tomorrow.
- (10) You mustn't work tomorrow.
- (11) You don't have to work tomorrow.

The proposition constituents in sentences (8) and (9) are expressed in the verb *work*, and the modality constituents can be thought of as being contained in the modal auxiliaries *must* and *have to*, both of which express necessity.

When negation is introduced resulting in sentences (10) and (11), there is a significant difference in meaning between the modals *mustn't* and *don't have to*. Negation in (10) is applied to the proposition expressed by the verb *work*: "It is necessary that you not work tomorrow." In (11), on the other hand, negation is attached to the modal auxiliary: "It is not necessary that you work tomorrow." This results in a meaning of prohibition in (10) that is not present in (11). Surely this kind of systematic explanation brings greater understanding of the difference between sentences like (10) and (11) than would statements to the effect that "the negative of modal auxiliaries does not always mean exactly the opposite of the positive."

D. Case

The next aspect of English grammar that we will look at is implicit in the following sentences (Fillmore, 1968):

- (12) Mother is cooking the potatoes.
- (13) The potatoes are cooking.
- (14) Mother is cooking.

Superficially, these sentences appear to be similar; but the subjects, *Mother* and *potatoes*, bear different relationships to the verb *cook*, unless we are thinking of *Mother* as being prepared for eating or of *potatoes* engaging in an activity normally reserved for humans. One way of handling these sentences would be to propose different meanings for *cook*. Fillmore (1968, 1969) proposes an alternative solution through the introduction of case categories. He would classify *cook* as a verb obligatorily accompanied by a case category which he names Objective (O), i.e., "things which are affected by the action or state identified by the verb"; in this instance *potatoes* is this categorical realization in (12) and (13). The case category Agentive (A) may optionally appear with the verb *cook* as in (12). Fillmore points out that the O category may be deleted with words like *cook* when A is present and the O would be, if present, a typical NP for the verb *cook* (*food, meal, potatoes, etc.*); this accounts for (14). The semantic features that characterize the use of *cook* are formalized as having the frame feature + [-O (A)]; that is, in sentences in which *cook* appears, it must be accompanied by O (except as specified above) and may optionally occur with A.

Another example of how case grammar is applied to explain differences on a syntactic level which heretofore have been called simply "differences in

meaning” can be seen in the sentences below containing the verb *open* (Fillmore, 1968).

- (15) The door opened.
- (16) John opened the door.
- (17) The wind opened the door.
- (18) John opened the door with a chisel.

The verb *open* occurs with the subject as Objective (O) in (15), Agentive (A) in (16) and (18), and Instrumental (I) in (17). We notice that O is present in all of the sentences, and that I appears in (17) as subject (*wind*) and in (18) in a prepositional phrase (*chisel*). Thus the frame feature for *open* allows for all of these possibilities: + [— O (I) (A)].

Fillmore’s case grammar attempts to be universal in its application. The term case is used “to identify the underlying syntactic-semantic relationship.” He differentiates between case as applied universally and case *form* which is “the expression of a case relationship in a particular language—whether affixation, suppletion, use of clitic particles, or constraints on word order.”

A further example has been pointed out by Eric Nelson, one of my students.

- (19) He clutched something.
- (20) He clutched at something.

The *something* of (19) can be specified as Objective and *something in* (20) as Locative, which in this instance calls for the use of the preposition *at*. Fillmore defines Locative as “the case which identifies the location or spatial orientation of the state or action identified by the verb.”

The concept of the verb as central, with these cases bearing specific relationships to the verb, is an attractive idea since I have always intuitively felt that the verb was the core of the English sentence. If Fillmore’s ideas can be universally applied, these case relationships, whether overtly similar between languages or not, would certainly be a basis upon which some of the meaning of sentences could be explained.

E. Paraphrase

The use of paraphrase to test synonymy in language is frequently mentioned in the writings of transformational grammarians. I find this a useful concept, particularly at more advanced stages of language learning. I am inclined to think that the beginning stages need emphasis upon a few highly frequent grammatical patterns before introducing paraphrases, but their use for extending vocabulary and for teaching stylistic variety seems intriguing. Take, for example, the following pairs of sentences:

- (21) He apologized for being late.
- (22) He was apologetic for being late.
- (23) He depends on his father.

- (24) He is dependent on his father.
- (25) He thanked them for their contribution,
- (26) He was thankful for their contribution,

The choice of preposition in these examples is so closely tied to the verb that the practice of the adjectival paraphrase, with which the same preposition occurs, would reinforce the use of that preposition. These sentences tend, incidentally, to provide a bit of evidence to add to the current view in linguistics that adjectives are a subset of verbs.

Sentences (25) and (26) raise the question, also currently under discussion by linguists, as to what constitutes paraphrase and whether transformations of a sentence preserve the meaning of that sentence. Perhaps, then, the sentences above are not true paraphrases, since (25) and (26) have related but different meanings.

Probably the most frequent example of paraphrase is the passive sentence.

- (27) John gave the girl a ring.
- (28) The girl was given a ring (by John).
- (29) A ring was given (to) the girl (by John).

If we combine the idea of paraphrase with the concept of case, as discussed above, we see that the emphasis in these three sentences is different. In (27) the subject is Agentive, in (28,) it is Dative, and in (29) it is Objective; and, although these sentences are synonymous in that their general meaning is the same, they are stylistically different. These stylistic differences have to be taught at some level in ESL.

F. Presupposition

Good teaching has always depended upon contextualized exercises. This simply means that language is taught in situations which simulate as closely as possible "real-life" experience. It is assumed that by doing so the student will better comprehend what he is learning. But context alone is not sufficient. Even with a well-thought-out situation in which to introduce verbs like *bring* and *take* the point of view of the speaker and the hearer must be added (at least in the dialect I use). This is part of what linguists call "presupposition." Gardner (1971) quotes Fillmore's definition of sentence presuppositions as "those conditions which must be satisfied before a sentence can be used." Keenan (1972) presents two kinds of presupposition: logical and pragmatic. In discussing pragmatic presupposition he introduces the concept of appropriateness, which is certainly basic to language teaching. We need to provide the student with the ability to select utterances appropriate to particular circumstances. Keenan explicitly enumerates the certain requirements which will produce this appropriateness.

Now many sentences require that certain culturally defined conditions or contexts be satisfied in order for an utterance of that sentence to be understood (in its literal, intended meaning). Thus these conditions are

naturally called presuppositions of the sentence; if they are not satisfied then the utterance is either not understandable or else is understood in some nonliteral way—insult or jest for example. These conditions include among many others: (a) status and kind of relations among the participants; (b) age, sex, and generation relations among the participants; (c) status, kin, age, sex, and generation relations between participants and individuals mentioned in the sentences; (d) presence or absence of certain objects in the physical setting of the utterance; and (e) relative location of participants and items mentioned in the sentence itself. (Keenan, 1972)

Following Keenan's definition of practical presupposition—“An utterance of a sentence pragmatically presupposes that its context is appropriate”—language teachers must teach the presuppositions that correlate with the context in which we want students to use the utterances they are learning.

The presupposition involved in the use of *bring* and *take* falls into Keenan's type (e) above, the relative location of the speaker and person spoken to. “I'll bring the book with me” usually presupposes that the hearer is somewhere else and that the speaker is going to join him. “I'll take the book with me,” on the other hand, does not make the same assumption that the speaker will be going directly to the hearer, although it does not rule out the possibility of their meeting later.

Most teachers of ESL have been teaching presuppositions like the above, but probably not in a systematic fashion. What linguists are saying now is that there are *many* utterances which depend upon the use of presupposition for real understanding. Language teachers may have been overlooking some of these.

Presuppositions which might affect the choice of the relative pronoun are illustrated in the following sentences:

(30) I have a cat who likes popcorn.

(31) I have a cat which likes popcorn.

The presuppositions which are responsible for the choice of relative pronoun in (30) and (31) involve the attitude of the speaker toward cats. The *who* speaker evidently considers cats as having human features, while the *which* speaker classifies cats as nonhuman. The ordinary rules for the use of *who* and *which* do not always take such presuppositions into consideration.

Sentences like the following cited by Slager and Major (1973) illustrate the presuppositions implicit in many of the basic grammar items we teach:

(32) How long have you been in New York?

(33) How long were you in New York?

(34) Open the window.

(35) Open a window.

Sentence (32) presupposes that the speaker is in New York, (33) that he is not; (34) presupposes that there is one window in the room, and (35) that there is more than one.

The conditions or sentence presuppositions quoted by Keenan above can be used as a basis for contexts that will develop the use of correct pre-

suppositions on the part of the language learner. More than this, it seems essential that presuppositions be included in the content of language teaching materials where they are essential to the understanding and appropriateness of language items. Insofar as language teachers are already aware of this need and placing more emphasis upon contextually based teaching materials, they have been applying concepts which reinforce what linguists are now making explicit in theory.

G. Negation

Teachers of ESL are familiar with the use of the negative adverb *not* in sentences like these:

- (36) The students will not leave early.
- (37) The students have not left early.
- (38) The students are not leaving early.
- (39) The students did not leave early.

Recent linguistic research reveals rather complex problems with English sentence negation which sooner or later should find their way into language textbooks. Notice the two sentences below.

- (40) I think Bill didn't leave anything, did he?
- (41) I don't think Bill left anything, did he?

A comparison of (40) and (41) shows that the scope of negation carries beyond the clause in which the negative element appears. The negative verb in the subordinate clause of (40) necessitates the use of what Quirk terms a "nonassertive" (anything). Even though there is a positive verb in the subordinate clause in (41), the nonassertive *anything* again occurs. When (41) is used as a paraphrase of (40)—not simply the negative of (40): "It is not true that I think Bill didn't leave anything"—it involves the rule of "not-transportation," i.e., the negative adverb *not* is transported to the main clause from the embedded clause.

Notice also that the question tags in both of these sentences are positive, one of the clear criteria used by Klima (1964) as a test of sentence negation.

Another peculiarity of negation occurs with the word *until*.

- (42) He didn't arrive until 5 o'clock.
- (43) *He arrived until 5 o'clock.
- (44) He didn't wait until 5 o'clock.
- (45) He waited until 5 o'clock.

Certain constraints are apparent in the use of *until*; it cannot occur in positive sentences with verbs which indicate action at a point of time. It is grammatical in positive sentences with verbs like *wait* which have durative meaning.

The next five sentences illustrate the fact that *not* occurs in sentences which are very similar, some of which are negative and others positive.

- (46) There wasn't any rain, was there?

- (47) There wasn't any rain, not even then.
 (48) Not even then was there any rain.
 (49) There was some rain not long ago, wasn't there?
 (50) Not long ago there was some rain.

The positive question tag in (46), the negative appositive tag in (47), and the inversion of the position of the verb in (48) follow Klima's criteria for sentence negation. Notice that in (49) and (50) the positive question tag occurs and there is no inversion of the verb. In addition the absence of the nonassertive form *any* is clear evidence that these sentences are positive.

Because negation is one of the most frequently used "modalities," "modes," or "transformations"—however we wish to describe the phenomenon—which combine with or are applied to propositions in English sentences, and because of its correlation with nonassertive forms or inversion of word order, it behooves us to take a close look at what linguists are discovering about this aspect of grammar.

Summary

What has been suggested here, through examples from English linguistics, is that language teachers should make use of any information which linguistics offers that will help them do a more efficient job of teaching language as a communicative tool. It does not matter that the state of linguistics today may be described as in flux or chaotic, depending upon how charitable you wish to be. We need to be flexible; and at present we must be satisfied with piecemeal tidbits of information about language, but we should be ready to apply whatever leads to a better understanding of the underlying rules. As Jarvis points out, much information from linguistics could be utilized if "pedagogical grammars . . . made theoretical descriptions available for teaching purposes."

What we are all attempting to do is to produce students who can communicate intelligently. Linguistics cannot provide solutions to all our problems, but language teachers can continue to profit, as I firmly believe they have in the past, from what linguists reveal about language. Furthermore, if our questions were answered once and for all, we would no longer be able to say with Robert Browning, "a man's reach should exceed his grasp, or what's heaven for?".

REFERENCES

- Bolinger, Dwight. 1972. "The Influence of Linguistics: Plus and Minus," *TESOL Quarterly*, 6,2. 107-20.
 Carroll, John B. 1971. "Current Issues in Psycholinguistics and Second Language Teaching," *TESOL Quarterly*, 5,2. 101-14.
 DeCamp, David. 1968. "The Current Discrepancy between Theoretical and Applied Linguistics," *TESOL Quarterly*, 2,2. 3-11.
 Fillmore, Charles J. 1968. "The Case for Case," in Emmon Bach and Robert T. Harms (eds.), *Universals in Linguistic Theory*. Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
 — . 1969. "Toward a Modern Theory of Case," in David A. Reibel and Sanford A.

- Schane (eds.), *Modern Studies in English*. Prentice-Hall.
- . 1973. "The Language Teacher as Linguist." Paper delivered at the TESOL Convention, San Juan, Puerto Rico, May, 1973.
- Gardner, Richard. 1971. "'Presupposition' in Philosophy and Linguistics," in Charles J. Fillmore and D. Terence Langendoen (eds.), *Studies in Linguistic Semantics*. Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Gleason, H. A., Jr. 1965. *Linguistics and English Grammar*. Holt, Reinhart, and Winston.
- Jackendoff, Ray S. 1971. "On Some Questionable Arguments about Qualification and Negation," *Language*, 47, 282-97.
- Jarvis, R. A. 1972. "A Pedagogical Grammar of the Modal Auxiliaries," *English Language Teaching*, 26, 238-48.
- Jespersen, Otto. 1965. *The Philosophy of Grammar*. W. W. Norton.
- Keenan, Edward L. 1971. "Two Kinds of Presupposition in Natural Language," in Charles J. Fillmore and D. Terence Langendoen (eds.), *Studies in Linguistic Semantics*. Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Klima, Edward S. 1964. "Negation in English," in V. A. Fodor and J. J. Katz (eds.), *The Structure of Language: Readings in the Philosophy of Language*. Prentice-Hall.
- Krohn, Robert. 1972. *English Sentence Structure*. The University of Michigan Press.
- Lakoff, George. 1970. "Pronominalization, Negation, and the Analysis of Adverbs," in Roberick A. Jacobs and Peter S. Rosenbaum (cd.), *Readings in English Transformational Grammar*. Ginn and Company.
- Lakoff, Robin. 1969. "A Syntactic Argument for Negative Transportation" in *Papers from the Fifth Regional Meeting Chicago Linguistic Society*.
- Lamendella, John T. 1969. "On the Irrelevance of Transformational Grammar to Second Language Pedagogy," *Language Learning*, 19, 255-70.
- Lindholm, James M. 1969. "Negative-Raising and Pronominalization," in *Papers from the Fifth Regional Meeting Chicago Linguistic Society*.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, and Jan Svartvik. 1972. *A Grammar of Contemporary English*. Seminar Press.
- Slager, William R., and Diana Major. 1973. "Teaching Transformational Grammar: On Avoiding the Hollow Shell of Formalism," *English Journal*, 6, 410-18, 453.

Summary and Discussion

In one familiar tallying system, the fifth tally is the one that gathers up the preceding four to constitute a unit of five. Five is only a unit of convenience, with its basis probably in the anatomy of our fingers and toes. Yet, since we think easily in terms of fives, since the 1973 Lackland Lectures collected here are the fifth series in as many years, and since in our culture five years is long enough to encompass trends, now seems as good a time as any to pause and take stock, to identify if we can the focal concerns which might characterize our professional development of the past five years.

What the five series of lectures seem to tell us in retrospect is that in 1969, the year of the first series (*TESOL Quarterly*, 1970, 4:1), we were struggling with implications of theory, most notably recent linguistic theory, for second language instruction, particularly in the area of materials development. Finding linguistic theory somewhat recalcitrant, and only just beginning to explore the relevance of recent work in other disciplines, like psychology, we turned in the first three years of the 70's to examination of pedagogical practice, looking to the needs of our students for guidance. In the 1970 lecture series (*TESOL Quarterly*, 1971, 5:1) workable classroom practices were discussed. In the 1971 series (*TESOL Quarterly*, 1972, 6:1) the relation between language drills and language use was, of major interest, and classroom practices directed toward developing communicative competence were foregrounded. In 1972 (*TESOL Quarterly*, 1973, 7:1) attention was on ways of contextualizing classroom instruction in keeping with communication goals. Also in 1972 there were hints of renewed attention to the theoretical underpinnings of our classroom practices. In the present set of 1973 lectures a significant amount of interplay between theory-or perhaps more accurately, disciplinary knowledge-and practice emerges, with the classroom teacher the mediator. So, this fifth lecture series does, in a sense, gather up the first four, returning to attention to theory, as in the first series, but to a broader-based theory, and at the same time maintaining the classroom perspective of the next three series.

The first paper, by Carroll, sets a modest, realistic tone, echoed in the following papers. Especially in his guidelines concerning listening comprehension and active learning, less so in the summary of his efforts to develop a performance grammar, he provides helpful suggestions, with psychological rationale, which a teacher can easily implement. Of particular interest is his discussion of memory processes, an area which seems increasingly to be coming to the attention of students of language. On the basis of the information that Carroll provides, classroom teachers can immediately see a role for themselves in keeping track of what a learner has been taught and then at appropriate times pushing him to retrieve particular items from his intermediate memory, thus engaging him in the kind of

active learning that Carroll suggests is necessary to ensure storage of information in what he calls "truly long-term memory."

Marckwardt, too, in the second paper, is concerned with providing the teacher with information, this time information about language, to be used at the teacher's discretion as the need arises to answer questions about language posed by the student, by the teaching materials at hand, or by the teacher himself. He recommends the dictionary as a valuable resource whose potential has not been fully exploited nor even recognized. His argument that lexicographers have come closer than grammarians to dealing with language in its totality is convincing, as is the concomitant argument that teachers should be educated in the full and enlightened use of the dictionary.

In the third paper, Hill places himself in the shoes of a language teacher who no longer accepts some of the major structuralist assumptions about language and language learning but who still finds much that is sensible in the structuralist approach to language teaching, to which he adds other techniques that he feels serve language learning needs. The progression of language drills which Hill proposes does, however, indicate a pervading reliance on structuralist theory. He correctly singles out the usefulness of the structuralist notion of contrast, exemplified by drill on language features that sound the same and those that sound different. It would have been interesting if he had explored the notion of sameness and difference in terms not only of sound but also of meaning. Hill's position that there is no one system of language teaching, that there are as many systems as teachers, is realistic. His suggestions are useful for some language learning goals.

As Saville-Troike points out in her paper, however, the audio-lingual method did not easily lend itself to the teaching of reading, at least not in TESOL. Her discussion of what is involved in reading is informed by recent work in linguistics, with its view of language as abstract knowledge underlying concrete performance. Her emphasis on the necessity for a reader to respond to syntactic information, particularly in the form that is favored in written language, underlines the important point that learning to read in a second language cannot be separated from learning the language. Her suggestions for approaches to the teaching of reading, especially to advanced students, cover an impressive amount of territory. Interestingly, many of her suggestions seem as applicable to first as to second language learners, indicating perhaps that when the enormous complexity of language is revealed, as in recent research, some of the same implications hold for first as well as for second language teaching.

Valette not only clarifies the relation of testing to instructional objectives but also sorts out some of the objectives that have tended to get muddled together in the teaching process. Her timely and full discussion of ways of teaching and testing communication skills in the four modes—speaking, writing, listening, and reading—should serve teachers well. It is interesting in passing to note her order of discussing these four modes. She is not im-

plying any teaching order, but the organization of her discussion reflects her own linking of listening and reading on the one hand and speaking and writing on the other. Carroll and Saville-Troike, too, refer to the receptive/productive dimensions, an organization of the four skills which has a different theoretical base from the long familiar organization in terms of order of acquisition in the first language.

Robinett, in the last paper, returns to the familiar topic of the application of linguistics to second language teaching. In the last two decades advocacy of such application has moved, to exaggerate only somewhat, from an article of faith to a suspect, if not discredited, shibboleth. Robinett recommends and demonstrates a rapprochement between linguistics and TESOL in which the teacher is the middleman. Like Marckwardt, she is concerned with providing language teachers with resources for them to draw on as needed, and like him, the resource that she is talking about is knowledge of how English functions. Using illustrations relevant to the TESOL classroom, she discusses how grammars written from various linguistic points of view can provide helpful information for the language teacher. Of special significance is her emphasis on linguistic information that illuminates the ways that utterances convey meaning.

All six papers in one way or another, by precept or example or implication, suggest that a teacher's responses to learner needs must often be spontaneous and circumstantial, and that for them to be so the teacher must have resources of knowledge to draw on. Packaged materials simply cannot predict which learning experiences will be most appropriate for particular students at particular times. This state of affairs would seem to be a corollary of the goal of communicative competence.

These six papers give the teacher a good notion of some of the domains of knowledge that will stand him in good stead. He needs to know about the relation between the receptive and productive skills, which Carroll touches on, and about the memory processes that he describes. He needs to know how language works and where to go to fill in gaps in his knowledge. Marckwardt and Robinett provide directions. He needs to know that even though there is no one approach to teaching, all approaches imply something about the practitioners' notions of the nature of language and language learning, as Hill and Saville-Troike exemplify. He needs to know more precisely what his instructional objectives are and how to test what he has taught. This knowledge needs to be based on clear notions about the nature of language and language learning, as Valette's analyses of teaching and testing demonstrate. The teacher, then, is in the middle. He must mediate between theory and practice. He must draw on theory, on knowledge, from this discipline or that, as it serves what he judges to be the needs of his students. The present set of papers makes a real contribution to the professionalization of the TESOL teacher.

RC

Dr. Michael West—1888 to 1973

Dr. Michael West was the last of a group which considerably advanced the art of language teaching in the period between the two world wars. They were concerned with the teaching of English to speakers of other languages. Though English had not then attained its present dominance as a world language, it was already the only practicable medium of European education for the large proportion of mankind under English-speaking rule, and for that purpose a sure command of it was necessary. It was in the British colonial territories that most progress was made, and, despite their poverty and the vast differences between their cultures and that in which English had developed, language teaching probably became much more expert and effective in these than in most economically advanced countries. This was due to a few educators of teachers and text-book writers, who worked mainly in these territories (though H. E. Palmer worked in Japan, and others of these pioneers influenced countries in which English was a foreign language). They realized that the selection of language to be taught and its arrangement, as well as the methods of teaching it, must be based on the study of language in general and of the language to be taught in particular, but that it must be adapted to the particular conditions in which the teaching was carried on.

Dr. West was an extremely practical person. When he set out to educate teachers in Bengal he asked himself how their pupils would probably need to use English. He decided few of them would be likely to converse with native speakers and that the most valuable skill for them was ability to read English. Once he had made such a diagnosis of the situation he never lacked the courage of his convictions. He devised an approach to learning the language that went straight for intelligent reading and produced courses which were widely used for many years.

Dr. West's conclusions were always based on systematic enquiry. The results of the investigation begun in Bengal appeared in his publications on bilingualism. He saw that methods of teaching were not all that was involved. Indeed he put learning before teaching and tried to produce materials from which students could learn with the minimum of assistance. He realized that teachers were often poorly educated and limited in their effectiveness. He was also aware that this was not their fault, and that, in addition to poor opportunities for self-improvement, they often had to operate in very difficult conditions. Much of his work aimed at helping them. He was extremely realistic in his assessment of situations and possibilities and had no patience with theories or practices which did not take them into account. Procedures had to be proved in the classroom with typical teachers and learners before he accepted their validity. Right up to the end of his long life he was trying out new techniques.

He knew that a language is so complex only a little of it at a time can be learned and that its prodigal redundancy and its systematic and hierarchical characteristics enable a small part of it, properly selected, to cover a great

area of usage and also to act as a framework for a continually extending structure. His main contribution to the application of these insights was in vocabulary selection. He was a member of an international committee, financed by the Carnegie Corporation, which published an interim report on the selection of English vocabulary just before the last war. After the war he revised this single-handed, using a semantic count of Professor Irving Lorge to distinguish the meanings of 2,000 words considered most productive for the first stages of English. Characteristically he sought no recompense for himself, the trustee for the Carnegie grant being the University of London Institute of Education, of which he was a generous and valued friend. *A General Service List of English Words* (1953) includes an additional list of scientific and technical words made with the assistance of Dr. W. E. Flood, and the volume is still unique in its field.

Dr. West's pragmatic yet systematic approach to problems of language teaching, his boldness in applying his conclusions, his resourcefulness in experiment and his determination to be satisfied with nothing that did not stand the test of practical application did not diminish with advancing years. He was a lively controversialist but the kindest and most modest of men, and kept the respect of younger practitioners of the teaching of English when fashions had changed and language teaching had come to be discussed in more theoretical terms than he approved.

Bruce Pattison, Director
Division of Language Teaching
University of London Institute of Education

Announcement

Eighth Annual TESOL Convention

March 5–10, 1974

The Denver Hilton

Denver, Colorado

PRECONVENTION STUDY GROUPS AND WORKSHOPS

Tuesday, March 5—Wednesday, March 6, 1974

As in previous years, groups of limited enrollment will meet for two days preceding the formal opening of the convention. The study groups, each with a specialist group leader, will tend toward more formal instruction while the workshops, with a consultant, will encourage group participation. The levels of interest will extend from early childhood through higher education, and from theory and research to the practical application of theory and research.

GENERAL SESSIONS

Thursday, March 7—Sunday, March 10, 1974

The general sessions will be addressed by:

Betty Robinett

Wallace Lambert

Robin Lakoff

Mary Finocchiaro

(partial listing)

The general sessions will alternate with small-group, special-interest sessions.

GROUP SESSIONS

Thursday, March 7—Sunday, March 10, 1974

The group sessions will reflect the varied interests of the members of TESOL, including English as a Foreign Language (EFL), English as a Second Language (ESL), Standard English as a Second Dialect (ESD), Bilingual Education (BE), Adult Education, and Applied Linguistics. The topics will range from recent research to classroom practice, but the main emphasis will be on matters of procedures and techniques in the classroom. The main topics will focus on

Problems of Testing

Teacher Training

Materials Adaptation and Development

Cultural Implications and Interference in Teaching

TESOL and Other Organizations

Basic Skills: Grammar and Pronunciation

Basic Skills: Reading and Writing

Basic Skills: Vocabulary

Each small-group program will finish with a period for interaction where members of the audience can ask questions related to their specific teaching problems as they involve the topics covered by the speakers. We want to break down the barrier between speaker and audience, and especially to involve the classroom teacher in our program.

Convention Chairman:

Albino B. Baca, Project Director, Chicano Mobile Institutes, 719
Paseo de Peralta, Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501; (505) 982-3561

Study Group Chairman:

Gilberto Sanchez, Center for Applied Linguistics, 1611 North Kent
Street, Arlington, Virginia 22209

Local Chairmen:

Ernest Andrade, Weld BOCES, University of Northern Colorado, Uni-
versity of Northern Colorado, Greeley, Colorado; Manuel Andrade,
Denver Public Schools, Denver, Colorado

TESOL members will receive Convention and Study Group registration forms, Preliminary Program, Hotel Information and Reservation cards in December, 1973.

Non-members should send names and addresses to: James E. Alatis,
TESOL Executive Secretary, School of Language and Linguistics, George-
town University, Washington, D.C. 20007.

Publications Received

Malmstrom, Jean and Constance Weaver. *Transgrammar*. English Structure, Style, and Dialects. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1973.

SEAMO Regional English Language Centre Newsletter, VI, I (March 1973). Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Council, Singapore.

Sherman, D. R. *Old Mali and the Boy*. Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, Ltd, 1964. Reprinted 1971.

ERIC-TESOL Documents

The following are documents which have been selected from those processed by the ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics that may be of interest to TESOL members. They have been divided into five categories. GENERAL includes those documents whose scope spans two or more of the other sections, as well as miscellaneous studies of interest. The section Bilingualism includes three subcategories, *General*, *Content Analysis Schedules*, and *Newsletters*. LINGUISTIC STUDIES lists those documents that treat ESL problems in greater, linguistic depth.

Where indicated, paper copy (PC) and microfiche (MI?) reproductions of the full text are available from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS), P.O. Drawer O, Bethesda, Maryland, 20014. (Prices are noted in each citation for microfiche and paper copy.) Copies of documents must be ordered by the individual ED numbers, and payment must accompany orders totaling less than \$10.00. In the U. S., please add sales tax as applicable.

GENERAL

Dulay, Heidi C., and Helene Pepe. "The Influence of a Social Setting on Second Language Learning." 1970. 32p [Unpub. paper.] [EDRS Price: MF-\$0.65, PC-\$3.29; 7D 071 472.]

This report describes an educational experiment concerning second language acquisition. It hypothesizes that low ethnocentrism, positive attitudes toward the other group, and an integrative orientation toward language comprise high motivation, while the opposite criteria control low motivation. Puerto Rican children involved in the experiment completed attitudinal questionnaires concerning American culture. The questionnaire covered these areas: (1) plans for residence in the United States, (2) attitudes toward Americans, (3) expectations, (4) goals for children, (5) languages, (6) social distance, and (7) political party affiliations.

Harrison, G. Scott. "Some Cultural and Linguistic Background Information for a Beginning Teacher on the Navajo Reservation." 35p [M.A. Independent Study Project, School for International Training of the Experiment in International Living, 1971.] [EDRS Price: MF-\$0.65, PC-\$3.29; ED 071 505.]

This paper contains ideas intended to help the teacher who is preparing to teach Navaho children. Suggestions are offered for an independent reading and study program to increase the teacher's understanding of the culture in which he will be working. A brief history of the Navaho people is presented, followed by a discussion of some cultural differences between the Navaho and white student. A chapter entitled "Why Study Navaho?" briefly points out several significant linguistic characteristics of Navaho seen from the viewpoint of the English speaker. Materials for studying the Navaho language are suggested. A final chapter reports the author's experiences in a sixth-grade Navaho classroom and the activities that he found most successful. Appendixes list relevant materials.

Strevens, Peter. "Technical, Technological and Scientific English (TTSE)." 1972. 17p [Speech.] [EDRS Price: MF-\$0.65; PC-\$3.29; ED 071 460.]

There is a large and growing demand for specialized English language teaching to answer the needs of a particular subject, profession, or occupation. Teachers of specialized English must be beyond the approach to English as a general educational and cultural subject. It is possible to isolate and define technical, technological, and scientific English, all with common features of English, but with distinctions in concepts, characteristic thought processes, vocabulary and terminology, and the logical-grammatical devices used to express the concepts. All these elements contribute to the recurrent grammatical patterns evident in a particular type of language. One way to teach specialized English would be in a special purpose course after the student has learned "common core" English in a conventional course.

BILINGUALISM

General

Ahmann, J. Stanley, and B. Geraldine Lambert. *An Evaluation of a Bilingual Education Program: Annual Report, 1970-71*. St. Martinville, La.: Saint Martin Parish School Board, 1971. 36p [EDRS Price: MF-\$0.65, PC-\$3.29; ED 071 474.]

This annual report of an ongoing bilingual education program being conducted at St. Martin Parish evaluates data gathered between February and May 1971. A large segment of both the control and experimental groups is French dominant or black. Achievement of performance objectives by kindergarten and first grade students was evaluated by both teachers and monitors. A series of standardized tests, including the Stanford Achievement Test, was administered, and results of the tests are discussed. Twenty-two tables of data are included.

Franquez, Eleanor. *Bilingual/Bicultural Preschool Education Program: Montessori Design, 1972-73*. Compton, Calif.: Compton Unified School District, [1972]. 98p [EDRS Price: MF-\$0.65, HC-\$3.29; ED 072 697.]

This report on the Montessori-designed bilingual/bicultural preschool education program of the Compton School District begins with a statement of need. It includes information on project arrangements, organization, and proposed preschool curriculum. It presents plans for inservice staff development and parent participation, involvement, and education. The report also presents evaluation and audit plans, day care activities, a calendar of holidays, and the requested budget. The appendixes, which amount to almost half the report, include information on job descriptions, salary schedules, personnel policies, and curriculum areas.

Goodman, Frank M. *Compton Bilingual Plan: Review Report 1971-72*. Compton, Calif.: Compton Unified School District, [1972]. 40p [EDRS Price: MF-\$0.65, PC-\$3.29; ED 072 676.]

This report reviews the Compton Bilingual Plan during its third year of operation at Thomas Jefferson High School in South Central Los Angeles. After a brief introduction giving background on the program, the second section describes in some detail major activity of 1971-72. This section includes

a narrative report, a description of project personnel and duties, and information on community involvement. It also discusses new vocabulary developed by the project for lexical references, services given under ESEA Title VII, and inservice training for teachers. A description of procedures for bilingual-bicultural curriculum and materials forms the entire third section. Concerning the fourth year of operation, section four presents a plan for overall program management, and section five, an evaluation submitted by a consultant to the project.

Herbert, Charles H., Jr., and Anthony R. Sancho. *Puedo leer/I Can Read: Initial Reading in Spanish for Bilingual Children*. San Bernardino, Calif.: San Bernardino County Superintendent of Schools, 1972. 119p [Rev. ed.] [EDRS Price: MF-\$0.65, PC-\$6.58; ED 071 525.]

This manual contains some of the history of the project "Initial Reading in Spanish for Bilingual Children," undertaken by the U.S. Office of Education in the spring of 1970. The objective of the project was to gather detailed information and to produce a descriptive analysis of the methodologies employed by teachers in the teaching of initial reading to Spanish-speaking children. The manual is based on research reports from four project sites in Texas, as well as on information gathered from videotapes made in Texas and Mexico. Subjects treated are "The Bilingual Child's Right to Read," "Initial Reading in Spanish for Bilinguals," "Pre-Reading Period," and "The Introduction of Letters." A bibliography, a list of book suggestions, and an index are included.

Orvik, James M. *A Study of English Vocabulary Comparing Eskimo and Caucasian Children*. Final Rept. Fairbanks: Univ. of Alaska, 1973, 9p [EDRS Price: MF-\$0.65, PC-\$3.29; ED 072 705.]

The purpose of this study is to assess the English vocabulary of Eskimo pupils entering a bilingual education program by establishing a normative criterion based on the vocabulary levels of children whose first language is English. The tests used, "Ravens Coloured Progressive Matrices" and English Receptive Vocabulary, bear out the anticipated differences; a norm is established for Eskimo children although there is considerable difference between the two language groups. The discussion of results raises the possibility that cultural factors in test-taking behavior influence score differences in nonverbal domains of intellectual functioning.

Stabb, Martin S., et al. *Conference Report on "Aqui se habla español:" A Conference on the Role of Educational Institutions in Solving Problems Related to the Identity, Status and Future of Spanish-Speaking People of the United States*. University Park: Pa. State Univ., 1972. 48p [EDRS Price: MF-\$0.65, PC-\$3.29; ED 071 514.]

This conference sought to bring to the attention of a broad audience of educators the problems facing Spanish-speaking people in this country. The speakers, including Congressman Herman Badillo of New York, all agreed that not enough was being done to assist the person of Spanish background in adapting to a new and foreign culture, and presented specific examples of problems which arise in this clash between two cultures. The conference concluded that much more had to be done to aid the Spanish-speaking person, especially in the field of bilingual education. The appendixes, which amount

to almost half the report, provide a roster of participants, a list of Puerto Rican Studies Programs in the Delaware Valley, a statewide design for bilingual education, and a selected bibliography.

Stafford, Kenneth R. *Types of Bilingualism and Performance of Navaho Children in School, Phase II*. Final Rept. Tempe: Ariz. State Univ., 1972. 24p [EDRS Price: MF-\$0.65, PC-\$3.29; ED 072 706.]

This study is one of a series on cognitive behavior related to lingual types among Navaho children. The present work was aimed at gaining additional descriptive data regarding the effects of lingual types (compound bilingual, English-speaking monolingual, and Navaho-speaking monolingual) on school achievement as measured by the Metropolitan Achievement Tests. Additionally, information was gained about (1) IQ score discrepancies resulting from the use of different types of tests, (2) the best predictors of school success, and (3) the effects of early English instruction. The following recommendations were made: (1) suitable, specific instruction in English should be provided to Navaho children unfamiliar with the English language and culture preliminary to other school instruction; (2) in evaluating the intelligence and learning ability of these children, measures should be used which motivate and accurately reflect ability or potential achievement; and (3) a curriculum for the early school years which incorporates the Navaho culture and heritage and involves wide use of Navaho teachers should be developed. The study includes some fourteen tables for the presentation of statistical data and a list of references.

Content Analysis Schedules

These *Content Analysis Schedules for Bilingual Education Programs* present information on the history, funding, and scope of various projects. In an attempt to standardize data pertaining to those programs, a twenty-page questionnaire was developed by Hunter College of the City University of New York and set to project directors, who returned the completed forms with additional material specific to their programs. Included in the schedules are sociolinguistic process variables such as the native and dominant languages and their interaction, information on staff selection, and the linguistic backgrounds of project teachers. Assessments are made of the duration and extent of the bilingual components and the methods of language teaching in general. The reports include an analysis of materials, student groupings, tutoring, curriculum patterns, and cognitive development; and discuss self-esteem, learning strategies, the bicultural and community components, and means of evaluation. The following schedules, identified below by subtitles, have recently been processed into the ERIC system; in each case, the EDRS prices are MF-\$0.65, PC-\$3.29.

BICEP Intercambio de la cultura. 1972. 54p [San Bernardino, Calif.; Spanish.] ED 072 708.

Bilingual Education Program. 1971. 41p [Providence, R.I.; Portuguese.] ED 072 713.

Bilingual Instruction for Spanish-Speaking Pupils. 1971. 39p [Marysville, Calif.; Spanish.] ED 072 698.

Bilingualism for Conceptualization of Learning. 1972. 30p [Laredo, Tex.; Spanish.] ED 072 709.

- Brentwood Bilingual Education Project.* 1972. 42p [Brentwood, Calif.; Spanish.] ED 072 712.
- Catch-Up.* 1971. 23p [Zapata, Tex.; Spanish.] ED 072 701.
- Cherokee Bilingual Education Program.* 1972. 43p [Tahlequah, Okla.; Cherokee.] ED 072 704.
- Collier County Bilingual Project.* 1972. 37p [Naples, Fla.; Spanish.] ED 072 715.
- Española Bilingual Education Program.* 1972. 51p [Española, N. Mex.; Spanish.] ED 072 711.
- HABLA—Helping Advance Bilingual Learning in Abernathy.* 1971. 49p [Abernathy, Tex.; Spanish.] ED 072 714.
- Let's Be Amigos.* 1972. 99p [Philadelphia, Pa.; Spanish.] ED 072702.
- Pilot Bilingual Program, Grades 1-2-3.* 1971. 54p [Redwood City, Calif.; Spanish.] ED 072 703.
- Portuguese Bilingual-Bicultural Project.* 1972. 31p [Artesia, Calif.; Portuguese.] ED 072 699.
- Programa en dos lenguas.* 1971. 49p [Fort Worth, Tex.; Spanish.] ED 072 710.
- Santa Barbara County Bilingual Project.* 1972. 56p [Santa Barbara, Calif.; Spanish.] ED 072 716.

Newsletters

Materiales en Marcha para el Esfuerzo Bilingüe—Bicultural is a monthly newsletter published by San Diego City Schools (California). It seeks to promote the concept of bilingual/bicultural education. Many of the articles appear both in English and Spanish. Following is a list of several issues recently processed into the ERIC system.

July 1972. 22p [EDRS Price: MF-\$0.65, PC-\$3.29; ED 073 719.]

Among the articles in this issue are "McGuffey, Move Over," "Nacho and Other Friends," "Naturaleza y Sociedad for First-Grade Social Studies," and "Field-Testing Favorites." Appended are lists of distributors of educational materials in Spanish and Portuguese, and recommended instructional materials.

August 1972. 22p [EDRS Price: MF-\$0.65, PC-\$3.29; ED 073 718.]

"Steps Toward Effective Bilingualism," "A 'Used' Teacher's View of New Language Arts Materials," "Rich Resources for Reading" and "Tidbits to Turn On Science Students and Teachers," are some of the articles featured in this issue. Other sections include book reviews, a list of recommended reading materials, and a list of distributors of educational materials in Spanish and Portuguese.

October 1972. 18p [EDRS Price: MF-\$0.65, PC-\$3.29. ED 073 716.]

Papers appearing in the October issue include "Selection of Social Studies Resources," "Capturing a Child's Fancy: Read-Aloud Books," and "Ana's and Marta's Toast to Second-Grade Social Studies." Recommended reading materials in the fields of elementary Mexican history, second-grade social studies, and short stories are given. Appended is a list of distributors of educational materials in Spanish and English.

December 1972. 24p [EDRS Price: MF-\$0.65, PC-\$3.29; ED 073 726.]

Included in this issue, among other articles, are "Political Power and Bilingualism: "Saturday Fun for Joao and María," "Student Selected Geography Texts," and "To Become Aware of One's Reality," as well as a list of distributors of educational materials in Spanish and Portuguese.

ENGLISH (Foreign Language)

Decker, Donald M. "The Use and Teaching of English in Mexico." 1972. 97p [Unpub. paper.] [EDRS Price: MF-\$0.65, PC-\$3.29; ED 071 506.]

In Mexico, the teaching of English surpasses the teaching of all other foreign languages together and extends widely throughout Mexican educational institutions from nursery schools to universities. This report provides specific details on the use of English in Mexico and describes English language instruction at all levels, in public and private schools, universities, binational centers, and in private institutes by private teachers. Descriptions of the various levels include course and program details, and remarks concerning teachers, students, and textbooks.

Olsson, Margareta. *Intelligibility: A Study of Errors and Their Importance*. Gothenburg, Sweden: Gothenburg School of Education; Gothenburg Univ., 1972. 153p [EDRS Price: MF-\$0.65, PC-\$6.58; ED 072 681.]

This experiment continues the GUME experiments investigating methods for teaching English to Swedish school pupils. The aims of this particular study are twofold: (1) to analyze and classify the errors made by Swedish pupils in an oral English test in an effort to establish error patterns; and (2) to describe how the twelve most frequent errors in a systematic classification of errors are used to form the basis of an acceptability and an intelligibility test, which is subsequently submitted to native Englishmen.

Such an experiment raises the possibility that the objectives of intelligibility and communicative comprehension may be more important than grammatical correctness. Included here are reports on the oral tests administered to Swedish students, the analysis of error patterns, the intelligibility experiment with English informants, conclusions, and discussion of implications. Appendixes provide additional details.

Seshadri, C.K. "TESOL and Spoken English in the Indian Context." *Journal of the Mahuraja Sayajirao Univ. of Baroda* (India) 19 (Spr 1970). 6p [EDRS Price: MF-\$0.65, PC-\$3.29; ED 071 470.]

This paper examines the belief that the best way of teaching English-as-a-second language (TESL) is to provide the student with opportunities for hearing and speaking "standard" English. In India, it is noted, the greatest single difficulty for students is the acquisition of oral English skills. The lack of any direct, positive transfer of linguistic theory to the development of TESL instructional materials is criticized. The educational problems engendered by teaching students to speak English before reading the language are discussed, and concluding remarks point out the need for a revision in Indian educational policy concerning TESOL.

ENGLISH (Second Language)

Colflesh, Madeline. *Curriculum Guide for Non-English Speakers, Grades 9-10*. West Chester, Pa.: West Chester School District, 1972. 51p [EDRS Price: MF-\$0.65, PC-\$3.29; ED 071 521.]

This curriculum guide for English describes an individualized program for Spanish-speaking students aged fourteen through seventeen, but it can be adapted for speakers of other languages. It outlines a program for all ability levels, except those classified as retarded educable. It formulates thirty-six lessons for four subjects: English, mathematics, history, and science. A bibliography is included.

Norris, William E. *TESOL at the Beginning of the 70's: Trends, Topics, and Research Needs*. Pittsburgh, Pa.: Univ. of Pittsburgh, 1972. 50p [Rev. cd.] [EDRS Price: MF-\$0.65, PC-Not available from EDRS; ED 072 696.]

This report presents an overview of the field of teaching English to speakers of other languages (TESOL) with particular focus on the recent shift of attention among American TESOL specialists toward the U.S. domestic scene. The first section summarizes the results of a survey of TESOL at the beginning of the 1970's; main trends and topics in the field are identified and their educational significance is discussed. The second part lists and assigns priorities to those current topics which are most in need of investigation and development. The subgroups of TESOL specialists who are most concerned with each topic are also indicated.

LINGUISTIC STUDIES

Lotz, John. *Two Papers on English-Hungarian Contrastive Phonology*. Washington, D. C.: Center for Applied Linguistics; Budapest: Hungarian Academy of Sciences, 1972. 11p [EDRS Price: MF-\$0.65, PC-\$3.29; ED 072 688.]

The two papers in this booklet comprise part of the research in the Hungarian-English Contrastive Linguistics Project, which is concerned with investigating the differences and similarities between the two languages with implications for second language acquisition. The first paper compares the obstruent clusters in English and Hungarian, especially from a morphophonemic point of view; the second paper compares the glides or semivowels in English and Hungarian.

Metcalf, Allan A., et al. *Riverside English: The Spoken Language of a Southern California Community*. Riverside: Univ. of Calif., 1971. 44p [EDRS Price: MF-\$0.65, PC-\$3.29; ED 071 464.]

This booklet points out some of the characteristics of the varieties of English spoken in Riverside and in the rest of California. The first chapter provides a general discussion of language variation and change on the levels of vocabulary, pronunciation, and grammar. The second chapter discusses California English and pronunciation and vocabulary characteristics of different areas. Chapter three considers the findings of the Linguistic Atlas of the Pacific Coast survey made in the 1950's and a more recent survey made in Riverside using an interview technique similar to but shorter than

the Linguistic Atlas survey. Trends evident from the comparison of the two surveys indicate a move toward homogeneity, "spelling pronunciations," and greater influence from the Midlands and the South. The final chapter deals with non-regional variations that can be attributed to age, sex, occupation, social class, or ethnic group. A bibliography is included.

Now **REGENTS** *offers*

cassette and tape recordings

for all the

DIXSON Series*

and other well-known texts:

- * COMPLETE COURSE IN ENGLISH SERIES
LADO ENGLISH SERIES
- * MODERN AMERICAN ENGLISH SERIES
WELCOME TO ENGLISH SERIES
- * EVERYDAY DIALOGUES IN ENGLISH
- * EXERCISES IN ENGLISH CONVERSATION Books 1 and 2
PRACTICAL CONVERSATION IN ENGLISH SERIES
SKITS IN ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE
- * EASY READING SELECTIONS
- * ELEMENTARY READER IN ENGLISH
- * MODERN SHORT STORIES
- * THE AMERICAN CLASSICS (10 titles)
- * PRONUNCIATION EXERCISES IN ENGLISH
- * ORAL PATTERN DRILLS IN FUNDAMENTAL ENGLISH
P.A.L. PROGRESSIVE AUDIO-LINGUAL DRILLS IN ENGLISH

For the Spanish-Speaking Student:

- * CURSO COMPLETO DE INGLES
- * CURSO PRACTICO DE PRONUNCIACION
ESTUDIOS DE INGLES INTERMEDIO-AVANZADO
- * INGLES PRACTICO SIN MAESTRO
INVITACION AL INGLES

For full details please write to:

REGENTS PUBLISHING CO., INC.

2 Park Avenue

New York, N. Y. 10016

U.S.A.

DEVELOPING FLUENCY IN ENGLISH

R. Crymes, H. Taylor, both of the University of Hawaii; L. Smith, East-West Center; G. James, Kyoto YMCA Gakuin

For intermediate and advanced students of English as a second language. Designed to improve fluency in English through practice in listening and speaking with emphasis on what is said, and through exercises incorporating systematic presentation of the major nominalization processes in English.

April 1974 approx. 256pp. \$5.95

SPEECH IMPROVEMENT

M.J. Gordon, Kapiolani Community College, University of Hawaii

A practical guide designed to help both native and non-native speakers of English overcome problems in articulation, rhythm, and intonation. Excellent for use in group speech therapy programs or as a resource book for practicum courses in speech correction.

January 1974 approx. 464pp. \$10.95

UTTERANCE-RESPONSE DRILLS FOR STUDENTS OF ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE

J.B. Alter, R.W. Collier, and M.T. Steinberg, all of the University of Hawaii. 1967 129pp. \$4.95

LETTERS FROM ROGER: Exercises in Communication

R.N. Campbell, University of California, L.A.; and M. Bracy. 1972 140pp. \$3.95

READING AND WORD STUDY: For Students of English as a Second Language

K. Croft, San Francisco State College. 1960 353pp. \$4.95

USING ENGLISH: Your Second Language

D. Danielson, San Francisco State College; R.E. Hayden, University Extension, University of California, Berkeley 1973 approx. 288pp. \$5.25

READING IN ENGLISH: For Students of English as a Second Language

D. Danielson, San Francisco State College; R.E. Hayden, University Extension, University of California, Berkeley. 1961 242pp. \$5.25

MODERN ENGLISH: A Practical Reference Guide

M. Frank, New York University. 1972 448pp. \$5.35

MODERN ENGLISH: Exercises for Non-Native Speakers, Part I and Part II

M. Frank, New York University.

Part I: 1972 224pp. \$4.95

Part II: 1972 192pp. \$4.25

A MANUAL FOR SPEECH IMPROVEMENT

M.J. Gordon, H. Wong, both of the University of Hawaii. 1961 172pp. \$5.35

READING IMPROVEMENT EXERCISES: For Students of English as a Second Language

D.P. Harris, Georgetown University. 1966 178pp. \$3.95

MASTERING AMERICAN ENGLISH: A Handbook-Workbook of Essentials

R.E. Hayden, University Extension, University of California, Berkeley; D.W. Pilgrim, San Francisco State College, Loop Branch. 1956 260pp. \$5.50

RAPID REVIEW OF ENGLISH GRAMMAR: For Students of English as a Second Language

J. Praninskas, American University of Beirut, Lebanon. 1959 310pp. \$5.95

PRENTICE-HALL

ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE

For further information write:

Robert Jordan, Box J-780, College Division, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey 07632

PRENTICE-HALL, INC.

Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey 07632

English as a Second Language. The Language Master[®] System starts them fast.

English doesn't agree with all tongues. Its sound system can seem without rules. Always presenting new contradictions. □ You've got to give students a base quickly. Or they're bored. Hostile. □ That's where the Language Master System really shines. Students set their own pace. Hear their responses. Getting immediate reward and reinforcement. □ The English as a Second Language program covers Pronunciation and Contrasts. Verb Structure Practice. Stressing manipulation of the language in everyday contexts. □ Getting them ready for the over 50 other programs. Full information is available from your Bell & Howell dealer.

AUDIO VISUAL PRODUCTS DIVISION
7100 McCormick Road, Chicago, Illinois 60645

 **BELL & HOWELL**



COMING SOON!

ENGLISH

900

REVISED EDITION

by

English Language Services, Inc.

For more information write to:

COLLIER MACMILLAN INTERNATIONAL, INC.

866 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022