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Language Choice in Bilingual Classrooms

Dorothy Legarreta

This article discusses language choices in Spanish bilingual classrooms, based on observations in five kindergartens. The stated objectives for language choice, i.e.: 50% Spanish & 50% English, are compared to actual percentages of Spanish and English used by the adults and children. The amount of teacher talk was also compared to pupil talk, including both "free" pupil responses and choral responses. Functions of teacher language, such as warming or accepting, directing, and correcting children, were also examined in terms of percentages of Spanish and English chosen.

Two models were observed, the Concurrent Translation and Alternate Days. In the Concurrent Translation model, it was found that: (1) English is used by bilingual teachers over 70% of total class time; (2) that Spanish-speaking pupils responded with very similar language choices; (3) that teacher talk comprises 80–85% of classroom talk; and (4) that English is again the usual choice for warming or accepting the child's contribution, for directing, and for correcting the children. In contrast, the Alternate Days model generated an equal distribution of Spanish and English by teachers and children overall, with more Spanish used for warming and directing. Again, English was the primary choice for correcting children.

It appears that the Concurrent Translation model does not achieve balanced use (50% Spanish and 50% English) by teachers or pupils.

Bilingual theorists and educators agree that the crucial variable in an optimal bilingual classroom is the extent to which the minority child's vernacular is used throughout the curriculum (Andersson and Boyer 1970: 69–124; Mackey 1970: 66–72; Gaarder 1970: 136–178). The usual rule of thumb is that the child's native language should be utilized equally overall with the dominant language (UNESCO 1953: 68–70).

Unfortunately, little quantitative assessment of language choices in bilingual classrooms has been reported. Instead, most studies use anecdotal or impressionistic data based on self-report by bilingual teachers. For example, Lesley (1972: 68–72) collected data on 21 bilingual programs in California. Teachers in three classrooms reported using less than 25% English overall; 12 reported using 50–75% English, and six used English over 75% of the time. Unfortunately, self-report by balanced bilingual speakers is unreliable, since many such speakers are not consciously aware of which language they are using at any given time (Gumperz 1970: 6, 7).

Townsend (1974:viii) did use a quantitative instrument, Interaction Analysis (Flanders 1970: 28-53), to code 30 bilingual preschool teachers
and aides as each taught one Spanish and one English lesson. He found that teachers used significantly more praise and gave more directions during the English lesson, but asked more questions as well as gave more corrections of pupil responses, in the Spanish lesson.

There is other evidence that language choice by adults in bilingual classrooms may shift when the context of use changes. Impressionistic data gathered by Lesley (1972:71–72) indicate that English was the language chosen for formal instruction in the core subjects of mathematics and reading, with Spanish reserved for electives. Shultz (1975:18) found that teachers in bilingual classrooms tend to speak Spanish in a conscious and deliberate marked manner, while using English spontaneously in a casual, unmarked manner. If there are, indeed, different sets of sociolinguistic “rules” of discourse in bilingual classrooms which are generated by teachers’ language choices, bilingual children new to formal educational settings may need to be sensitive to these to succeed in school.

We do know that children quickly learn the relative importance of their own vernacular vis à vis the dominant language of the school by noting how much, and in what contexts, it is used by the teachers at school. Examples of such teacher ratings made overt are the choice of language used to address other adults or classroom visitors, or the language choice in notes to parents. One bilingual program has these directions under “Curriculum Teaching Strategies”:

> The teacher should address other adults in Spanish in order to show the children that the language has prestige among adults. The teacher should be particularly careful to address outside visitors who know Spanish in this language.

(Ramirez 1972:136)

In this study, quantitative language choices by teachers and pupils in Spanish bilingual kindergarten classrooms were examined. The questions to be answered were:

1. What are the actual percentages of Spanish and English used by the teacher/aide in a complete class session? (Usually just under three hours.)
2. What were the language choices of Spanish-speaking pupils and English-speaking pupils when speaking to the teacher/aide?
3. Did these language choices reflect shifts in language use by the kindergarten pupils?
4. How much pupil talk occurs in bilingual classrooms compared to teacher talk?
5. What language does the teacher/aide choose for: (a) solidarity functions, e.g., warming, accepting, or amplifying pupil talk; (b) directing pupils; and (c) distancing functions, e.g., correcting pupils or “cooling” the atmosphere in the classroom?

The observation procedure used in this study was an adaptation of Flanders’ Multiple Coding System (1970: 28–53), using categories from the Reciprocal Category System (Ober 1971: 37–86).
The investigation in November and December of 1974 included all the Spanish bilingual kindergarten classes, six in number, in a large California city serving a very diverse ethnic population. Four of the classrooms (one, two, three and four) followed an “open classroom” model in widely varying degrees; each utilized Concurrent Translation, i.e., presenting material alternately in each language. One classroom (five) was more structured and used a modification of the “Alternate Days” approach (Tucker, Otanes, Sibayan 1970: 281–285). One day English was used until recess, then Spanish until dismissal. The next day Spanish was used until recess, then English until dismissal, and so on. One concurrent translation classroom (six) proved impossible for one person to code, since at least five activities went on simultaneously. Teachers in all classrooms indicated that each language was expected to be used 50% of the time. The ethnic mix in each classroom was fairly consistent: about 65% native Spanish-speaking children. Four of the teachers were native Spanish speakers, the remaining one was very fluent, and all classrooms had native Spanish-speaking aides. Three of the classrooms (two, three and four) had self-contained formal English-as-a-second-language (ESL) training about 20 minutes per day. Spanish-as-second-language (SSL) was also offered, in varying degrees, in most classrooms. On the days that were observed or coded, a bilingual television program provided the SSL in two programs, another used the Michigan Oral materials in Spanish for 20 minutes, another teacher made her own materials, while two planned to start SSL later in the year.

Coding in the concurrent translation classrooms covered a complete one-day class session (two-and-one-half hours coded at three-second intervals). The recess was not coded. The Alternate Days coding spanned two consecutive days, in order to equalize the time blocks devoted to each language, since recess, which marked a language switch, was not at midpoint in the session. An average of 800 total talk tallies were recorded for each of the concurrent classrooms, indicating about 40 minutes of teacher-pupil interaction per class session.

Results and Discussion

1. What are the actual percentages of total teacher/aide talk in Spanish and in English in a complete class session?

In the four classrooms utilizing concurrent translation as the language model (one, two, three, and four), English was spoken most of the time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom</th>
<th>Total Tallies</th>
<th>% of Total Teacher/Aide Talk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,170</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 1: Total Teacher Talk
The range was 59-84%, with an average of 72% English used during a typical session. In contrast, the Alternate Periods model (five) produced nearly equal amounts of English and Spanish.

Judging from classrooms, it appears that the concurrent translation model does not achieve balanced language use by teachers and aides.

2. What were the language choices of Spanish-speaking children when they spoke to the teacher/aide?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom</th>
<th>Total Tallies</th>
<th>% of Spanish Speaking Pupils Responses In Spanish</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By inspection of Table 2, it can be seen that Spanish-speaking children spoke English to the teacher/aide an average of 71% of the time in the concurrent translation classrooms (one, two, three, and four), with the range being 52–93%. Again, the Alternate Days classroom (five) maintained parity in language choice by pupils.

There was considerable symmetry between teacher talk and Spanish-speaking pupil talk in all classrooms considered.

It appears that Spanish-speaking children reflect the language choices of teacher/aide, regardless of the bilingual model used (concurrent translation or alternate days).

English-speaking children do not appear on the Table, since they chose to speak Spanish very, very infrequently. The handful of recurrences were stereotyped responses to greetings in Spanish, or in choral response during the Spanish-as-second-language component in two programs. No instances of spontaneous use of Spanish by Anglo children were noted in the data gathering.

3. How much total pupil speech (Spanish plus English) occurs in bilingual classrooms?
   a. How does this compare with the amount of teacher talk?
   b. How much of total pupil talk is choral response, i.e., repetition by the pupil group of material cued by the teacher: “Children, say: Today is Monday. . . .” or (holding up picture of cat) “What is Children?” . . .

Total pupil talk appears to comprise a small percentage, as compared to total talk. The range was 11–30%; and the average was 21%. When the amount of choral response was subtracted, the average of total pupil talk
TABLE 3
Total of All Pupil Talk, Individual and Choral, as Percentage of Total Classroom Talk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom</th>
<th>Total Talk Plus Pupil Talk</th>
<th>Percentage of Pupil Talk Over Total Talk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raw Tallies</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,096</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,521</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...drops to 15% of total talk. Bearing in mind that class size averaged 26 pupils, it appears that the teacher dominates classroom discourse rather completely, as has been noted in other subject matter areas and at other grade levels (Flanders 1967: 285; Bellack 1966: 84–85).

4. What language does the teacher/aide choose for warming, accepting, or amplifying pupil remarks?

TABLE 4
Teacher Language Choice for Warming, Accepting, or Amplifying Pupil Speech

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom</th>
<th>Total Number Of Events</th>
<th>Total Percentage English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...It appears that teachers/aides choose English 77% of the time on the average (range 51–94%) as the language to express acceptance or solidarity in bilingual classrooms using concurrent translation. Only one classroom in this model (four) used nearly equal amounts of Spanish and English. In contrast, the alternate period model teacher/aide used much more Spanish than English (72 versus 28%) for warming, accepting, or amplifying pupil statements.

TABLE 5
Teacher Language Choice to Direct Pupils

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom</th>
<th>Total Number Of Events</th>
<th>Total Percentage In</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4b. What language does the teacher/aide choose for directing pupils?
In the concurrent translation classrooms, English was again the choice, 72%, of the time on average. In contrast, in the alternate periods model (five), adults used English 38% of the time to direct pupils.

4c. What language does the teacher/aide used for correcting pupils or “cooling” the classroom?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Language Choice to Correct or “Cool” Pupils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

English was utilized overwhelmingly in all classrooms using concurrent translation for all disciplinary speech. The average was 76%. This preponderant use of English held up in the alternate periods model as well, though to a lesser extent.

It appears that in bilingual classrooms using a concurrent translation format for language, the teachers/aides speak English 72% of the time on the average. This apparently serves as a model to native Spanish-speaking pupils, who speak to the teacher/aide 71% of the time in English.

This represents a dramatic shift in language use by Spanish-speaking five-year-olds. In the short span of about nine weeks of formal schooling, children who speak only Spanish in their homes, neighborhoods and churches, are apparently already reflecting the vastly different language input in the schools by bilingual teachers/aides.

When we look at the choices made by the teachers/aides in the concurrent translation model for the basic, important language functions in the classroom, we can begin to see the nature of the impetus for this rapid change. For example, instead of using the vernacular Spanish of the majority of the pupils to express solidarity (warming, accepting, amplifying), the teacher/aides chose to use English 77% of the time. Directives for classroom instruction, very important to beginners in formal education, were given in English 72% of the time. Finally, 76% of all disciplinary speech was given in English. Indeed, the major reason teachers/aides switched from Spanish to English was to correct pupil misbehavior. This phenomenon was also noted by Shultz (1975: 18) who saw it as another example of an implicit decision by bilingual staff that English was the “advantageous and natural language of the classroom.”

---

2A Pupil’s Language Use Inventory (Fishman et al. 1971: 157-176) given in Spanish to all Spanish-speaking pupils indicated that Spanish was spoken overwhelmingly (95%) in the domains of home, neighborhood, church and recess.
Recall that the ethnic mix in the bilingual classrooms was 65% Spanish-speaking, with about half of these children being monolingual Spanish. It seems fair to conclude that the language choices of the teachers/aides in the concurrent translation model were far from optimal: they did not reflect the classroom ethnic mix, nor the communicative repertoires of the majority of pupils served, nor the goals of bilingual education. Instead of producing bilingual pupils, a language environment so heavily English-dominated discriminates against Spanish-speaking pupils and discourages Anglo pupils from learning Spanish as well. Rather than being bilingual education, capitalizing on the unique linguistic and cultural backgrounds of Latino children, the concurrent translation model studied here is a rapid transition-to-English program, Despite a sincere and conscious commitment to bilingual teaching by the teachers/aides, they seem overwhelmed by the pull of the dominant language and the dominant culture, with the result that English again becomes the classroom language.

The investigator recommends that the alternate periods model be utilized more generally, since it appears far more likely to foster the objectives of bilingual education than does concurrent translation. This model maintained equivalency between Spanish and English, both in teacher talk and pupil talk. In addition, solidarity functions of language were generally in the child's vernacular, while cooling and correcting functions were more equal in each language than in the concurrent translation classrooms. Additionally, a consistent language model was presented to the pupils, with switching occurring very infrequently.

The investigator further recommends that the model of the totally open classroom which proved impossible for one person to code also be investigated further. Numerical data were gathered from coding two adults out of four and indicated that somewhat over 50% of classroom teacher talk was in Spanish. The absence of teacher domination and of choral response or elicited repetition was refreshing, and the extent of peer speech and interaction was unequaled in other classrooms. Children worked at interesting tasks in groups formed spontaneously, while children needing work in content areas were invited to complete reading and math units available in Spanish and English. Since a variety of activities was going on at all times, the necessary opportunities for language practice in meaningful situations was maximal.

It seems to the investigator that an alternate periods language format in such an open classroom would be the ideal bilingual classroom.
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Beyond RASHOMON—Conceptualizing and Describing the Teaching Act

John F. Fanselow

When teachers, supervisors, employers, students or salespeople discuss the same lessons, texts, tests, methods and schools of language teaching, they often sound like the characters in the Japanese movie, Rashomon—they each give contradictory and equivocal accounts of the same events or items. To classify the communications people send and receive in both teaching and non-teaching settings so that we can move beyond Rashomon, and give similar accounts of the same events, an instrument has been developed called FOCUS, an acronym for Foci for Observing Communications Used in Settings. The language of FOCUS is technical: composed of operationally defined terms that are non-judgmental.

One purpose of the article is to teach the five characteristics of communications that are noted with FOCUS, provide a rationale for each and suggest applications of the instrument for teachers, teacher trainers, supervisors and researchers. Another purpose is to argue that the teaching act is not a mystery that defies precise and rational description and that we can learn a great deal about how to teach by analyzing descriptions that show how practicing teachers and their students communicate both in the classroom and outside the classroom at parties, on the job and at home.

In The Silent Language, Edward Hall describes three types of learning: formal, informal and technical (1959). Formal instruction is prescriptive, outlining what should and should not be done and judging the degree of approximation to a model. Informal instruction depends on models presented for imitation. Technical instruction depends on an explicit description and classification of what is to be learned, conveyed in a vocabulary of operationally defined terms; it is non-judgmental.

To illustrate these three types of learning, Hall uses the example of skiing. In a village where all have to ski to get around, children learn to ski mainly by watching their parents—informal learning. Weekend skiers in the same village learn mainly by being admonished with judgments and prescriptions as they ski—formal learning. One learns skiing technically through explicit labels. These labels are based on a description, classification and analysis of the patterned behaviors of skiers and are nonjudgmental.

Though all three types of learning exist in various proportions in all learning situations, formal and informal learning dominate the practica in the pre-service and in-service education of most second language teachers. Some programs are entirely formal, relying solely on injunction. In other programs, judgments and prescriptions (formal) are presented along with

Mr. Fanselow is Coordinator, TESOL Program, Teachers College, Columbia University, and Associate Professor, Language and Education. In 1975–76 he was Second Vice President of TESOL and Program Chairman of the 1976 TESOL Convention in New York City.
demonstration lessons or micro lessons (informal). We have all heard these admonitions: “Your pace was good, but you have to be more attentive to those in the back” or “I think my voice sounds odd, and I have to get some of that weight off” or “Be sure not to ever write an error on the blackboard, but give a lot of praise.” The philosophy of many teacher educators, supervisors and employers seems to be that teachers will get the hang of teaching if they teach, look at enough classes and listen to enough admonitions.

Few seem to believe that teachers will get the hang of linguistics. Perhaps this is why technical teaching in most second language teacher education programs has for the most part been reserved for various aspects of linguistics, the technical language used to describe the content second language teachers are expected to teach. Thus, most second language teachers have been exposed to the technical language of phonology, morphology, and syntax and some even know the technical language of sociolinguistics and psycholinguistics. The terms used in these technical languages have precise meanings that receive wide consent.

No technical language exists to designate the teaching behavior in second language learning settings. The vocabulary used to discuss language teaching, textbooks and tests is composed of such words as drill, reinforcement, mechanical, communicate, pace, audio-lingual, situational reinforcement, words that are ill-defined and inconsistently used. We have phonemes and morphemes but no teachemes.¹

The lack of a technical language to discuss the informal teaching done in demonstration lessons and micro-teaching and the formal teaching that occurs when we judge and critique a lesson we have seen leads to a situation analogous to one in the Japanese movie Rashomon, where four people give contradictory and equivocal accounts and interpretations of an event they have all witnessed. Like the characters in the movie, second language teachers and supervisors, when pressed to defend their accounts, interpretations, and judgments after a lesson, highlight behaviors, exercises, and communications that support their point of view, even though such items may be infrequent and even incidental to the central event.

Without a common unit of analysis or operationally defined words that are part of an overall shared concept, each viewer is bound to see events through his own perceptions and preconceived notions. Consequently, the words he uses to describe each teaching act will often have meanings that do not coincide with the meanings attached to them by another viewer. As a result, technical instruction is impossible, and these types of discussion can lead to little more than the advocacy of one particular theory over another or to the superiority of one type of exercise over another. Without technical language one cannot develop a description of what teachers and students actually do, compare lessons, methods or different “schools”

¹ I first heard this term from Professor Austerlitz, Department of Linguistics, Columbia University, during a discussion of my research on the teaching act.
of language teaching or see the relationship between what was done and
the teacher’s intentions. Nor can one see the extent to which classroom
behaviors reflect a theory of language teaching or measure the effect on
learning of particular communications.

In my view, we need a technical language for the teaching act equal
to the technical language used to teach content. To this end, I have de-
volved a conceptual framework and set of terms for classifying, creating
and evaluating communications in a range of settings. This system is called
FOCUS, an acronym for Foci for Observing Communications Used in Set-
tings. In this system, communicatins both inside and outside of the class-
room are seen as a series of patterned events in which two or more people
use mediums such as speech, gestures, noise, or writing to evaluate, inter-
pret and in other ways communicate separate areas of content such as the
meaning of words, personal feelings, or classroom procedure, for one of
four pedagogical purposes: structuring, soliciting, responding, and reacting.
Therefore, FOCUS distinguishes five characteristics of communications: the
source, the medium, the use, the content and the pedagogical purpose.

Though I do not have a technical language to code the settings in
which communications are made I do note the setting and some details
of it since the setting has such a strong effect on determining patterns of
characteristics of communications. A bar produces patterns impossible in
most teaching settings, and a confessional calls forth communications that
could never be made in a toll booth. The word setting in the acronym
FOCUS highlights the importance of noting the setting in which commu-
nications take place.

I note the pedagogical purpose of communications in FOCUS because
this characteristic determines the basic unit of analysis, the move (Bellack,
et al., 1966). Communications that set the stage for subsequent behavior
and exercises or self-directed activities such as reading silently or cleaning
up a classroom on one’s own without being told are structuring moves.
Those communications that set tasks or ask questions are considered so-
licting moves. Performances of set tasks and answers to questions are re-
sponding moves. Communications that modify previous moves, rate them
or are called forth by previous moves are reacting moves. Both context and
source are crucial in determining move boundaries and move types. 3

Names of schools of language teaching, types of skills developed and
names of techniques and methods have been used as basic units of anal-
ysis in previous discussions of language teaching. Thus, one hears of the
audio-lingual methods as opposed to the silent way, situational reinforce-

2 The term “teaching act” must be broader when discussing language teaching than
when discussing other types of teaching. Studying the teaching act of the language
teacher must include study of how we communicate in non-teaching settings as well as
teaching settings since part of our job is to teach our students how to communicate
outside of the classroom, in non-teaching settings.

3 For a guide to learning the moves see Carol Rubin, Self-Instructional Materials
for Learning Bellack’s Moves.
ment and its similarity to the direct method or the relationship between grammar-translation and counselling-learning. In some discussions the interaction between the development of one of the four traditional skills and favorite techniques or methods receives attention. One hears how helpful games can be in the development of reading skills, the utility of songs in developing speaking skills and the advantages of dialogs in fostering face to face language skills, etc.

Using such large units for analysis—the school, the skill, the method—can obscure a great deal. Three teachers may consider themselves members of School 1, practitioners of Method A and believers in the need to develop oral skills before any others. Yet, one teacher shakes students’ hands after many correct responses; another never comments about student performance. A third comments only after a good student’s response and does not react to poor students at all, whether their responses are correct or incorrect. In addition, one of the three teachers who believes in the same school periodically explains the rationale for the method used at the beginning of a class while the other two never do; they begin each class with greetings and personal remarks. Since teachers of the same school may use different behaviors, a smaller unit of analysis than the school is necessary. And if either the preparation for the setting of tasks or feedback have any effect on learning it make sense to use structuring and reacting moves as basic units of analysis rather than schools, skills or types of methods. Since tasks are set and performed or questions are asked and answered in classes no matter what school, method or skill is supportedly involved, it makes sense to use soliciting and responding moves as basic units of analysis as well.

Though the move is defined as a combination having one of four pedagogical purposes it can be used to classify communications in non-teaching settings as well, since we ask and answer questions, comment on what others do and perform self-directed activities in all settings. Thus, we can employ the same basic unit to classify communications both inside and outside of classrooms. As a result, precise comparisons can be made between teaching and non-teaching settings. Since the move has been used in scores of studies of classes other than those in which language is taught, comparisons between patterns of moves in history, science, math and second language classes can also be made.

Categories developed in studies of the functions of language have not been used as the basic unit of analysis both because they usually refer to a series of communications and because deciding between them requires more inference than deciding between move types. Halliday’s classification of the purposes for which we communicate, for example, is helpful in interpreting data discovered by analyzing the characteristics we note (1973). But the categories do not allow for as precise a tabulation as we are interested in.

Simply making tallies of the pedagogical purposes of communications is not as instructive as tallying the source of each communication along
with the purpose. In the latter, we can tell the proportion of moves made by each person in a setting. One believer in Method A may make 100% of the soliciting moves in the class; another may encourage student solicits. If half of the reacting moves are performed by students in one class and only a few in another class this difference in source must be shown. When the solicit “Shut up!” is made by a student to a teacher it has a very different meaning than when made by the teacher to a student. Precise descriptions of these distinctions are not possible using the usual units of analysis such as the school, method or skill.

The boxes in the two columns below are just like items in a substitution table; any box in Column 1 can combine with any box in Column 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column 1 Source*</th>
<th>Column 2 Move Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who communicates?</td>
<td>What is the pedagogical purpose of the communication?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher t</td>
<td>to structure str</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>textbook b</td>
<td>to solicit sol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>informant i</td>
<td>to respond res</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student s</td>
<td>to react rea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>group of students g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>class c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In a non-teaching setting, the sources would of course be different; any abbreviations can be used. On a quiz show an m could be used for the master of ceremonies and a g for guests; in a sandbox c1 could stand for one child and c2 for another.

Using the boxes to note these two characteristics of communication in a conversation has often revealed a pattern of two sources reacting about an equal number of times in my observations. However, in some conversations one source structures constantly and the other person only has a chance to react. In a classroom, the teacher structures, solicits and reacts while the students only respond, while in a tutoring session and in group work in classrooms the students also solicit and react. Of course in a classroom setting without discipline students also react and solicit. The setting in which communications take place has a great effect on determining the patterns of sources and moves. Thus, altering the settings in which language instruction takes place can itself radically change the pattern of behavior that goes on. And altering the patterns of these two characteristics of communication in a class, at a cocktail party or in any other setting will greatly alter the nature of interaction in these settings.
Of course, two classes may show a very similar frequency, sequence and combination of moves and sources and yet be very different. Three teachers may each communicate 200 soliciting moves by setting 200 tasks or asking 200 questions. But if the solicit in one class requires the oral repetition of a word, in another the copying of a word from the blackboard and in still another the phonetic transcription of words, these differences must be noted. Therefore, with FOCUS, in addition to noting the source and pedagogical purpose of communications we note the mediums the moves contain.

Though some might object to McLuhan's famous dictum that the medium is the message, most would agree that a major difference between many communications is that the messages are communicated in different mediums. Showing a picture of an avocado, holding up a real avocado, writing the word avocado in phonetic script or uttering avocado in soliciting moves all may bring an image of a pear shaped food into the minds of those who know the object and its name. But the transcribed words bring no image to the mind of those unfamiliar with phonetic script. And the real avocado may communicate something of the texture and actual size of the avocado in a way the picture does not. In the same way, one may wish to present one's personal displeasure in a reacting move with a comment, a grunt or an agonized look. The comment would communicate displeasure only if the audience understood the words, and the agonized look would communicate only if it were seen. Edmund Carpenter contends that Mendel's theories of genetics were ignored for thirty-five years because they were presented originally in print without visual illustrations (1974). Thus, in FOCUS one reason I note the type of medium is because I assume that different mediums communicating the same content provide different kinds and amounts of information.

I also note the type of medium used because a great range of mediums is used frequently both in teaching and non-teaching settings. When a teacher reacts to an error in tense by putting his right thumb up over his shoulder as if he were hitching a ride and a student reacts by saying "Oh, past!" gesture and speech are both used. Likewise, in a non-teaching setting, a flower given to one's date before dinner communicates just as "How are you?" does. It seems unreasonable to note and classify communications made in speech and ignore those made with other types of mediums such as gestures and flowers.

Noting mediums in moves also provides insight into how messages are communicated. The solicit, "Pick up the book," can mean either "Please pick up the book; nothing is wrong; we just want the book on the desk" or "Pick up the book; you are clumsy; you should not have dropped it" depending on the tone of voice used. In FOCUS, the tone of voice and spoken words are considered two separate mediums. In "Pick up the book" the words are the same whether one is being neutral or showing displeasure. The tone of voice communicates an extra message. People make
evaluations with their tone of voice, their looks and their movements even though the words they utter may simply be stating a fact or giving a command. “It’s not what he said, but how he said it that bothered me” and “Her words said ‘no’ while her eyes said ‘yes’” are two familiar communications that reflect the crucial importance of examining more than the medium of the spoken word alone.

For ease of discussion, the mediums used to communicate content in moves are categorized as linguistic, non-linguistic and para-linguistic. Communications expressed with words, produced by the vocal cords and tongue, or written representations of such communications, constitute linguistic mediums. Communications that are made with instruments or with parts of the body used as an instrument and things made from tools or produced artistically, mechanically, or naturally such as pictures, objects and music are classified non-linguistic. Communications expressed by the body without vocal cords and tongue such as gestures, movement and touch constitute para-linguistic mediums, referred to by some as body language.

On a lower level of analysis, these three major categories are further split into three sub-categories. Mediums that appeal primarily to the ear such as spoken words, intonation, noise, music, and laughing are coded as aural. Those that appeal primarily to the eye such as printed words, phonetic transcriptions, pictures, diagrams, and gestures are coded as visual. Those that appeal to more than one sense or other senses such as touching, distance, dancing, movement, and clothing are classified “other.” Looking at a video tape with the sound off clearly highlights the visual mediums. Listening to an audio recording of conversations or a teaching session clearly highlights aural mediums. Categories of the mediums along with examples are shown in the Tables in Appendix I.

This categorization of mediums is more helpful than a two-way division between verbal and non-verbal seen in much of the literature because this classification allows us to show differences between mediums that are critical in second language settings. We usually do not teach students to draw in language class yet we do teach them gestures. If we did not separate non-linguistic from para-linguistic we would code a class learning gestures and a class learning to draw in the same way since both drawing and gesturing would be considered non-verbal. It is important to show whether students are learning how to communicate with linguistic mediums such as words, para-linguistic mediums such as body language or non-linguistic mediums such as drawings. It is also important to distinguish between aural mediums such as spoken words, music, tone of voice and visual mediums such as print, drawings, and maps because these distinctions show us whether students are developing receptive or productive skills.

Our substitution table now has three columns. The four move types now interact not only with the six major sources but also with the three major categories of mediums and three sub-categories of each. Noting the mediums used in moves by different sources greatly expands the power of FOCUS. Six sources combining with four move types may produce at least
twenty-four distinct groupings. When six sources combine with four move
types and three categories of mediums many more distinct combinations are
possible. Within each category of medium there are three sub-categories:
aural, written, and other, and in each at least ten separate types of mediums
are possible. The number of permutations possible when noting just these
three characteristics is thus extremely large.

Attention to the mediums used to communicate moves not only reveals
a great deal about how different people communicate; it also reveals a great
number of moves that would not ordinarily be noticed because they are
communicated in mediums we frequently fail to note, such as distance,
movement, background noise and other non-linguistic and para-linguistic
mediums that appear in some cases to the eyes and ears and in other cases
to senses other than the eyes or ears such as touch and feeling.

Similar patterns of sources, moves and mediums in separate lessons do
not mean the lessons are the same. A lesson on tense, intonation, adjective
word order, the classification of snakes or students’ views on religion will
develop mastery of different areas of content. Teacher and student moves
that communicate personal feelings must be coded differently from moves
that communicate the theme of Last Tango in Paris or procedures for a
fire drill. Likewise, at a party the topic of a conversation might be personal
feelings about a film or a description of the way the film was made. Therefore,
with FOCUS, in addition to noting the source, pedagogical purpose, and
mediums I note the content the moves contain.

I employ four major categories of content. If some aspect of the target
language is being communicated as an area of study—as information set apart
and being studied, tested, or practiced—the content is labeled language.
The content in the solicit “Give me a match” would be considered language
if it were communicated to test one’s understanding of the words give or
match or to practice the pronunciation of the final sound in match for
example. Language is divided into subcategories representing seven systems
developed in second language classes: contextual, grammatical, literary,
meaning, mechanics of writing, sound, speech production. Categories of
content along with examples are shown in the Tables in Appendix I.

If one said “Give me a match” because one really needed to light a
cigar, the content would be coded life. Expressing formulas such as greetings,
reflections from the imagination, personal feelings or personal information
or general knowledge such as historical dates, prices of cars or issues such
as inflation are all examples of communications that would be considered to
have content of life.

The third category of content, procedure, is employed when mediums are
used to communicate information in one of these sub-categories: administra-
tion, classroom social behavior, language teaching procedure, teaching and
learning rationale. The calling of the roll, disciplining of students, directions
to manipulate language, explanations of the reasons particular exercises are
being done are all examples of communications that would be classified
procedure.
When mediums communicate information that cannot be classified as language, life or procedure the content is coded subject matter, the fourth category of content. Thus if anyone communicates a skill such as knitting, wine tasting, bridge, or cooking or a school subject such as history, biology or mathematics or a survival skill such as how to cash a check or read a lease, the content is classified as subject matter.

For decades, language teachers have been saying that if history teachers and science teachers do not help teach language the students will suffer. During the same decades, many language teachers in Africa and perhaps other areas were saying that the way to teach language was to teach history, science, crafts and other subjects in the target language. Language was therefore not limited to the language classroom nor were the other subjects limited to particular subject matter classes; language and subject matter in the same language were taught hand in hand. Today, this idea is being applied in some classes in the United States and being discussed under the label Language for Special or Specific Purposes. The category subject matter is designed to show teaching of this type.

Each category has sub-categories and each sub-category divisions. The level of category of content one employs depends on the needs one has. If one wants to compare a number of settings to see the extent to which each category is communicated, then only the four major categories need be used. If one is interested in determining the areas of language most frequently communicated in a series of lessons, then the sub-categories shown in the Tables in Appendix I would be employed. If the entire lesson is devoted to a sub-category such as the sound system, then the divisions of the sound system would be called for. In this case, either the usual linguistic divisions of the sound system could be employed or those listed in the Tables in Appendix I.

A central characteristic noted with FOCUS is the use. The use shows how the mediums are used to communicate content. To determine the category of use, the first question is whether the mediums communicate any content. In receptive activities such as silent reading, listening exercises, feeling, tasting or smelling things to sense their texture, flavor or scent, a person is trying to make sense out of content another person communicated; the receiver is not communicating content; the sender is. These receptive activities are coded attend (1).

To distinguish between different categories of productive activities we first ask whether the mediums communicate comments about content or content itself. When speech, print, pictures or other mediums are used to comment on something else we code the communications characterize (2). If speech, print, pictures or other mediums are used to present content itself rather than a comment on content or an item, we code the communication present (3). In a game of bridge, a player can bid “one heart,” “one spade” or “two clubs”; since these statements do not literally mean he has one heart, one spade or two clubs but rather are labels indicating an approximate number of points and number of hearts, spades or clubs, the player is com-
communicating a message about his hand; therefore, these communications would be coded characterize (2). If a player were allowed to say “I have five hearts: the ace, queen, jack, ten and nine, etc.” rather than the label “one heart” he would be communicating messages that would be coded present (3). Activities such as indicating whether communications are the same or different, incorrect or correct or true or false, defining words by giving their attributes, indicating how many syllables a word has or giving categorical labels are all coded characterize (2). Giving directions and asking questions, identifying objects, giving atonyms and synonyms, reading orally, writing dictations, and communicating content of life or subject matter directly are all coded present (3). This distinction has of course been made by others. Most recently, Smith, in a discussion of cognitive interrelations, makes the distinction. The category present (3) represents what he calls an “is a (izza) relationship” (1975: 21). An example would be “Fred is a teacher.” The category characterize (2) represents what he discusses as a “has” relationship or an “is” relationship without the “a.” Examples would be “Fred has long hair” and “Fred is young.”

If the communications do not fit into the categories attend (1), characterize (2), or present (3), we ask whether the communications give an explanation or make an inference. If they do, we code the communications relate (4). Generalizations, giving reasons for behavior, speculating, and making inferences are activities that are coded relate (4). As Long has shown, further classification of this type of communication can be useful (Long et al., 1976).

If the communications do not fit any of these four categories, we assume speech, print, etc. are simply being used to re-present communications another has made in the same medium. If they are used in this way we code them re-present (5). Copying, imitating, paraphrasing, making substitutions in sentences, and changing the word order in sentences are all examples of the category re-present (5). Detailed definitions of these major categories of use as well as the sub-categories, together with examples, are presented in Appendix I and II.

This categorization of uses means that in my conceptualization there are basically only five major kinds of structuring, soliciting, responding and reacting moves possible. Variation in these major kinds of structuring, soliciting, responding and reacting moves comes either from their source, alteration in the mediums and content or in the information given in the surrounding moves. Thus, Class 1 and Class 2 may both respond with the use present 80% of the time. But in Class 1, the medium used in the responses is print while in Class 2 it is speech. And in Class 1, the content is language while in Class 2 it is life. Furthermore, the solicits in Class 1 are communicated with realia while in Class 2 they are presented with speech. The reactions in both Class 1 and Class 2 are all the sub-category of the use characterize called evaluate. But in Class 1 the evaluations are communicated with gestures while in Class 2 the teacher shakes students’ hands so the medium is touch. Finally, when errors are made in Class 1 the teacher
consistently uses the sub-category of characterize called label in solicits that follow the error, e.g., “Use the past tense.” In Class 2, the teacher never uses the category label after errors, simply saying “Again,” but students say the answers. Therefore, the information given after incorrect responses is very different in both classes. In fact, one reason that so many comparison of methods studies have not found many differences in learning in classes exposed to different methods may be simply because the supposedly different methods in fact required the same types of responses from students. Students supposedly exposed to different methods may have been doing mostly the same types of things; and students supposedly exposed to the same method may have been doing different things.

Heretofore, this categorization has not been employed to describe and compare communications in classrooms and other settings. Rather, communications have been called mechanical, meaningful, skill getting, pseudo-communicative, communicative, etc. These distinctions fail to take into account different mental operations demanded by different communications. Saying a word has three syllables, or is a noun, or is different from another word, or is incorrect, or giving it a definition or stating a rule, or inferring or recalling or repeating—all require different mental operations.

Two groups—one in a bar and another in a classroom—may spend hours exchanging data about a sport using gestures, laughing, and passing score cards around—extremely communicative activity! But if one group is using metaphors to describe some team members, making generalizations about why the team is so active, evaluating each other’s generalizations and classifying the attributes of each player, and the other group is simply describing the games they have seen, the communicative activity in each group is very different. It seems as important to note that the participants in each group are using mediums in vastly different ways that reflect different mental operations as to note that the communications in both groups are meaningful or communicative.

Words such as mechanical, meaningful, etc. not only fail to account for different types of mental operations, they also require a high degree of inference. Many are similar to items in rating scales that contain comments such as these: conversation was interesting; teacher was well prepared; teacher achieved goal. Each person’s interpretation of interesting or meaningful is different. Because a technical language such as FOCUS has operationally defined terms it does not require the high degree of inference that words such as meaningful do. Without the use of technical terms, descriptions of communications in and out of classes will invariably include global, imprecise language requiring high inference and leading to varying and often contradictory versions of the same events.

In addition to requiring high inference, words such as meaningful and interesting are loaded; the words themselves have good and bad connotations. If asked to choose, most would no doubt like to teach a class or participate in a conversation that was meaningful and interesting rather than meaningless or uninteresting. Words such as meaningful and interesting are in them-
selves judgmental as well as descriptive. Judgments mean someone's ego is involved, and this can interfere with perception. At the conclusion of a conference on teacher education, a participant related St. Paul’s comment on self-perception to the use of a technical language in teacher education.

... St. Paul said, “Ye shall be compared to a man beholding his own countenance in a glass, for he beheld himself and went his way, and presently forgot what manner of man he was.” This is what happened to these student teachers. They saw themselves on television teaching... saw what little they did right. Then, they turned the projector off and they went back to the classroom, and whatever they did had nothing to do with what they saw of themselves, as they did not know how to perceive themselves. A language of teacher behavior provides a vocabulary for self-perception for the teacher (Burkhart 1969: 63).

A recent book on tennis contains the same theme: Step 1 in learning is to “observe nonjudgmentally, existing behavior... awareness of what is, without judgment... is the best precondition for change” (Gallwey 1974: 80).

The use of high inference words that themselves are judgmental is a characteristic of formal instruction. While formal instruction contributes to the Rashomon effect technical instruction moves beyond the Rashomon effect. In technical instruction the “headsets,” egos and preoccupations of the participant/observers filter perception much less; and contradictory versions of the same event, caused in part by the use of terms requiring high inference, are decreased. While interpretations and evaluations of the effects of events may still differ after a description in which technical terms are used, at least the participants will be discussing the events themselves with precise operationally defined terms that are not judgmental.

The basic elements of FOCUS are shown below in Table 1. Though the number of characteristics of communication noted with FOCUS is only five—source, pedagogical purpose, medium, use, content—and the number of major categories of each characteristic is always less than six—just as 103 chemical elements combine to form thousands of compounds, the 12 tone system can produce jazz, rock and roll or classical music, and the differences in the point and manner of articulation can describe most sounds—a cross-categorization of the categories of characteristics noted with FOCUS can be used to describe the exciting variety of communications both in second language learning settings and elsewhere. Different frequencies, combinations and sequences of the basic elements of FOCUS can clearly illustrate both similarities and differences of communications made by two children in a sandbox, two teachers presenting the same lesson in Lado English, two students being taught by a tape recorder, two history teachers teaching in Hungarian, and most other combinations of settings, sources and targets one could conjure up.

This conceptualization and these labels can be employed both in lesson planning and research at many levels. For example, a teacher might decide to see the extent to which the students understand polite and impolite
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1</th>
<th>FIVE CHARACTERISTICS OF COMMUNICATIONS IN SETTINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Who communicates?</td>
<td>2. What is the pedagogical purpose of the communication?*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher</td>
<td>to structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individual student</td>
<td>1. attend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>group of students</td>
<td>linguistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whole class</td>
<td>2. characterize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to solicit</td>
<td>to respond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-linguistic</td>
<td>3. present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>para-linguistic</td>
<td>procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to react</td>
<td>4. relate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. What areas of content are communicated?**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subject matter</td>
<td>re-present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These four pedagogical purposes are from Bellack.
** The uses and areas of content are presented alphabetically rather than in any hierarchical order.

gestures. To meet this aim, the teacher could include solicits in a lesson plan which required students to respond using gestures to present content in the sub-category of language called the contextual system. Or, the teacher could perform the gestures in his solicits and require the students to characterize them by using speech to evaluate them in their responses.

As a research instrument, FOCUS can be employed to analyze communications on many different levels and with varying degrees of compre-
pensiveness. It is a simple matter to listen to a tape of a lesson and compare it with the plan one has made. But tallying need not be tied to lesson plans. To note one or two characteristics of communications as they occur, checklists can easily be constructed. One might want to tally the mediums students use in class before the lesson begins and during the lesson. One may want to compare patterns of moves in teaching settings and non-teaching settings, the mediums students are required to use during class and those required on examinations, the areas of content covered daily and those completely ignored. More comprehensive coding can be done by transcribing communications and coding all five characteristics; Appendix II contains a sample of this type of coding with excerpts from two settings: a classroom and an airport.

At first, perception of what has been seen is clarified simply by using categories from the instrument to label characteristics of communications and tally them. Similarities and differences can be highlighted between different “schools” of language teaching, between practitioners of different methods, between communications in teaching settings and non-teaching settings, and between teachers with different kinds and amounts of training and experience. As communications in separate lessons are classified and counted, questions about relationships between communications in each class can be asked. “What mediums, uses and areas of content do so-called eclectic teachers employ in reactions to error in contrast to audio-lingual teachers, silent-way teachers and those without training who correct others in science classes or during ordinary conversations on the street?” “What is the content of student reactions in a class in which the teacher constantly speaks about personal matters?” “What type of reactions and responses occur in classes where teachers communicate a great number of moves with content of procedure?” “What uses occur in classes where teachers employ group work and a great deal of realia in contrast to classes in which no groups or realia are used?” These are only a few of the questions about relationships that can be asked. As these types of relationships become clearer, the effects different patterns of communication have on learning may begin to emerge. In fact, one central purpose of all of this systematic description is to begin to identify consistent relationships between characteristics of communications so that we can begin to base our teaching on evidence of effectiveness plus theory rather than on theory alone or one’s whims.

Without a conceptual framework to which we may attach our descriptions of teacher-learner behaviors, we cannot as clearly discern the relationship between pedagogical intention and learning response. Nor can we adequately integrate desired modifications into our teaching. Suggestions from others, detailed notes in lesson plans, specific behaviors to be employed, patterns of communications in teaching and non-teaching settings—all can be better understood.

---

For those who are totally repelled by this idea of classifying and quantifying such a human activity as teaching in this way, I suggest you read Zen and the Art of Motorcycle Maintenance. The author’s discussion of the school of reason and the romantic school provide insight into the problem of classifying and quantifying.
understood, remembered, and mastered when placed within the board con-
ceptual framework provided by FOCUS.

The Competency Based Teacher Education Movement encourages the
 type of precise, systematic, and non-judgmental study of the teaching act
and its effects that FOCUS can provide. The CBTE movement believes that
if teachers can see the range of teacher behaviors possible, use the behaviors
consciously and measure their effects on learning, teachers may expand the
repertoire of their behaviors (Elam 1971). Study after study has shown
the limited range of teacher behaviors both in subject matter classes (Bellack
et al., 1966; Flanders 1970; Hoetker and Ahlbrand 1969) and in second
language classes (Fanselow 1976; Gamba 1976; Long 1976; Moskowitz 1976;
Naiman et al., 1975; Rwakyaka 1976). Since another tenet of CBTE re-
quires that teacher trainers must study the degree to which the training
program they execute aids in the expansion of teacher behaviors (Elam
1971), future research studies should be able to tell us the extent to which
the use of technical instruction in the teaching act alters what almost seems
to have become a ritual for many teachers.

For too long, we have sought technical information only from psy-
chologists, linguists and researchers who did comparison of methods studies.
Or we have sought formal and informal instruction from authors of methods
books, advocates of particular “schools” or sets of tests or materials. To be
sure, these sources have been helpful and ought not to be discarded. They
can be supplemented, however, by instruments such as FOCUS which (1)
permit us to develop technical information about what we practicing language
teachers and our students actually do both in classrooms and other settings,5
(2) help us examine the effects different communications have on learning;
and (3) enable us to translate the suggestions and theories from linguists,
advocates of particular theories and others into precise objectives.

Just as observing and playing a game of chess is more valuable if one
understands that the game is limited to various combinations of moves of 32
chess pieces in distinct ways over 64 squares, and just as a physical examina-
tion makes more sense if the doctor does it with a conceptual framework
and with technical terms based on a classification his colleagues share, so
observing of teaching in second language classes and other settings is more
valuable if it is seen conceptually and is discussed with operationally defined
terms.

Developments in teaching, as in any field, come from those who have
conceptualized their discipline and possess shared terms to describe their
craft. Conceptualization strengthens the basic elements and combines them
in new ways, thereby increasing control and expanding options. Teachers and

5 In a recent paper at UNESCO, Christina Bratt Paulston discussed “recent de-
velopments in language teaching in the United States.” At the conclusion of her
description she admitted that her view was based on her own work at the University
of Pittsburgh, “not the assessment of actual teaching in the country (19).” In fact,
most reviews of language teaching are based on what is read in journals and printed
in books, not what teachers actually do. Moskowitz’s recent description (1976) is the
exception rather than the rule.
students who, through heightened understanding, can create new combinations of sources, pedagogical purposes, mediums, uses, and areas of content will produce totally different and more varied patterns of communications in a range of settings. Much like chess masters, poets, artists, or scientists who have created new and original patterns in their respective fields because they have attached intricacy of detail to simplicity of concept, teachers, too, may now seek the creative, innovative and effective, confident that the teaching act is no longer a mystery that defies precise and rational control.
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#### Table 2 Five Characteristics of Communications in Settings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Who communicates?</th>
<th>2. What is the pedagogical purpose of the communication?</th>
<th>3. What mediums are used to communicate content?</th>
<th>4. How are the mediums used to communicate areas of content?</th>
<th>5. What areas of content are communicated?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to structure</td>
<td>linguistic</td>
<td>1. attend</td>
<td>language systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>aural</td>
<td>2. characterize</td>
<td>contextual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>visual</td>
<td>21. differentiate</td>
<td>grammatical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ideogram</td>
<td>22. evaluate</td>
<td>literary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>transcribed</td>
<td>23. examine</td>
<td>meaning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>written</td>
<td>24. illustrate</td>
<td>mechanics of writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25. label</td>
<td>sound segmental supra-seg.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. present</td>
<td>speech production</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31. call words</td>
<td>unclassified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32. change medium</td>
<td>life</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33. question</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34. state</td>
<td>formula</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. relate</td>
<td>imagination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41. explain</td>
<td>personal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42. interpret</td>
<td>public</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>other</td>
<td>skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Teacher:**
  - to solicit
  - other
  - 25. label

- **Individual student:**
  - to respond
  - symbolic
  - 42. interpret
  - other
These four pedagogical purposes are from Bellack.
** The uses and areas of content are presented alphabetically.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Pedagogical Purpose*</th>
<th>Mediums</th>
<th>Uses**</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>structuring moves str prepare for the setting of tasks or other activities</td>
<td>linguistic</td>
<td>attend not communicating content—listening, silent reading, tasting, feeling objects, etc.</td>
<td>contextual: collocation, connotation, culture, detail and main idea, register, situation, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual students s1 to s6</td>
<td></td>
<td>aural</td>
<td>characterize communicating about content or things differentiate</td>
<td>grammatical: function words, sentence forms, inflections, reduced forms, word, order, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assigned group of students g1 to g6</td>
<td>soliciting moves sol set tasks or ask questions</td>
<td>visual</td>
<td>indicating that communications are the same or different evaluate prescribing or indicating comms. are right or wrong or true or false; ans. yes/no &amp; either/or questions examine</td>
<td>literary: imagery, mood, style, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group of students ss1 to ss6</td>
<td>responding moves res perform tasks or answer</td>
<td>ideogram: $, #, etc. transcribed: phonetic writing of fillers, intonation, stress, words, sounds, etc. written: printed written individual letters, words, commas, periods, etc.</td>
<td>language systems: figurative, grammatical, historical, humorous, idiomatic, ironic, literal, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mechanics of writing: how to hold a pen, making capitals, punctuation, spelling, etc. sound: segmental: consonant clusters, syllabification, sounds, etc. supra-segmental: intonation, rhythm, stress, etc. speech production: your tongue should be up; the voice box vibrates, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Pedagogical Purpose
* *Messages**

**Examples & Definitions**
class

question
Braille; drawing a letter or stress mark on one's hand, etc.

label
naming parts of speech or groups of items

imagination: what would happen if...?, etc.
personal: feelings, information, etc.
public: general knowledge about persons, places, things, aesthetics, religion, etc.
skills: cooking, studying, track, typing, etc.
social issues: population, prejudice, etc.

procedure
administration: calling roll; phoney greetings; checking questions—do you follow?: transition—OK, Uhm; query—repeating with rising information, etc.
classroom social behavior: discipline, etc.
teaching directions: setting tasks, communicating instructional information, etc.
teaching rationale: support for a method or procedure, etc.
subject matter
school subjects: biology, math, not language, etc.
survival skills: how to budget, understanding a lease, etc.
unspecified

informant

class moves real reflexive communications that are not requested

non-linguistic

aural
bell, clapping, humming, music, noise, tapping, etc.

visual
real: food, live things, objects, people, speech organs, voice box, working things, etc.
representational: cartoon, picture, puppet, sketch, etc.
schematic: diagram, erasing, line showing space, map, underlining, etc.
symbolic: rod representing a house, etc.

present
communicating content itself
call words
change medium
question
state

relate
relating communications about content and content itself
explain
making generalizations, giving rules or reasons; explicitly relating, etc.
interpret
making inferences, generating new patterns, implicitly relating, etc.
re-presents
communicating content another has just

bearing
moves bear unconscious communications such as jiggling one's keys; the environment or situation one is in, etc.

textbook
communicated in the
other
medium, use and content.
other
medium, use and content.

** The term message refers to the combination of medium, use and content.
APPENDIX II  COMMUNICATIONS CODED WITH FOCUS

| Setting: An intermediate language classroom; students are seated in rows. Here are some excerpts from lessons: | Five Characteristics of Communication |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Read this passage silently. Was Truman from Texas? No, Missouri. What about Eisenhower? He was from Texas. (Student reads passage silently.) | Pedagogical Purpose | Mediam Use | Content |
| 2. What part of speech is from? A preposition. (Teacher shakes student's hand.) | s | res | lv | attend | language+life |
| 6. Does Truman have two? Yes. | s | sol | la | char:examine | language:sound |
| 7. We'll do some vocabulary work now. | t | str | la | pres:state | procedure' |
| 8. Say something about this. (Holds up an old, torn plastic raincoat.) | t | sol | la | pres:state | language:mean. |
| It's for the water. It's ugly. I like it. It is just like mine. Feel this. (Gives student a candle.) Is it rough or smooth? Smooth. (Shakes head up and down.) | s1 | res | la | char:illustrate | language:mean. |
| | | | la | char:illustrate | language:mean. |
| | | | la | char:evaluate | language:mean. |
| | | | la | char:evaluate | language:mean. |
| | | | la | char:evaluate | language:mean. |
| | | | la | char:evaluate | language:mean. |
| | | | la | char:evaluate | language:mean. |
| | | | la | char:evaluate | language:mean. |
| | | | la | char:evaluate | language:mean. |
| | | | la | char:evaluate | language:mean. |
| | | | la | char:evaluate | language:mean. |
| | | | la | char:evaluate | language:mean. |

1 Practice coding of excerpts from lessons, texts, tests and conversations is needed to master FOCUS in much the same way that a great deal of transcription practice is needed before serious phonetic work can be done.

2 Of course since there is a direction in the solicit the content of procedure is presented also. However, as a convention we do not code procedural content in solicits.

3 An alternate way to code these responses, and all others, is to show what is given in the solicit on the response line. Here are three of the responses coded the alternate way.

3 s res la evaluate language: grammar (la pres:ques+char:label)
6 t res la evaluate language: sound (la pres:ques+char:examine)
8 s res la evaluate language: meaning (la pres:state:contrast+nvl pres:state)
**Setting:** An airport—first at the ticket counter, then at customs and finally on a plane.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. How much is a ticket to Chicago?</th>
<th>s¹</th>
<th>sol</th>
<th>la</th>
<th>pres:ques</th>
<th>life</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$120.00. That's rather high.</td>
<td>t²</td>
<td>res</td>
<td>la</td>
<td>pres:state</td>
<td>life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It's gone up because of the price of fuel, the increased wages for pilots and higher fees at all the airports.</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>rea</td>
<td>la</td>
<td>char:illustrate</td>
<td>life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please book me on the next flight. (after checking)</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>res</td>
<td>la</td>
<td>pres:state</td>
<td>procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I've booked you on the 3 o'clock. Thank you. (and smiles in a friendly way)</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>rea</td>
<td>la</td>
<td>pres:state</td>
<td>life:formula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How long have you been in Montreal?</td>
<td>t³</td>
<td>sol</td>
<td>la</td>
<td>pres:ques</td>
<td>procedure²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For three days.</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>res</td>
<td>la</td>
<td>pres:state</td>
<td>procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why were you here?</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>sol</td>
<td>la</td>
<td>pres:ques</td>
<td>procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To visit some friends.</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>res</td>
<td>pv³</td>
<td>pres:state</td>
<td>procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please open your bags. (opens bags) (looks through the bags and checks with his hands the contents of some bags)</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>rea</td>
<td>pv³</td>
<td>attend</td>
<td>procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have to pay duty on these shoes.</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>sol</td>
<td>la</td>
<td>char:evaluate</td>
<td>procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That's stupid! Go over to the collection booth. (points to the collection booth) (goes over to the collection booth)</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>rea</td>
<td>la²</td>
<td>char:evaluate</td>
<td>life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It's to the left of Avis.</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>res</td>
<td>pv</td>
<td>char:examine</td>
<td>procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Welcome aboard. (passenger goes to seat)</td>
<td>t⁴</td>
<td>rea</td>
<td>la</td>
<td>pres:state</td>
<td>life:formula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is the captain speaking. We will be taking off soon—right on schedule. We will be flying at 35,000 feet. The weather is clear all the way and the ceiling in the Chicago area is high. Enjoy the flight. (one passenger to another)</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>str</td>
<td>pv</td>
<td>pres:state</td>
<td>procedure³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They all sound the same.</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>rea</td>
<td>la</td>
<td>char:differentiate</td>
<td>life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you like a cocktail or a soft drink? (pointing to both on the cart)</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>sol</td>
<td>la²</td>
<td>pres:ques</td>
<td>life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A cocktail. (Steward begins to fill glass with ice)</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>res</td>
<td>la</td>
<td>char:evaluate</td>
<td>life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light on the ice though.</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>str</td>
<td>nvl</td>
<td>pres:state</td>
<td>procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Here the roles are switched; the steward is serving the passenger and the passenger is coded as t.)</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>rea</td>
<td>la</td>
<td>char:illustrate</td>
<td>life</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ We use the letter t for the knower or the one in charge and an s for the learner or the person being served or directed.

² The content of these same questions if asked over dinner by a friend would be coded life. But in the setting of the customs area the content is procedure. The official is only interested in whether you did or did not do something that was not allowed by the rules. Here is a good example of how crucial the setting is in determining the meaning of communications.
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Standard and Nonstandard Dialect Competencies of Hawaiian Creole English Speakers *

Carol Fleisher Feldman, Addison Stone, James V. Wertsch, and Michael Strizich

In the context of a larger study designed to investigate the cognitive implications of speaking a Creole variety of English, some data were collected which call into question the common assumption of linguists and educators that speakers of a nonstandard variety of English do not have a functional command of Standard English. High school students in a remote rural town on the island of Hawaii were found to be equally competent in Standard and Hawaiian English as measured by parallel forms of a sentence imitation test. The implications of this finding for educational practices in Hawaii are discussed, and it is concluded that educators should no longer discourage the use of Hawaiian English in the classroom, since the primary educational goal should be the development of the general linguistic ability which underlies both dialects.

During the past several years there has been a marked shift in the approach educators have taken toward students who speak “nonstandard” varieties of English. Educators used to strive for the elimination of the use of a nonstandard variety of English and its replacement with Standard English. It has now become widely accepted that the principal goal should be rather the supplementation of the linguistic repertoire of such speakers through the development of their ability to use Standard English. This supplementation approach is based on the work of linguists such as Labov (1966) who have argued convincingly that there is no inherent connection between nonstandard varieties of English and the problems of “loose” or “sloppy” thinking often associated with their use. The newer approach often amounts to nothing more than a change in the educator’s attitude toward nonstandard varieties of English; the result has been that there is no longer such a strong tendency to label nonstandard varieties as wrong, sloppy, etc.

Both approaches, however, call for a heavy emphasis on Standard English instruction in the classroom. A tacit assumption underlying both of these approaches is that anyone who uses a nonstandard variety of English at
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home or with his peer group is going to be less capable of communicating in Standard English than if he had used only Standard English. We shall label this the "trade-off assumption." According to the trade-off assumption, if we were to examine the linguistic abilities of speakers in an environment where standard and nonstandard varieties of English were spoken, we would expect to find that those speakers fluent in the nonstandard variety would tend not to be fluent in the standard variety and vice versa. Conversely, we would not expect many speakers to be either fluent or not fluent in both varieties. In this paper, we shall present data which bear on the trade-off assumption, and which fail to support it. The present study is not the first to find such evidence. It does, however, provide a corroboration and extension of earlier work which points out more clearly the generality of bidialectal competence.

Method

Subjects
The subjects were students at Ka'u High School on the island of Hawaii (the Big Island). Ka'u High School is located in Pahala, a small and isolated town near the southern tip of the Big Island. The school draws its students from the entire southern end of the island. The local economy consists almost exclusively of sugar cane production, and the vast majority of the subjects are from families with connections to the cane industry. As in any small town, there is a mixture of socio-economic levels; however, the student population is primarily of lower-middle and working-class background. As in many regions of Hawaii, there is a diverse racial mixture.

Although the classroom instruction is in Standard English, the students speak only Hawaiian English (or "Pidgin") among themselves, and since they rarely speak in class (a phenomenon to be discussed below), they very seldom get any practice in speaking Standard English. At home, they speak either Hawaiian English or, in some cases, the native language of their parents. Their command of Standard English is generally considered to be minimal by their teachers, and they were never observed by the researchers to speak Standard English during a month of very close and often personal contact.

There were 96 subjects ranging in age from 14 to 18. The sample was representative of the racial mixture of the school as a whole and consisted of 20 students from each of grades 9-11 and 36 twelfth-graders. The students were drawn from the alphabetical middle of each grade. Half of the subjects from each grade were of each sex.

The Test
Our data were gathered using a sentence repetition task based on the one employed by Day, Boggs, Tharp, Gallimore, and Speidel (1974); however, we made extensive alterations in the original form of the task. The major alteration which allowed us to examine the trade-off assumption was that we employed two separate tasks to measure the subjects' processing abilities in Standard English on the one hand, and in Hawaiian English
on the other, rather than using only Standard English sentences and counting
the number of times Hawaiian English forms were substituted, as did Day 
et al. Having separate measures allowed us to make the crucial comparisons
between subjects’ processing abilities in the two dialects.

The first of the two sections was very similar to the Standard English
Repetition Test (SERT) used by Day et al. This section included eleven
Standard English sentences. Each sentence included at least one scorable
construction for which the nonstandard variety of English spoken by subjects
in our sample had a distinctive and different expression. For example, the
negative contraction “didn’t” in (1) would be expressed in the nonstandard
dialect as “never,” as in (1’).³

(1) I didn’t go to work yesterday, ...

(1’) I never go to work yesterday, ...

Up to this point our sentences are analogous to those of Day et al. The
only difference is that, because the subjects in our sample were older than
those for whom the Day test was prepared, we used sentences that were
longer and more complex (lexically and syntactically). We shall refer to this
section of our sentence repetition task as the SE (Standard English) section.

In addition to the SE section, we devised what we shall refer to as the
HE (Hawaiian English) section of the test. This section consisted of ten
sentences in the variety of English spoken by the local residents of the
Ka’u district of the island of Hawaii. Each sentence in this section was
written in such a way that its structure was the same as that of a sentence
in the SE section. To create these sentences, constructions in the SE section
were translated into their HE counterparts and the lexical content was
changed when necessary. By employing this parallel-form test, it became
possible to make comparisons between subjects’ processing abilities in SE
and HE.

Several of the sentences used in both sections of the test were adapted
from those used by Day et al. (1974), but in all cases, we made some kind
of alteration in order to make the sentence more appropriate for the age
and/or dialect of our subject group. Such alterations were made with the
help of local informants. The sets of sentences used are displayed in Table 1.

After our two lists of sentences were developed, they were tape-recorded
by a resident of the island, who had lived both in Ka’u and in Hilo and was
an unusually fluent speaker of both of the two varieties of English used in
our task.

Test Validity

Because the present test was adapted from one developed by Day et al.
(1974), we did not conceive of it as totally new and invalidated. At the time
of the adaptation, Day et al. had gathered data with their SERT from

³No attempt is made here to represent phonetic differences between Standard
English and the nonstandard variety of English spoken by the subjects.
TABLE 1
Stimulus Sentences Used in Repetition Task with Hawaiian English Speakers

STANDARD ENGLISH

Practice Sentences:

a. It's been really dry in Ka'u for the last ten months.
b. There's a nice white sand beach at Punaluu.

test Sentences:

1. Some of the cows died because there wasn't any water.
2. There's a monster that lives in Honokaa.
3. We didn't see the game last night because the bus was broken.
   *There aren't more* than two good buses on that route.
4. There's a present for you in the kitchen *that's* all wrapped up.
   Your friend, *the one from Hilo*, left it for you the other day.
5. I asked Roger *if* he has a cast on his leg. He's mad *that* he has a broken leg.
6. My father wrote to my grandmother last month *because* when my mother's
   *not* well, my grandmother cooks for us.
7. It's funny; the new house is for sale, *but* there is no one around who wants to
   buy it.
8. When is your uncle, *the one who* works for the plantation, going to take you to
   Hilo? Where was he today?
9. *If* the car isn't here, I can't drive it. *If* the bike isn't here, I can't ride it.
10. *There's a guy from Ka'u who* has a car *that's* really fast, and he always
    wins the drags in Kona.
11. Hey, what's this thing *that's* all green? *There's* another one in the store *that's*
    just like it.
12. I didn't go to work yesterday, *so* my boss called me up and told me I was a
    lazy pig.
13. Michael was pushed over the cliff by the small red car which was still quite new.

HAWAIIAN ENGLISH

Practice Sentences:

a. You know Mary Mota, she da one wen fall down in da cafeteria.
b. I remember da time us wen get nabbed for cutting out from school lunchtime.

test Sentences:

1. When us gotta hand in da test papa?
2. I no like go football game if gonna rain tonight.
3. *Get one guy in our class an he get one sista, she some rich.*
   *Every time* she come Ka'au fo see her moda.
4. Funny kinde, no, da ca get one hole in da muffla, but no moa one place ova
   hea fo fix 'em.
5. *When da radio no stay on, I no can hea 'em. When da TV no stay on, I no*
   see 'em.
6. Us new eat dinna las' night, *cause* my fada wen fo get fo buy da food. *Every*
   *time no moa even snacks fo grime.*
7. When you was today? When yo broda, *da one play to you folks' team, gonna*
   take you to Mauna Loa?
8. I neva go out wid Stevens las' night, so his sista wen go call me up fo tell me
   I was one snob.
9. My moda wen go call my aunty up las' night *because* when my moda *not*
   home, my aunty stay wid us.
11. I wen go ask Edwad if da sista get one cold. He some lucky, he get one sma
    sista.
12. *Get one new dress in da closet an' stay all folded up. Your aunty, da one from*
    Honolulu, *wen get one for you yestaday.*
several samples and considered the test to be a reasonable means of assessing dialect competence. Day et al. had found a strong relationship between performance on the SERT and scores on the Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities \((r(27) = .73)\). Furthermore, Day et al. present some data bearing on the criterion validity of the SERT in the form of age and sample comparisons which demonstrate that performance on the SERT improves with age and with increased exposure to a Standard English culture. Because of these prior validations, we collected no formal validity data.

Gallimore and Tharp (1976) have recently developed a test (the HCERT) consisting of sentences in Hawaiian English. Evidence supporting the claim that the SERT and its companion, the HCERT, assess linguistic abilities has been reported. Gallimore and Tharp report the results of a large-scale, factor-analytic examination of kindergarten and first-grade abilities which lead them to the conclusion that by the end of the kindergarten year, the SERT and HCERT, along with certain subscales of the Wechsler Preschool and Primary Intelligence Scale and the Metropolitan Readiness Test, measure a separate factor, which they interpret as “verbal fluency.”

Thus, on the basis of the above considerations and the close similarity between the SERT (and the HCERT) and the present test, it is reasonable to assume that our sentence repetition test does indeed assess linguistic competence.

The Testing Procedure

In the sentence repetition testing session, the subject was asked to listen to a sentence and then repeat it. All responses were taped for later scoring. The order of presentation of the SE and HE sections of the test was counterbalanced. In all cases, the two testing sessions of the sentence repetition task were separated by a five- to ten-minute nonverbal test of cognitive abilities, which served to break up the task and thus to allow renewed concentration for the second section. The entire session took between twenty and thirty minutes per subject.

The subjects were first presented with two practice sentences and were asked to repeat them. Once the subjects were acquainted with the materials and procedures, they were presented with the “real sentences.” Actually, the first two of these sentences were not scored in order to allow the subjects more time to become comfortable with the procedure.

Data Analysis

The repetitions of each subject were transcribed and then scored for the target linguistic features built into each sentence. These features are underlined in Table 1. For the purposes of this analysis, each subject’s performance on each feature was coded simply as correct or incorrect. Only exact repetitions were scored as correct; paraphrases of all kinds were simply scored as incorrect. Total scores were the number of underlined features correct in each half of the test.
In order to establish the salient characteristics of the test, the entire set of 74 features or "items" from both halves of the test was subjected to a series of item analyses. An analysis based on the Rasch model was performed. This analysis isolates items whose response characteristics differ markedly from those of the test as a whole. The results of this analysis (no items were rejected) suggest that the test is a very homogeneous measure of a single trait. Thus, the items of the SE and HE portions of the test do not function in any appreciably different manner, as one might expect of them under the trade-off hypothesis.

We also performed a principal components analysis on the 74 items, and the results substantiated those of the first analysis. There were four factors accounting for 64, 14, 12, and 11 percent of the variance, respectively.

The most striking fact revealed by this analysis is that items from both the SE and HE sections of the test load about equally well on the first factor (which accounts for 64% of the variance in subjects' performance). There is no noticeable tendency for items from one section of the test to load on it and items from the other section not to do so. Such a result indicates that some general performance trait is of great importance in determining the subjects' performance on the sentence repetition tests.

That the subjects' performance on both sections of the test is largely determined by some general ability is also indicated by the fact that the correlation between the two test sections is very high (r (96) = .68). The implications of this high correlation can perhaps be grasped more concretely if one looks at the data from the point of view of a simple prediction generated by the trade-off assumption. If subjects are indeed deficient in one dialect as a function of their proficiency in the other, then one should find that the majority of subjects are above the median on one test and below the median on the other. In fact, fully two-thirds of the subjects are either above or below the median on both tests; i.e., subjects are either masters of both dialects or masters of neither. This tendency is clearly a departure from the predicted pattern and also differs significantly from a chance distribution (X² = 8.53, p < .05). A similar analysis based on dividing the score ranges for each dialect test into thirds showed that 63 percent of the subjects had scores in the same third for both tests, 28 percent had scores in adjacent thirds, and only 9 percent had scores in the top third on one test and in the

---

4 All of the tests were subjected to an item analysis based on a model first formulated by Georg Rasch (1966). The basic programming techniques for implementing the model are given in Wright and Panchapakesan (1969). The Rasch model, briefly stated, assumes that the response of an individual to an item is entirely a function of the person's ability on a single trait and the item's difficulty. If it is reasonably improbable (e.g., p < .05) that a given item conforms to this model, it is discarded. An item could fail to conform to the model because it was measuring a trait different from that being measured by the other items, or because there was no particular central trait being measured by a large subset of the items, or because it discriminated among different score groups differently than the other items, or any similar problem that one might conceive of. For further details, see Wright and Panchapakesan (1969) and references cited therein.
bottom third on the other. This distribution also deviates significantly from chance ($X^2 = 24.11, p < .01$). Thus, there is an overwhelming tendency for subjects to score consistently on the two dialect tests.

In a further effort to find evidence for the trade-off hypothesis, we looked at the second and third factors from the principal components analysis. We reasoned that the trade-off structure we were looking for might constitute the underlying dimensionality of one of these secondary factors. No evidence relevant to the trade-off assumption was found in the second factor. The third factor, however, loaded certain SE items positively and certain HE items negatively. This pattern indicates that the third factor might be susceptible of characterization as an HE versus SE dimension and might represent the trade-off phenomenon in action.

In order to examine this possibility, we calculated each subject's score on the subset of HE items with loadings on the third factor (greater than +.1) and on the subset of SE items with loadings on the third factor (less than −.1). We then treated the total scores created from these item subsets as subtests of HE and SE, respectively.

Having thus calculated measures of HE and SE ability using only those items which formed the HE-SE dichotomy underlying the third factor, we assumed that we had as clear a measure as possible of each domain unconfounded by those items which did not clearly differentiate the two domains. By using this measure, we thus expected to find clear evidence for the trade-off hypothesis. That is, we expected that by using these items to form the measures, we would find that those subjects who were good at HE would not be good at SE and vice versa.

We found, however, that the correlation between the two subtests was still moderately high ($r (66) = .45$). This correlation is lower than that between the initial tests, but it is still high: to the extent that a given subject does well on the SE subtest, he tends to do well on the HE subtest also. This finding was also substantiated by a consideration of subjects' joint score positions on the two subtests. Seventy percent of the subjects scored either above or below the median on both subtests ($X^2 = 8.53, p < .05$). Similarly, 50 percent scored in the same third on both subtests, 44 percent had scores in adjacent thirds, and only six percent had scores in the top third of one subtest and the bottom third of the other ($X^2 = 24.11, p < .01$).

We are thus forced to conclude that we have no evidence to support the trade-off hypothesis in our sample. Despite the fact that the children in the Ka'u Community speak almost exclusively HE among themselves and within their families, their knowledge of SE is largely predictable from their knowledge of HE.

---

5 In the case of the SE half of the test, relative clause constructions and appositive consistently loaded on factor three. The crucial constructions from the HE portion of the test were the existential “get one” (e.g., “Get one new dress in the closet” = “There is a new dress in the closet”), the past tense construction “wen” + (e.g., “My father wen forget . . .” = “My father forgot . . .”), and the copula “stay” (e.g., “Da kine stay all bus’ up” = “The one that is all broken up”).
Discussion and Conclusions
There are two main hypotheses which could account for the high correlation between performances on the two halves of the test. The first possible explanation is that there is some ability peculiar to repetition tasks per se which accounts for a high correlation between performances on two such tasks. The importance of linguistic memory, or whatever factors are involved in sentence repetition tasks, might outweigh the influence of the various dialects involved. However, the importance of the influence of dialect has usually been assumed in sentence repetition tasks. (For a discussion of the validity of using such tests to measure knowledge of syntactic constructions, see Slobin and Welsh (1973).) There is no reason to believe that the repetition test we used differed in any important respect from those previously used.

The second possible explanation is that there really is a high correlation between abilities in SE and HE, and that this correlation will be reflected in any measures designed to tap these abilities. Such a correlation would indicate that some sort of general linguistic ability underlies performance in both dialects and that the trade-off assumption is misguided.

The present study is by no means the first to provide evidence against the trade-off assumption; however, it corroborates and extends previous findings in three important directions. First, it substantiates Ciborowski and Choy's (1974) initial report that such bidialectal competence can be found in Hawaiian-English-speaking children as well as in Black-English-speaking children (Hall and Freedle, 1973). Second, it provides some evidence that the findings of Ciborowski and Choy are not an artifact of their measuring instrument (memory for stories). And third, it demonstrates that bidialectal competence is not restricted to the urban, middle-class children tested by Ciborowski and Choy but is also the case for rural, working-class children.

Given the congruence of the findings of these two studies, it does not seem premature to discuss the educational implications of the present research. It should be kept in mind, however, that there is a clear need for additional research on the exact extent of the bidialectal competence of children in Hawaii, and particularly for research using more sensitive measures of language-processing ability.

Since some sort of general language ability seems to underlie performance in both dialects, we would suggest that it is the task of education to make use of and enhance this ability. A suitable educational program would seek to develop general language ability by encouraging the use of either SE or HE or both. In many Hawaii schools the children hardly speak at all, even in excellent schools where the children make evident their comfort with the total school situation. Silent classrooms (which are also very common in Alaska; see Feldman et al., 1974) pose obvious problems for the teacher (who suffers from a lack of feedback) but more serious ones for the students, who fail to have the experience of verbalizing in any dialect formal concepts presented in class. Such verbalization is
probably essential for the acquisition of new ideas. In addition, verbalization (in either dialect) probably exercises the general language ability factor found here, permitting growth in language skills that would then be manifested in both dialects.

The children in such dialect-speaking communities are often embarrassed to speak in SE because they are acutely aware of their imperfect mastery of it. They tend not to speak in HE even if they are not explicitly discouraged by their teachers because they think of it as inappropriate for the classroom. This perception is reinforced by a variety of factors. Perhaps the most important of these is that HE is usually seen, and may in fact be most readily used, as a medium of communication between intimates, exercised in the service of personal meanings. Also, however, teachers themselves rarely use, and occasionally criticize children who use, HE in the classroom. This latter practice is especially common in the early elementary years, when children are most susceptible to embarrassment which may have a lasting effect. Thus, while in the classroom, the bidialectal child may feel that he knows no language in which to speak.

Of course, there are many other factors to be taken into account when developing a curriculum, but our data indicate that one of the educational factors often enlisted in the argument against the use of HE may lack empirical support. Unless other empirical evidence appears supporting the notion that the use of HE inhibits students' growth in SE abilities, we would suggest that educators reconsider their policy of excluding HE from the classroom. The important, but difficult, goal for the educator of bidialectal children is to encourage the students to talk more about concepts presented to them. This might be achieved by encouraging the children to speak in HE and/or in SE. Educators, and the children themselves, quite rightly feel that dialect-speaking children should be given an opportunity to become comfortable in using the dominant SE form in order to have a chance to "get ahead" in the mainstream culture. Training in SE, if it were effective in producing comfort in speaking, could also help solve the "silent-classroom" problem by eliminating the source of the children's embarrassment with respect to speaking in SE. The significance of the evidence presented here is the implication that there is no conflict between these two proposals and that they might well be employed simultaneously without detriment to the effects of either program. Indeed, each program might benefit the other.
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Toward the Measurement of Functional Proficiency:

Contextualization of the Noise Test*

Stephen J. Gaies, Harry L. Gradman, Bernard Spolsky

In its original form, the “noise” test is a dictation of fifty discrete English sentences, varying in syntactic complexity, recorded on tape with accompanying background white noise. In terms of both its theoretical rationale and its statistical reliability, the noise test has generally been accepted as a useful instrument for evaluating overall English proficiency. A recent study, however, suggested that while the noise test clearly indicates the nonnative proficiency of a subject, “it exaggerates to some degree the difference between a subject’s ability to function in a normal, real-life situation of reduced redundancy and that of a native speaker.” The study also asserted that further judgments about the usefulness of the noise test could be made only after revision of the instrument, with a special emphasis on contextualization.

The present study describes the revision process, which attempted to increase the face validity of the test, primarily used to evaluate the proficiency of EFL/ESL students planning to pursue university degree work. Technical aspects of adding background noise, attempts to control for syntactic comparability among the test items, and preliminary data on the performance of the revised instrument are discussed.

Background

The test to be reported on is a revision of a format initiated by Bernard Spolsky and Bengt Sigurd several years ago (Spolsky et al., 1968). In its original form, the “noise test,” as it has come to be known, consisted of fifty discrete English sentences recorded on tape with accompanying noise in the background. Except for the presence of the noise, the instrument was in essence a dictation test. It was simple to administer, relatively easy to score, and statistically reliable.

It also appeared that the noise test was a valid measure of overall proficiency in English. The test had face validity to the extent that it presented strings of spoken English under less than ideal acoustic conditions, thereby replicating the circumstances in which we often have to decode

* This is a revised version of a paper presented at the 1976 TESOL Convention in New York City. Mr. Gaies, Lecturer, Center for English Language Training/Program in Applied Linguistics, Indiana University, has published in the areas of language testing and ESL teachers’ classroom language; Mr. Gradman, Associate Professor of Education and Chairman of Applied Linguistics and the Center for English Language Training, Indiana University, has published articles on contrastive analysis and language testing, with emphasis upon reduced redundancy testing; Mr. Spolsky, Dean of the Graduate School and Professor of Anthropology, Elementary Education, and Linguistics, The University of New Mexico, has published many papers on sociolinguistics and language testing, is editor of The Language Education of Minority Children, and with Randall L. Jones, Testing Language Proficiency.

* This is a revised version of a paper delivered at the Tenth Annual TESOL Convention, held in New York City, March 4-7, 1976.
linguistic messages (Spolsky 1971). The test also correlated well with other testing instruments, and it clearly discriminated between subjects with native or near-native proficiency and those with less than native proficiency (Gradman 1973; and Gradman and Spolsky 1975). Performances on the test seemed to confirm the theoretical basis of the test: that is, that the less proficient in a language a listener is, the more difficult it is for him or her to comprehend a message in which the natural redundancy of language is reduced through distortion of the conducting medium. To put it another way, it has appeared reasonable to evaluate an individual's proficiency in English by determining the extent to which the individual can comprehend messages whose acoustic intelligibility has been reduced.

What, then, is the motivation for substantially revising a test which has seemed satisfactory on so many counts? In fact, recent studies of the noise test raise serious questions about the validity of the test in its original form (Gradman and Gaies 1975). First, it is not at all clear that the level of acoustic interference is the main determinant of the performance on the test items. It should be mentioned at this point that in the original form of the test, five different signal-to-noise ratios are used. The interference is greatest in the first ten sentences and increasingly less in subsequent groups of ten sentences. The last ten sentences are virtually noise-free. Performance by large groups of native and nonnative speakers suggest that interference at a level greater than a signal-to-noise ratio of 7 db affects native and nonnative speakers differently, but that native and nonnative speakers seem to do as well with sentences dictated at a signal-to-noise ratio of 7 db as with sentences which are free of background interference. This is not to say that native and nonnative speakers performed equally well; it does suggest, however, that only when the noise reaches a certain level are we able to observe the advantage native speakers have over nonnative speakers in dealing with background noise.

It must also be added, though, that the effect of the acoustic interference on performance must itself be questioned. It was found that there was a correlation of (.93) between performance of a group on nonnative speakers on all sentences with background noise and sentences considered to have no background noise (Gradman and Spolsky, 1975). That is, the ranking was almost identical whether or not there was acoustic interference, and it therefore seemed reasonable to suggest that it is not the noise alone which accounts for an individual's performance on a test item.

We speculated that what caused nonnatives the greatest difficulty was the fact that discrete sentences were dictated. It appeared from our analysis of past performances on the noise test that those sentences on which subjects did most poorly were precisely those for which comprehension seemed to be most dependent on context. It is our feeling that the reduced redundancy resulting from lack of context, rather than that resulting from signal interference, most hampers nonnative speaker performance. In other words, we think that the noise test in its original form discriminates be-
between native and nonnative speakers' abilities, but that "it exaggerates to some degree the difference between a nonnative subject's ability to function in a normal, real-life situation of reduced redundancy and that of a native speaker" (Gradman and Gaies 1975:7). We hypothesized that by contextualizing test items, we would be able to obtain a more valid measure of a nonnative speaker's ability to function in normal linguistic activity. In order to examine the effect of a signal interference on the comprehension of sentences uttered in context, we undertook a revision of the noise test.

Revision

New items were written in such a way as to increase the face validity of the test in terms of the situation in which it is most often used; namely, to evaluate the proficiency of EFL students planning to pursue university degree work. For that reason, the short dialogs and mini-lectures of which the revised test is composed are reflective of both the kind of English and the subject matter which an individual might encounter in the classroom and the surrounding community. Items which presumably take place in the classroom deal with both general classroom procedures and specific subject matter taken from a variety of fields—linguistics, history, science, music, and so on. Other items deal with situations which could take place in stores, the bank, the post office, and offices.

Attempts were made to control for syntactic complexity. Two forms of the revised noise test were created with a balance of sentence types ranging from simple declarative, negative, interrogative, and imperatives, through more complex sentences including such operations as passivization, embedding of both relative and complement constructions, indefinite noun phrase reductions, and so forth.

A pilot tape was made in a recording studio; nonprofessional speakers were used. Each of the recorded forms contains twenty items and takes about fifteen minutes to administer. To add noise to the tape, readings of the peaks of voice intensity were made on all of the test items, and a median was computed. A tape containing "pink" noise was produced with a noise generator. The noise tape was first calibrated at a level equal to the median of the peaks of signal intensity. Then, to mix the signal and noise, the ratio was adjusted so that the signal was rerecorded at a 0 db reading on the VU meter and the noise at a reading of —7 db. It is in this way that the signal-to-noise ratio is defined for the test.

To illustrate the nature of the revised test, the directions and examples presented to students on tape and on paper prior to the test are reproduced below.

1 "Pink" noise is a mechanically produced and controlled noise "for which the spectrum density is inversely related to frequency. The slope of the pressure spectrum level of pink noise is minus 3 decibels per octave" (Sonn, Martin. Psychoacoustical Terminology. Portsmouth, R. I.: Raytheon Co., 1969).
In this test, you will hear twenty short English passages. Some of the passages will be spoken by one person only. Others will be conversations between two people. Some of the passages will have noise in the background. Before the last sentence in each passage, you will hear a tone, like this: (TONE). You should write on your answer sheet the sentence that follows that tone.

Listen to the following example and write down the sentence which follows the tone.

EXAMPLE X:
(ON "Can I help you?"
TAPE "Yes, I want to mail this package overseas—to Thailand."
BUT "Well, I’m sorry, but this a branch office. We only handle letters and domestic parcel post."
(NOT PAPER) (TONE)

"Take your package to the main post office.”

The sentence after the tone was: “Take your package to the main post office.” That is the sentence you should have written on your answer sheet.

Listen to the next example and again write down the sentence which follows the tone.

EXAMPLE Y:
(ON "Despite subsequent events which were to bring his administration to an end, former President Nixon’s 1972 re-election was one of the most one-sided victories in American political history."
TAPE BUT (TONE)

"Only two states were won by his opponent.”

The sentence after the tone was: “Only two states were won by his opponent.” Therefore, that is the sentence you should have written on your answer sheet.

Are there any questions?

If there are no more questions, the test will begin. Once the tape has started, it will not be stopped until all the passages are completed.

Pilot Testing

The test was administered to two different groups: One group, consisting of native and advanced nonnative speakers of English, was enrolled in two sections of a graduate course in language testing. The other group, consisting of lower intermediate nonnative speakers of English, was enrolled in a listening comprehension and conversation class designed especially for nonnative speakers of English pursuing college degrees. As there were two versions of the test, both identical in format and differing only in item content, one section of the language testing class was given Form B of the noise test first, and then Form A, in order to minimize the effect of practice in the final results while the second section of the language testing class was given Form A first, then Form B. The English language improvement class received Form A first, followed by Form B. In each case the versions of the test were administered consecutively, during the same class period. The tests were given on tape (Scotch Brand AV 176).
with a Sony Tape recorder (Model TC-105). For purposes of comparison, the older discrete-sentence multiple choice version of the noise test was given to the language testing classes.

Results and Discussion

Perhaps the most important question we asked was whether this version of reduced redundancy, that is, the added pink noise at a signal-to-noise ratio of 7:1, had a significant effect upon sentence comprehension. We were unable to determine that the noise had any effect. While there was a slight improvement on performance on the ten sentences without noise on both A and B versions of the test, the improvement appeared to be minimal. On Form A, for instance, the average score for nonnative speakers was 25.9 for sentences with background noise and 29.8 for sentences without background noise, an improvement of 3.9 points (out of a possible 50 total points). On Form B, the improvement was merely 1.6 points, from a mean score of 30.6 on sentences with added noise to 32.2 for sentences without background noise. Certainly for native speakers there was no difference in their performance on the sentences with and without background noise. Performance averages were 99.1 on Form A and 98.9 on Form B.

Equally important is the fact that there appears to be no difference in the ranking of students, regardless of whether or not the noise was added. Comparing the performance of all the nonnative speakers of English to whom this test was administered, the Spearman ranked-order correlation of the ten sentences with noise and the ten sentences without noise was .97 on Form A of the test and .91 on Form B. In other words, not only were the scores of the subjects who took this test almost the same for sentences with and without noise as a group, as evidenced by the mean scores, but also individually, as evidenced by the rank order correlation.

As to the question of whether the test differentiates between native and nonnative speakers of English, the answer is a resounding yes. We have already seen that the native speakers who took this test had mean scores of 99 out of a possible 100 points. Nonnative speakers who took this test, on the other hand, had mean scores of 55.7 (on Form A) and 62.8 (on Form B). Furthermore, the test also discriminated well between those nonnative speakers who were enrolled in English language improvement classes and those who were not. Consider, for example, that on Form A of the test, the range for native speakers was 100 to 95. For those nonnative speakers not enrolled in remedial language classes, the range was 96 to 43. For those in the English language improvement classes, the range was 56 to 11. The statistics for Form B were similar, with a range of 100 to 93 for native speakers, 98 to 49 for nonnative speakers not in the remedial coursework, and 66 to 21 for those in English language improvement classes. The exception, that is, those who scored well from among the nonnative speakers, for example, were those whose command of English as a foreign language, was so good that it was native-like. Conversely,
those who did not score well on these forms of the test and who were not in remedial coursework were judged nonetheless to need language help by their instructor.

In comparison to the earlier forms of the so-called noise test, we found that this newer version functioned similarly. A multiple choice version of the fifty discrete sentence test was administered to the nonnative speakers in the language testing classes. Their performance on that test was correlated with Form A of the contextualized noise test, and the resulting figure of .77 is indicative of the fact that the tests appear to be functioning similarly. We suspect that the figure would have been higher had we been able to secure a larger population than thirteen students for this comparison. On the other hand, it is worth mentioning that the reaction of all of the language testing students to the older version of the noise test was considerably more negative than to the newer contextualized version. If the subjects are to have any say at all, then there is ample reason to believe that the contextualized version was far preferable. In a rather open discussion, we were informed by students who had taken both versions of the test that contextualization was more language-like, even as a test, in that one's attention could wander for a moment without irreparable loss of function on the test, whereas on the older discrete sentence test, lack of attention, even for a moment, could be critical. It might also be mentioned that the contextualized version was somewhat shorter and, therefore, probably perceived as more desirable on those grounds as well.

In conclusion, then, our major findings are as follows: First, the use of background noise seems to have had little effect on the measurement of overall English proficiency for our subjects. Second, the test does differentiate effectively native and nonnative speakers of English; and it differentiates nonnative speakers as well. Finally, perhaps the most significant conclusion of this study may be that the best way to give a dictation test is to contextualized it.
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APPENDIX : SUMMARY OF STATISTICAL DATA
MEAN PERFORMANCE ON CONTEXTUALIZED TEST OF OVERALL PROFICIENCY IN ENGLISH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FORM A</th>
<th></th>
<th>FORM B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS (n= 32)</td>
<td>99.1</td>
<td>100-95</td>
<td>98.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNS1 (n= 16)</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>96-43</td>
<td>80.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNS2 (n= 12)</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>56-11</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NS = Native speakers
NNS1 = Nonnative speakers no longer enrolled in remedial English
NNS2 = Nonnative speakers enrolled in remedial English

COMPARISON OF PERFORMANCE BY NONNATIVE SPEAKERS ON ITEMS WITH AND WITHOUT NOISE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ITEMS 1-10</th>
<th>ITEMS 11-20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(with noise)</td>
<td>(without noise)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORM A</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORM B</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RANK-ORDER CORRELATION OF PERFORMANCE OF NONNATIVE SPEAKERS ON FORMS A AND B
rho = .95 (n = 28)

RANK-ORDER CORRELATION OF PERFORMANCE OF NONNATIVE SPEAKERS NO LONGER ENROLLED IN REMEDIAL ENGLISH ON FORM A AND ON THE MULTIPLE-CHOICE VERSION OF THE DISCRETE-SENTENCE 'NOISE TEST
rho = .77 (n = 13)
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Using Cloze Procedure as an Overall Language Proficiency Test

Kenneth G. Aitken

Cloze tests are valid, reliable second language proficiency tests. This paper discusses the construction, administration, scoring and interpretation of cloze tests of overall language proficiency. Other uses of the cloze in ESL are mentioned. Finally an explanation of the cognitive processes in doing cloze tasks is offered.

Teachers of English as a second language are beginning to recognize the value of overall language proficiency tests in their programs. One such test of global proficiency is the cloze test, a type of fill-in-the-blank test constructed by randomly deleting words from a prose passage, and replacing them with blanks. Cloze tests appear to be valid, reliable language proficiency tests that can easily be constructed and used by any ESL teacher (Aitken 1975; Stubbs and Tucker 1974; and Oller 1973). The purpose of this paper is to provide some guidelines on the construction, administration, scoring, and interpretation of cloze tests, as well as to discuss a possible explanation of the cognitive processes involved in taking a cloze test. It is hoped that this discussion of the cloze procedure will be comprehensive enough to allow ESL teachers to use the cloze procedure in their own classrooms.

In order to introduce the reader to the subject I will first discuss some of the uses of cloze tests. Next I will explain some procedures for constructing administering, scoring and interpreting cloze tests. Finally I will conclude with a brief discussion of one possible explanation made by Oller (1973) of the cognitive processes involved in taking a cloze test.

Background and Uses of Cloze Procedure

Cloze tests, pioneered by Taylor (1953 and 1956), have been used for a multitude of purposes (see Jongsma 1971, Oller 1975, and Robinson 1972, for a review of research). Anderson (1971) used cloze procedure to determine the readability, hence, appropriateness, of materials for an ESL class or individual. Extending this idea, one could use materials currently used in the program that the students wish to enter and construct a criterion-referenced test of the student’s ability to cope with that material. Jongsma (1971) reports that cloze procedure is a valid and reliable measure of both specific and general reading comprehension. Recently, considerable interest has been shown in the use of cloze tests as measures of overall language proficiency in foreign language. Darnell (1968), using a cloze test and modified scoring system, obtained a high (.83) correlation with the Test of
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English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) total test score. Oller (1972) using two different scoring methods but the same cloze test obtained high correlations of (.75) and (.83) with the UCLA E.S.A. placement Examination. Stubbs and Tucker (1974) also reported a high correlation of (.76) between a cloze test and the English Entrance Examination of the American University of Beirut. There appears to be some support for using the cloze as an overall language proficiency test, as well as a reading comprehension measure.

Construction

Constructing a cloze test is a very simple operation. First select a self-contained passage of approximately 375 words. The type of passage selected will depend on the purpose of the test. A test of specific reading comprehension would require a passage previously read. On the other hand, a test of general comprehension, a readability test, or a proficiency test would necessitate choosing a passage as close to the criterion language style as possible. The teacher must be sensitive to the purpose of the test and the goals of the students and the course. In selecting a cloze passage the teacher must be careful not to place a greater demand on the students' knowledge of the content matter than can reasonably be expected of them. Though judgments of content difficulty are generally subjective, reasonably accurate predictions of language difficulty can be made by applying readability formulas to the passages to be used. These formulas usually predict readability, (i.e. passage difficulty) in terms of the minimum reading grade level of persons who can successfully comprehend the passage. Perhaps the most commonly used readability formula is the one devised by Dale and Chall (1948). Recently, however, I have switched to the grade placement formulas devised by Bormuth (1969) to predict 45 and 55 percent cloze criterion scores (the significance of these will become apparent later). Using either formula, it would probably take less than an hour to count up the various difficulty factors and do the addition and multiplication tasks in the formula, working without a calculator.

Second, systematically delete every seventh word, replacing it with a blank of standardized length, until there are fifty blanks. One might conceivably use any n-th word deletion pattern but it has been found that a less-than-every-fourth word, or more-than-every-tenth word deletion pattern is either unmanageable to take or impractical to construct (MacGinitie 1961). Whatever system is chosen, the passage length should be adjusted in such a way as to accommodate about fifty deletions (Pack 1973). Do not choose the items to be deleted, but maintain a uniform random deletion pattern. Some people have taken issue with this and have recommended that proper nouns, numbers, formulas, and dates be skipped over so as to avoid deleting them, maintaining a random pattern thereafter. Whichever view is adopted, consistency is essential. Generally cloze tests have been constructed with the first and last sentences left intact.

Third, prepare the directions and a sample question in simple language.
Administration

The instructions should be read aloud as the student follows his copy on the test. The following are the instructions I use:

In the exercise below every seventh word has been taken out, and blanks put in in their place. Your job will be to guess which word has been left out of each space and write that word in the blank.

Remember these things:
(1) Write only ONE word in each blank.
(2) Try to fill in every blank. Guess if you do not know.
(3) You may leave difficult blanks and come back to them when you have finished.
(4) Spelling mistakes will not be marked wrong.
(5) Write neatly please.
(6) Take as much time as you need. It usually takes about half an hour to do the exercise.

An easy sample item follows. For example:

“When the big man _______ driving his big car _________
the road he met _________ small man in a _________ car
driving up the _________

After the students have worked this sample item and asked any questions, the students are allowed to begin the test.

Scoring Procedure

When the test has been completed, marking is relatively simple. There are two ways to mark the cloze test; either by accepting only the exact word that was deleted, or by accepting any contextually acceptable answer. Anderson (1971) found that the two methods yielded the same results and recommended the former method because it was easier. Stubbs and Tucker (1974) suggest that the exact word replacement method is as valid as the other method. They found that with a group of 206 university students in ESL cloze tests scored both ways correlated very highly with each other (r = .97). Oller (1972) however, argues that the any-acceptable-answer method is better for use with ESL students.

I have used both scoring methods with children and adults in ESL classes at the beginning, intermediate and advanced stages of second language study. I currently favor the any-contextually-acceptable-answer method. However, there needs to be more research on marker reliability using this method.

In marking, incorrect spellings should not be penalized as long as the word is recognizable. However, the word must be grammatically correct. The wrong verb tense, for example, would not get credit. Each correct (or acceptable) answer is worth one point. Double the total (if you use fifty blanks) for the percentage.
Interpreting Cloze Scores

Before entering a discussion on the interpretation of cloze scores it would be advantageous to discuss what is meant by “reading comprehension” and “overall language proficiency.” Exactly what is meant by “reading comprehension” has never been satisfactorily determined; however, there has been a certain amount of agreement among reading specialists. Fries (1963) identifies three layers of language meanings that must be dealt with in reading comprehension:

1. Meaning carried by the lexical items.
2. Meanings carried by the grammatical structures.

Harris (1969: 59) attempts to answer the question, “What is meant by reading comprehension?” in much the same way and concludes that, in practice, the several abilities needed to comprehend the levels of meaning are mutually dependent. Thonis (1970: 164) states that reading comprehension in ESL depends on a knowledge of the meanings of words, phrases and sentences, and of arrangements of words, phrases, and sentences according to the conventions of written English. She suggests that the readers must perceive words, phrases and sentences in print; must have experiences which provide a basis for understanding these words, phrases and sentences; must grasp meanings that are greater than the words themselves; and must use this control of print in many different ways. There is more to reading comprehension than meets the eye.

Language proficiency refers to the facility with which an individual can cope with the communication needs of a given task, or in a given situation (Spolsky 1968). These contexts require the individual to function on all three of Fries’ levels of meaning and to draw heavily on his own experience bank of real and vicarious communication experiences. Those who attempt to measure language proficiency recognize that what Harris says about skills in reading comprehension being mutually dependent extends into all aspects of language use. Language proficiency is more than mastery of a specific number of discrete structure points and lexical items.

In the final analysis, since overall language proficiency and reading comprehension both depend on the individual’s mastery of meaning on the various levels, as well as on the individual’s experience bank, a good reading comprehension test is also good test of overall language proficiency. We will return to this point again later.

In multiple-choice reading tests 75 percent and 90 percent comprehension scores are often used for evaluating reading comprehension. A score of 90 percent or greater puts one on what is referred to as an independent level. A score of 75 percent to 89 percent puts one on an instructional level. Finally, a score below 75 percent puts one on the frustration level. The following descriptions of these three levels are suggested as guides, rather than absolute rules, to assist the teacher in determining the relationship between the student’s proficiency and the communication task.
At the independent level the student can handle the material independently from the classroom or the teacher. A book with a readability rating at this level may be suitable for leisure reading. This range of scores on an overall language proficiency test would indicate that the student would likely experience successful communication in similar circumstances outside the classroom.

When functioning on the instructional level the student can manage to cope with this material with guidance or assistance from an instructor. A book on this readability level would be suitable for a supplemental reading activity after an explanation or discussion to introduce the content. This score range on a language proficiency test would indicate that the student would need some form of supplemental second language instruction at a level depending on his actual score.

At the frustration level the student cannot understand the material. A book rated in this score range would be much too difficult to understand. A score in this range on a language proficiency test would indicate a need for some basic, intensive ESL instruction.

A comparison of the results of Anderson's (1971) study of cloze tests in ESL with the results from three studies of cloze test for native speakers at the 75 percent and 90 percent reference points is presented in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In regard to reference points for these previously mentioned levels, Anderson's results seem to be comparable to Bormuth's 1968 results. However it should be noted that Anderson's range within the instructional level is much narrower than the other studies for native speakers. I suspect that his equivalent for the 90% criteria is too low, and that in fact it should probably be closer to Bormuth's 1968 results. This remains to be verified. Needless to say, decisions about individuals based solely on percentages are not entirely just. Caution is required in these areas.

Let us take a hypothetical case to illustrate the cloze test presentation and interpretation. A group of ESL students wish to take a course in beginning bookkeeping. Our questions is, “Do they know enough English to follow the lectures and do the assignments in the workbook used in beginning bookkeeping?” One of the measuring sticks we have chosen to help us answer this question is a cloze test. In selecting a passage to use for the cloze we may choose either from the instructional materials used in the bookkeeping course, or from materials within the difficulty range that students enrolled in
the course can cope with. Often school regulations restrict enrollment in
courses to those who have attained ninth grade, for example. Should this
be the case with beginning bookkeeping, we may be able to learn from the
school’s reading consultant the average Reading Grade Level of native
English speaking students in ninth grade at our school, or in the area. Then
we may choose a passage that has a safe content (i.e. subject matter is not
too strange to be comprehended when a cloze test is made, but still within
the reading ability of native speakers taking the course. If our native speak-
ing ninth graders had a Reading Grade Level of 7.5, we might select a
passage with a Reading Grade Level of 6.5 or 7. The higher the Reading
Grade Level of the passage is, the lower the cloze scores of the student are.
After constructing, administering and marking the test we may find that we
have scores ranging from 16 to 60 percent score on all the three levels we
discussed previously. We would probably consider that those whose scores
are on the “instructional” or “independent” levels know enough English to
take the bookkeeping course, if the other proficiency measures support that
conclusion. We might even pass students whose scores are between 40 and
45 percent, the upper margin of the frustration level, if we have other evidence
to suggest that they can cope with both the linguistic and the communication
demands placed on students in beginning bookkeeping.

With practice, selecting appropriate cloze passages and interpreting cloze
test results in light of your selection criterion becomes easier.

Redundancy and Language Comprehension

One of the fundamental truths about natural language is that it is
redundant. Redundancy is that property of language that allows us to
predict missing symbols from the context (Carroll 1964). Highly redundant
texts tend to be repetitive and contain relatively little information per
symbol. By “information” is meant “the informativeness of the symbols”
(Shannon and Weaver 1949). Consider the following sentence with two
words deleted:

The ____ (A) ____ is going ____ (B) ____ sink in the quicksand.

Deletion (A) could be filled by almost any word representing a tangible
thing that could sink in quicksand. When we learn that the missing word
is “boy” we note that in this context “boy” contains a lot of information.
However, the word missing in deletion (B) could only be “to.” Since we
can guess this without too much difficulty, we learn that in this context “to”
contains relatively little information that is new. The words “going” and
“sink,” the environment of “to,” contain enough information that, when
compared with our own internalized grammar, we can unerringly predict the
correct answer.

The greater the redundancy in a message, the greater the chance that the
message will be understood. That the greater the redundancy one perceives
in a message, the greater the chance one will understand it, logically follows.
Redundancy is only helpful to the extent that the receiver of the message is
capable of taking advantage of it. If the receiver does not know the structure or rules of the language, or has no previous experiences to give him a feeling of what is likely to be communicated, redundancy is not very helpful. English to an ESL speaker is only redundant to the extent that his concept of English language and communication strategies matches that of a native speaker (see George 1972 for further discussion).

Redundancy is very helpful as it reduces the possibility of errors and misunderstanding and permits communication where there is interference in the communication channel. Messages can be comprehended even though a portion of them are omitted or distorted. However, if we give these mutilated messages to someone who is not a native speaker and does not know the language well, he will experience considerable difficulty in understanding the message. He requires the full normal redundancy (Spolsky 1971). A cloze test is just such a mutilated message. The correspondence between the ESL student’s conception of English redundancy and the actual rules of English redundancy becomes an index of his overall language proficiency in English.

When a student responds to the items on a cloze test he is required to project a word to fill in a blank and complete a sequence on the basis of an complete message. He formulates hypotheses or expectations about the information that is to follow by sampling the information that he has available. By further sampling subsequent sequences, the student confirms or disconfirms these hypotheses. If they are disconfirmed, he rejects or revises his expectation, forming a new hypothesis (Oller 1973).

Kenneth S. Goodman (1971) describes the receptive language processes, that is, those of listening and reading in the same terms:

... the efficient language user takes the most direct route and touches the fewest bases necessary to get to his goal. He accomplishes this by sampling, relying on the redundancy of language and his knowledge of linguistic constraints. He predicts structures, tests them against the semantic context which he builds up from the situation and the ongoing discourse and then confirms or disconfirms as he processes further language.

Receptive language processes are cycles of sampling, predicting, testing and confirming. The language user relies on strategies which yield the most reliable prediction with the minimum use of the information available. (p. 136)

Oller (1973) notes that this process is the “mirror image” of what takes place in productive language use (speaking or writing). When a person is trying to convey an idea in speech, he has certain expectations about what he wants to say. He samples his own output and tests and modifies it as he proceeds in order to meet his own expectations. Many of our ungrammatical utterances are the result of such midstream readjustments in our speech.

Further insight into the notion that receptive and productive language processes are integrated comes from Halle and Stevens (1962) who suggest that a listener recognizes what he hears by comparing it with some internal representation which is generated as required by following the same gen-
erative rules that normally are used in speaking. If this is true, then the rules of the language are incorporated into a language theory only once in a generative form. The theory, therefore, is one a language user, not a speaker or listener alone.

Miller (1964) in summarizing Halle and Stevens' suggestion explains:

The listener begins with a guess about the input. On that basis he generates an internal matching signal. The first attempt will probably be in error; if so, the mismatch is reported and used as a basis for the next guess, which should be closer. This cycle repeats (unconsciously, almost certainly) until a satisfactory (not necessarily correct) match is obtained, at which point the next segment of speech is scanned and matched, etc. The output is not a transformed version of the input; it is the programme that was followed to generate the matching representation. (pp. 30-31)

If these processes in "productive" and "receptive" language are not really distinct, but actually manifestations of the same underlying competence, as Halle and Stevens (1962), Miller (1964), Goodman (1971) and Oller (1973) imply, then a good general comprehension test of reading would be a good overall language proficiency test. Studies of cloze procedure in first and second language tend to bear this out.

In conclusion, I have found, after having constructed, administered and scored over a thousand cloze tests to ESL students in the last three years, that the cloze procedure is an extremely simple, yet valid language proficiency test. Cloze procedure is not a panacea for all ESL testing problems; however cloze tests yield more "miles per gallon" of sweat spent in test construction than most ESL teachers realize. Overall language proficiency tests like the cloze merit much greater consideration than they are given in preparing ESL proficiency test batteries.
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Distractor Efficiency in Foreign Language Testing

Hubbard C. Goodrich

The purpose of the investigation was to discover the relative rank order of efficiency of eight distractor categories in multiple-choice foreign language vocabulary tests. The questions postulated were the following:

1—Which distractor category has the greatest potency to attract students away from the correct response?
2—Which distractor category has the greatest facility to discriminate or separate students into proficiency levels?
3—What differences are there between populations of the same language but from different geographical areas?

The type of test question used was clarified, the types of distractors were defined and the process of selection described, the test design was discussed, and the resulting data tabulated and interpreted.

In conclusion, we found a definite hierarchy of preference, also differences and agreements in the effectiveness of the distractor types. Greater differences existed for our populations of contrasting English proficiency. Few differences existed for our populations of similar proficiency. No differences existed for our populations of similar proficiency but dissimilar location.

The Multiple Choice Test (MCT) format has been selected by many language teachers for the measurement of student achievement or general proficiency. Writing such a test, however, is not easy. The professionally developed test has applied procedures unavailable to the classroom teacher, who usually has little training, equipment or time in the construction of MCT to exercise some of the arcane operations of the testing specialist. Yet most teachers are required to prepare class tests at some point in their teaching careers. How can the teacher improve his test writing efforts? Let us first look at the type of test questions being considered.

The structure of the Multiple Choice Question under scrutiny here has three basic elements. (1) the Lead, Stem, or Question (2) the Correct Choice or Answer, and (3) two to four Wrong Choices or distractors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Distractors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) I write with a</td>
<td>(2) (a) pen</td>
<td>(b) horse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) book</td>
<td>(d) fork</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The effectiveness of Multiple Choice Questions depends on the validity of the lead and the correct choice, but we must not lose sight of the importance of the distractors in making any question of this type efficient.

Mr. Goodrich is Director, English Language Institute, University of Petroleum and Minerals, Dhahran, Saudi Arabia.
Choosing distractors is a small but essential aspect of constructing multiple choice items. Much has been written about tests and measurement, but few studies seem to have been undertaken to investigate the area of alternate choices. Specialists in foreign language testing have mentioned several types of distractors but it has been difficult to find evidence to substantiate their selections.

An effective question and each distractor should have a degree of potency and discrimination. The degree of potency is measured by the number of percentage of students making a specific choice. If no one chooses a particular distractor, it is not participating effectively in the process of giving the question a factor of difficulty. On the other hand, a distractor which is too attractive may be a correct answer to a badly posed question.

A distractor’s facility of discrimination is its ability to separate or differentiate students of differing levels of proficiency-between able and less able students. The potency of a distractor must be combined with its factor of discrimination if its efficiency is to be determined. One quality without the other can be misleading.

The purpose of this paper is to report the results of an investigation into the efficiency of various types or classes of single-word distractors in testing English as a Second Language in an attempt to improve a teacher’s test writing capabilities in at least this one area and to answer three questions:

1. Which distractor category has the greatest potency to attract students away from the correct response?
2. Which distractor category has the greatest facility or power to discriminate or separate students at different levels of proficiency?
3. What differences are there, if any, between populations of the same language but from different geographical areas?

Our aim, then, is to identify and define important classes of distractors and to design a test situation that would force students to demonstrate the relative efficiency of a class of distractors rather than any one specific distractor as one might find in a normal item analysis.

The first task was to identify discrete types of distractors. A search of

---

1 Different types of distractors are discussed in the following: (a) Clark, p. 77; (b) Cornbluth, pp. 164-173; (c) Harris, pp. 55-57; (d) Lado, pp. 191-194; (e) Valette, pp. 191-194; (f) Michigan Test Manual, p. 2.

2 Potency: Testing specialists disagree. The parameters of acceptable potency for a question vary from 0.30 to 0.90. Some authorities insist on including questions of different levels of difficulty to spread the students. Others feel that keeping the difficulty level at the mid-point (70% if that is passing or 50% for a normal distribution) is ideal and students will spread themselves. The level of difficulty for a distractor is not given. But any alternate choice with a value less than 1% should be considered worthless. The upper value would vary depending on the number of distractors available for each question but certain values over 40% should be examined carefully. Discrimination: A question discriminates if it separates or differentiates high and low scoring students. The power of discrimination depends on the degree to which the wrong answers attract the misinformed student. Diederich (p. 2) states that there should be at least a 10% (preferably 15%) difference between the high/low groups. Other statistics prefer different procedures but the principle remains.
the available literature and an exercise in imagination discovered ten distinct types which could be classified. Eight were finally chosen for the study.

1. False Cognate— A Cognate is a word similar in meaning and pronunciation in language one (L₁) and language two (L₂). A False Cognate is a word that sounds like a word in L₁ but does not mean the same thing in L₂. An example might be tea in English and /say/ in Arabic. The English word shy would be a false cognate. If one were to write a test item where the correct answer would be tea, an inept student with some familiarity with the English orthographic system might select a distractor such as shy because it sounds to his inner ear like a choice that might be an appropriate response to the question.

2. Cloze— The Cloze procedure involves the deletion of one or more words from a passage and asking the student to complete the passage with an appropriate word. The cloze distractor is an inappropriate word chosen by students of L₂ to cloze procedure test.

3. Antonym— An Antonym is a word which has an opposite or near opposite meaning to the correct choice.

4. False Synonym— A False Synonym is a word which has a close or, in some situations, a similar meaning to the correct choice, but is a selection which is not appropriate given the context of the lead.

5. Graphemic Variation— A Graphemic Variation is a word with letter modification—a word with letters moved, parts changed or shifted in certain ways as in reversals, substitutions, or positional alterations which may or may not, reflect phonemic contrasts between L₁ and L₂. Examples might be bread/beard or hide/ripe.

6. Arbitrary— An Arbitrary choice is a word selected at random and is usually completely irrelevant to the lead.

7. Affix— An Affix choice is a word which is modified by morphemic addition or deletion.

8. Contextual— A Contextual choice is a word which is related to the context of the question. It is its typicality that might mislead a student.

A number of other distractors were rejected. A pragmatic distractor is a word selected on the basis of classroom experience and might be difficult to generalize and apply outside the teacher's personal experience. Mis-spellings and nonsense words are also possible categories of distractors but were not included in this study for reasons of personal prejudice.

The second task was the actual process of selection. As the false cognates were considered to be the most restrictive and, with cloze, the most time consuming to develop, the search for distractors was initiated with the first two types.

The false cognates were chosen by a multiple process of elimination. First, the author read all the stimulus words from a frequency list (Thorndike-Lorge) of 3000 words (the syntactic or function words were rejected) to three bilingual Saudi informants. The informants translated orally. The author selected those Arabic words which might sound like an English word.
Three hundred and fifty-two words were discovered and the process reversed. The false cognate words were then printed on a list in English and shown to 50 Saudi students of English. They were asked to write down any Arabic word or words that were brought to mind for each English cue word. If 20% or more of the students agreed that the cue word called to mind a specific Arabic word with the same meaning as the original stimulus word, it was selected as a false cognate. The first step involved 3000 words. The second step involved 352 words. Only 143 words remained after the third step.

The 143 words were then submitted to a cloze procedure test. Ten native speakers of English (British and American teachers) and twenty Saudi students of English were given the cloze test. The results were tabulated and compared. If two or more students selected an alternate response to the one chosen by the native speakers, it was retained as a distractor. If there was agreement between the Saudi students and native speakers, the word was discarded. This procedure eliminated all but 60 of the original stimulus words.

The selection of the first two distractor groups involved the most amount of time and energy. In fact, so much effort was expended that these two classes of distractors might be eliminated from consideration by teachers interested in developing their own objective class tests. Most teachers do not have the time to devote to such activities. However, all the other distractors were chosen on the basis of the 60 remaining stimulus words each with a cloze and false cognate distractor.

Antonyms and false synonyms were chosen from various dictionaries and a Roget's Thesaurus. Where a clear antonym or synonym did not exist, or where it involved obvious differences in levels of difficulty, alternates were selected on the basis of prima facie differences or similarities.

Graphemic variation distractors were selected by the manipulation of the consonant letters of the stimulus word in an attempt to find some real English word. It was assumed that the similarity in appearance of the distractor to the stimulus word in a visual sense might be attractive to some students. If more than one alternative existed, the final selection was subjective. No purely spelling differences were chosen (e.g. dessert vs. desert).

Arbitrary choice distractors were chosen by chance from a 10,000 word frequency list. Any choice was eliminated if the number of syllables (word length) varied by more than two syllables, if the choice was a possible correct answer, or for syntactic incompatibility.

Affix distractors were selected by the modification of the stimulus word using appropriate affixes. The number of these distractors was limited in this study as their use might obviously provide a student with a clue to the correct answer.

Contextual distractors were chosen on the basis of the semantic environment of the question. The author made the selection solely by reference to the lead.

The third step was to write the questions. Each question was a completion type lead which required an understanding of the item in order to be
able to select the correct answer. Most of the questions retained vocabulary below the 3000 word level. It was decided to increase the number of questions on the test from sixty to eighty even though eight distractors were not available in all cases for all questions. The additional questions were designed to increase the quantity of some categories with few examples and to add questions with proven difficulty and discriminatory capability to increase the spread of the test population. A summary of the percentage of distractors in each category may be found in Table 1 (Pe).

Two forms of the exam were written. Each form had identical questions but in a different order. Most questions on the different forms had different distractors so that all eight distractors, if available, would be given an opportunity to attract similar populations under similar conditions. The correct choices and distractors were distributed equally among the two forms. Where eight distractors were not available, one or more categories were used again on the different form.

A practice administration of the tests was conducted in the early Spring of 1974 with a population of 334 Arabic speaking Saudi students of English at UPM. Corrections were then made on the examination, and the computer program was refined.

During the late Spring, Summer and Fall of 1974, 101 students were tested at the American University of Cairo (AUC). Forty Saudi secondary students, 25 Saudi adults and 728 additional UPM students were also tested. A total of 1203 Arabic speaking students of English eventually made up our test population.

The relative efficiency of a distractor is demonstrated by two criteria—a factor of potency and a factor of discrimination.

**Potency**—The Factor (PF) was determined by measuring the difference between expected responses (Pe) and actual responses (Pa) for each distractor group. The expected responses were determined by dividing the total number of times a distractor appeared on the test by the total number of incorrect choices on the exam. (PF = Pa – Pe).

A positive PF indicates the distractor was chosen by students more often

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distractor Class</th>
<th>Pa %</th>
<th>Pe %</th>
<th>PF</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognate False</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>-4.8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloze</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonym</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>+2.3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synonym False</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>+6.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grapheme</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>-2.7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbitrary</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>-4.7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affix</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>+4.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pa = actual response
Pe = expected response
PF = Potency Factor
than would be expected according to the number of times the distractor appeared on the test. A negative PF value indicates it was chosen less often than would be expected. The procedure above was used to provide the figures to rank the distractor types according to their relative potency.

**DISCRIMINATION** —The Discrimination Factor was determined by the relationship between a student’s total score on the test and the number of times he selected a given class of distractor. Two points should be noted from the first:

1. The validity of the test may be rightfully questioned. No attempt has been made to provide construct validity for placing students in high or low groups. However, limited data did exist for some students and it seems safe to assume that a limited content validity existed.
2. The derived relationships are spurious because the student’s score is a negative function of the total number of incorrect responses on the same test; therefore, the relative discrimination of the distractor will be determined by ranking the distractor according to the magnitude of the statistic measuring discrimination and not by the significance levels of the statistic.

Three statistical procedures were used initially to determine the ability of the distractor to differentiate between students with high and low scores. Table 2 shows the values of these three statistics for each type of distractor. In each case the number in parentheses following the statistic is the rank of the distractor’s ability to discriminate as indicated by that statistic.

The distractor types are listed in an order reflecting their composite rating for the three statistics. While there is very close agreement among the three as to ranking for the total population, Kendall’s Tau B is perhaps the easiest to defend in terms of both its appropriateness (the data is essentially a ranking when the students are split into groups of low-middle-high scores); and its consistency with the top 27% versus bottom 27% conventions used in item analysis.

**Interpretation of Data**

An examination of the data shows good agreement between test samples.
### TABLE 3a
Potency and Discrimination Ranking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AUC</th>
<th>DAMMAM</th>
<th>UPM II</th>
<th>UPM I</th>
<th>UP/II</th>
<th>UP/I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Totals and</td>
<td>AUC</td>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Totals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Population Figures for each sub-group in study</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Average Score on Distractor Test in percent</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>67.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Coordinate Evaluation Information:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Test of English Language Proficiency, Forms A-H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Potency Rank</td>
<td>Synonym False</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Context</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Antonym</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affix</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cloze</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grapheme Variation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cognate False</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arbitrary</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Discrimination Rank</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cognate False</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affix</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Antonym</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grapheme Variation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Synonym False</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cloze</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arbitrary</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AUC = American University of Cairo
UPM = University of Petroleum and Minerals
DAMMAN = Damman Gulf Secondary School
for potency. All the students—good or bad, Saudi or Egyptian—generally agreed on the attractiveness of the specific distractor class. Such was not the case with discrimination. Some distractors proved more effective with the good students while the poor students found others more effective. The false synonym, for example, was very popular but not very effective at differentiation. It proved equally attractive to both good and bad students. And false cognates discriminated extremely well but were among the least popular choices. Only the poorest student found them appealing.

By itself the data is interesting but not very helpful. Some procedure must be established to provide the teacher with a useful index. Lacking evidence to provide guidance and for the sake of simplicity, we have combined rankings evenly. More sophisticated teachers might wish to give different weights to the potency and discrimination ranks. Based on the data presented here, one can ascertain visually those distractors which appear to be most effective. They are in order of rank as shown in Table 3a.

Samples chosen from the first four distractor groups should provide sufficient choices for any test question. One might make selections from all four or only one class and expect a better chance of having efficient distractors than if one were to choose items from words in the last four of the rank.

As a final step, our test was revised so that words from all the poor distractor groups were placed in Form A and words from all the good distractor classes were included in Form B. Both forms used 55 identical questions and answers retained from the original form and amended where necessary. The order of the questions differed but the answer choice position was identical for both forms. If our contention is correct that one group of distractors is more efficient than another, Form B should prove to be the better test.

The confirmation test was administered to 228 UPM students in May 1975. The mean for Form A was 79.35. The mean for Form B was 74.1. The t-test for difference between the two means was significant at the 0.05 level (t = 16.851). Both forms were correlated with the students' scores on three forms of the Michigan Test of Aural Comprehension, and the Michigan Test of General Proficiency. In all cases, the correlations were higher for Form B than for Form A. In essence, the B Form of the test proved better than the A Form. As the forms were identical with the exception of the distractors used, it seems safe to assume that the distractors helped to make the difference.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distractor</th>
<th>Potency Rank</th>
<th>Discrimination Rank</th>
<th>Combined Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonym</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synonym, False</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affix</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognate, False</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grapheme Var.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloze</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbitrary</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

What may we discover from this presentation? To return to our three original questions, we found that there does exist a definite hierarchy of distractor efficiency in terms of (1) potency, and (2) discrimination. This was especially true for potency. All groups demonstrated a corresponding preference for distractor types. There was, however, an uneven agreement in discrimination.

We also discovered that the most popular distractors were not necessarily the most discriminating. In other words, many test subjects were attracted, both good and bad, rather than just the bad as we might wish. (3) We also found that subjects from different geographical locations, which imply different dialects, may not have any major differences in terms of potency, discrimination or rank in their choices.

Differences can be detected between groups of contrasting proficiency but similar populations. There appear to be major changes in distractor efficiency between the two populations which are most clearly identical in all but ability.

The Context distractor ranked first with the upper group and fourth with the lower group. Its discrimination index was especially weak with the less capable though it remained quite popular.

Antonyms and Synonyms could be ranked equally for the total population but were reversed, strangely, in that Synonyms were more effective for upper groups while lower groups found Antonyms more attractive. Conversely, Antonyms failed to discriminate for the upper groups and Synonyms for the lower groups though both distractors ranked equally for potency. It was an interesting and puzzling discovery but one for which we have no explanation.

An additional contrast for the less efficient distractors may be seen with the graphemic and cloze types. The former was ranked fourth with the more proficient student but seventh with the less able. The cloze ranked in reverse order—sixth and third respectively. Why should good students have visual problems of discernment? It is equally perplexing.

The cloze distractors seemed to be strongest for the low and intermediate students. In the confirmation test when ranked with the less efficient false cognate, grapheme variation and arbitrary distractors, the cloze type was an unambiguous first. One explanation for this showing is that this class of words proved in many cases to be identical or similar to words in the false synonym family.

The final three distractors agreed fairly evenly with all populations. The affix distractor was quite effective at all proficiency levels. It was a top distractor but weak in popularity. However, this type may be misplaced in a vocabulary test and may be measuring different skills.

The false cognates were average in discrimination but near the bottom in potency. Only the very lowest students chose them. For that group only, they might be considered for inclusion in a vocabulary MCT.

The last distractor type—those chosen arbitrarily—demonstrated no
redeeming features and should be withdrawn completely from consideration for any test of this nature.

Conclusion

In conclusion, we found that there were definite differences in the effectiveness of eight selected distractor types. We also found that the differences between populations of varied proficiency was greater than between groups from different geographical locations. As this was a descriptive study limited to native speakers of Arabic, one should not conclude that our results will be duplicated with other linguistically homogeneous populations. It is hoped that efforts of replication will be made with alternate language groups to provide additional data to confirm or confound the results given here, but it seems safe to state that the conclusions of this study are indicative of a tendency for some types of distractors to be more efficient than others in certain kinds of test situations, and that teachers might construct better tests if they give more careful consideration to the distractors they wish to include.
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Occasionally questions have been raised as to how well domestic students whose first language is English will perform on the TOEFL examination. This experimental examination showed that 173 freshman and sophomore Psychology class students at a major southern university earned an average score of 628. Their performance was compared with their scores on the American College Testing program (ACT) entrance examination revealing that academically they were representative of non-tested freshman and sophomore students.

Likewise the performance of this group was compared with that of a college group tested at a Western State University in the mid-60s, revealing great similarities in performance.

The major conclusion of this experiment was that TOEFL scores do not relate to academic aptitude or performance of domestic students and cannot be used successfully to discriminate between successful and unsuccessful college students. To attempt to evaluate the English competency of native speakers with this examination is inappropriate for, as revealed in the paper, the level of difficulty of the test discriminates only between students with non-native competency.

Introduction

In an attempt to provide baseline data as to the meaning of TOEFL scores, the Educational Testing Services’ Test of English as a Foreign Language was administered to 173 American freshmen and sophomore students enrolled in Psychology 2500 at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville. It was hoped the results of this test would provide an understanding of what undergraduate students could be expected to score on this widely used proficiency examination. The participants were students who volunteered to give three and a half hours of their time to take this five part examination in return for credit for participation in a required experiment and an opportunity to win money.

The examinations and the scoring services were provided without cost by the Educational Testing Service. Two hundred fifty dollars in prize money for this project was provided by the Learning Research Center of The University of Tennessee and was awarded to participants immediately following the testing without regard to performance on the examination.

According to ETS only once before—in February, 1969, at a “western state university”—was this examination administered to a domestic student group. On that occasion William H. Angoff and Auriel T. Sharon (1975) tested 71 native English speaking freshman. Thus, the populations

---

Mr. Johnson, Director, International Services, University of Tennessee, is current chairman of the Council of Advisers to Foreign Students and Scholars (CAFSS) of the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs (NAFSA).
were not identical; that is, in the present case, both freshman and sophomores were tested; also the year, the location of the universities and the size of the groups, are different.

Following receipt of the TOEFL test scores from ETS, the American College Testing Program (ACT) scores were obtained for 146, or 84.5% of the 173 American students who took the examination. Additionally, place of residence information, and racial data were collected for all participants.

Purpose

This experiment was conducted to seek answers to the following questions.

1. How realistic is the University’s requirement that a non-native English speaker submit a minimum score of 475 on the TOEFL test for admission consideration?
2. Does the residence of the domestic student have any effect on his Listening Comprehension score on the TOEFL?
3. What is the relationship between TOEFL part and total scores and the ACT part and composite scores?

Occasionally foreign students have suggested that the University of Tennessee’s requirement of a 475 total score for undergraduate admission is an unrealistic minimum, although many universities impose a higher cut-off score. By testing native speakers it was thought that some measure would be obtained of the validity of the 475 total requirement.

Secondly, more than one-fourth of the students enrolled at The University of Tennessee come from isolated areas of the state where a distinctive regional dialect continues to be spoken. It was thought, therefore, that perhaps a disproportionate number of students from rural homes who speak with a regional dialect might score lower on the listening part of the examination.

Third, much has recently been written of “grade inflation” and the suggestion that students are not as well qualified for college work now at the time of entry as students were in previous years. If this is the case, might it not logically follow that the TOEFL scores earned by this test population would be lower than those earned by the domestic population tested in 1969?

Fourth, in the 1969 administration it was found that a correlation of .64 existed between the TOEFL total and ACT English part score. Is this correlation still valid today, or has this changed?

Procedure

As was briefly mentioned earlier, all students enrolled in Psychology 2500, introductory Psychology were given an opportunity to take the TOEFL test and earn experiment participation credit for this course. Because equal psychological experiment credit could be earend for partici-
pation in any experiment lasting over 30 minutes and this test required three and one-half hours, an additional incentive was provided. All participants in the experiment were asked to bring positive birthdate identification with them to the testing. On the basis of birthdates, i.e. selected dates and months, $250.00 in prize money was distributed immediately following the testing.

The completed answer sheets were then sent to the Educational Testing Service for scoring. Upon their return each individual’s scores were recorded on an IBM card for data analysis. In addition to an identifying number and the five part and total scores on the TOEFL test, a code identifying race, a code identifying location of high school graduated from, i.e. metropolitan Tennessee, rural Tennessee, metropolitan south, rural south, metropolitan other, and rural other, and the four part and the composite scores earned on the ACT test were punched for those candidates from whom such scores were available in the University Admissions Office.

The data was then analyzed by the University Computing Center utilizing the IBM 360 computer using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) program.

Results

As would be expected at a public state university, the preponderance of the students tested in this project were from Tennessee: 152 of 173. Two-thirds, or 96 of the 152 Tennessee residents were from urban areas, and the balance, 56, reported Tennessee home towns with populations of less than 30,000.

The remaining 21 non-Tennessee test takers included 11 from southern and 10 from non-southern states. As only six of the 173 test takers were non-Caucasian, no attempt was made to analyze the scores by the criterion of race.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Listening Comprehension</th>
<th>English Structure</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Reading Comprehension</th>
<th>Writing Ability</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metro Tn. Residents N = 96</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>626.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Tn. Residents N = 56</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>628.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Tn. N = 21</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>635.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. scores possible</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>678</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The 173 domestic students who sat for this examination achieved the following mean scores on the TOEFL test: Listening Comprehension 69.9; English Structure 64.3; Vocabulary 65.2; Reading Comprehension 56.6; Writing Ability 58.0; and Total 628.0. The maximum scores on this form of TOEFL were: Listening Comprehension 73; English Structure 66; Vocabulary 69; Reading Comprehension 66; and Writing Ability 65 (See Table I). As was observed in the Angoff and Sharon Administration, the scores earned by the domestic students on the reading comprehension and writing ability sections were noticeably lower than the scores earned on the other three parts.

As one way of determining the validity of these scores for the entire University of Tennessee lower division undergraduate population, the ACT scores were obtained for the experimental group and compared to the Fall, 1974 UT freshman population. These are given in Table II. The scores for the experimental and the total population on the parts of the ACT were respectively: English 20.4/20.0; Math 21.0/20.9; Social Studies 20.2/20.6; Science 22.7/22.7; and Composite 21.2/21.2. Given the close similarity of the ACT scores between the two groups, and the fact that the Pearson Correlation Coefficient between the TOEFL total and the ACT composite score at this administration was 0.6555, it is likely that the TOEFL scores earned by the experimental population effectively represent the TOEFL scores of the entire UT freshman population.

Because the domestic student group tested in this experiment earned a total TOEFL mean score of 628, and judging from their ACT scores they were quite representative of domestic freshman and sophomore students, it would appear that The University of Tennessee general requirement of a 475 total TOEFL score for undergraduate foreign students is not unrealistic. As many foreign students in the pure and applied sciences providing minimal TOEFL scores at admission, satisfactorily, and frequently

1A T-test was used to compare the ACT scores of the experimental population with the total UT freshman class population to determine the representativeness of the experimental group. A T score of at least 1.96 was required for the two groups to be judged significantly different at the .05 level. As the largest T score observed was .63 for the comparison of the ACT Social Studies part scores of the two groups, the experimental population's ACT scores can be considered statistically representative of the Fall, 1974 freshman class.
with distinction, complete degree programs, it would not seem too low. Since undergraduate foreign students are expected to learn at apace of domestic students who, according to this experiment, will score at least 150 points higher on the average, any reduction in this score requirement would also seem unwise.

The effect of residence on a student's performance on the Listening Comprehension part score was opposite of what had been expected; not only did the students from rural Tennessee home towns, where a distinctive regional dialect prevails, not score lower than students from metropolitan Tennessee—they scored slightly higher! The rural Tennessee mean score was 70.3 as compared to 69.5 for metropolitan Tennessee residents. Some support for this idea that a regional dialect affects listening comprehension may be suggested by the fact that the 21 non-Tennessee residents tested slightly higher than the state residents—earning a mean score of 70.7. Comparing the three resident groups' scores reveals that the differences, i.e. 69.5, 70.3, 70.7 were so slight as to be statistically insignificant. Therefore, it is concluded that in this project residence was shown to have no influence on the Listening Comprehension part score of the TOEFL.

Table 111 compares the scores of the 173 freshman students with 71

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE III</th>
<th>TOEFL SCORE COMPARISON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Listening Comprehension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975 N = 173</td>
<td>69.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969 N = 71</td>
<td>69.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

freshman English speakers tested at a western state university in 1969. It shows that the present group scored noticeably higher. The means on the Listening Comprehension, English Structure, Reading Comprehension, and Vocabulary sections were separated by less than one point. On Writing Ability though, the present group mean scores were substantially higher. It tested at a mean of 58.0 as compared to 55.4 for the 1969 group. This 2.6 point difference was reflected in the total score difference (the TOEFL total score is twice the sum of the part scores). The mean total scores for the 1975 and the 1969 groups were 628 and 622 respectively.

The examination of the prediction capability of the part scores of the

It should be borne in mind that the two groups were not identical in composition; the 1969 group was entering freshman students and the current group was both freshman and sophomore students enrolled in a sophomore level psychology course. Because of the level of the course, and the fact that this test was administered in January, it is highly likely that these students had completed the first term of Freshman Composition. Presumably these factors might account for the 2.6 point mean score difference in the two groups.
The present group revealed a slightly higher correlation between the TOEFL total score and the ACT English part score. The 1969 testing found a .64 correlation; this project found a .67 correlation. The fact that in both cases the correlation is low should not be surprising. The TOEFL is obviously designed for speakers of English as a Foreign Language while the ACT test is intended for native speakers; thus the level of difficulty is appropriately different.

Discussion

The domestic students' mean TOEFL total of 628 might lead one to question the advisability of a University minimum score requirement of 475 for non-native speakers. Yet it is important to remember that TOEFL solely measures English ability; it makes no attempt to measure academic capability—the relatively low correlation of .655 with the ACT composite score also bears this out. Secondly, no standardized test yet developed can measure either desire or tenacity; and the experience of all educators can point to notable examples of “overachievers.” That is, students whose standardized test scores suggested a much lower capability than subsequent classroom performance revealed. Oriental students in particular, with relatively limited linguistic skills, frequently through diligent hard work and long hours of study earn much higher grades than a low TOEFL score might lead one to expect. Thus, the minimal TOEFL score of 475 for a non-native English speaker seems to be appropriate.

Listening Comprehension scores seem to be little affected by the speaking of a regional dialect. The ability to understand standard English may be in part due to the standardization due to the ready availability of radio and television. Perhaps if persons with very low exposure to standard English were tested the results on this section of the TOEFL might have been different.

The difference in the size of the test populations and the level of schooling have been pointed to as factors which might account for the

---

3 The wide variation in intercorrelations between the part and the composite scores is frequently observed. The English part score usually has the lowest intercorrelation as it is in part based on reading ability which is also measured by the social studies and the science part scores.
higher score of the 1975 than the 1969 test populations. Also, the fact that the mean composite ACT score for the 1969 sample was 19.13 as compared with 21.2 for the current sample is most important.

The relationship of the TOEFL part scores to the total and the ACT part scores to the composite ACT score has also been discussed. Certain scores were pointed to as more indicative of the total score than others.

**Conclusion**

The University of Tennessee minimal total score requirement of 475 for non-native speakers on the TOEFL seems quite realistic. By the same token, it is demonstrated that an average freshman or sophomore student should have no difficulty scoring at least 150 points higher. TOEFL is designed, in the words of ETS, “to assess the degree of facility with those nuances of English that seem to cause foreign students difficulties in pursuing college studies.” This testing demonstrated that this group of domestic students had little difficulty in understanding these nuances.

Another indication of the inappropriateness of the TOEFL for domestic students is evident from comparing our experimental group’s performance with the summary statistics available from ETS for the 215,486 foreign candidates who sat for TOEFL all over the world between October, 1966 and June, 1971 (see Table IV). The mean score for the foreign candidates was 490 or 138 points lower than this experimental group’s mean of 628. As interesting as the mean score differences between foreign candidates and the domestic experimental population are, is the standard deviation scores for the two groups—80.0 and 35.1, respectively. The uniformly higher mean scores for the current experimental population should be expected, and likewise the smaller standard deviation of these scores. This demonstrates that the distribution of the domestic student scores was much narrower than for the foreign test takers and points to the fact that this test was not developed to discriminate between native speakers of English.

This project has demonstrated that the TOEFL test is intended for
non-native speakers of English, and it is an inappropriate test of English ability for English speaking American students.

REFERENCE
An Exchange Teacher at the Kiev State Pedagogical Institute of Foreign Languages

Bernard Choseed

This report is based on a visit to Kiev in the Fall of 1974 under the AFS-Soviet language teachers exchange. The Kiev FL Teachers Institute is described in terms of numbers, organization, activities, and level of English proficiency. The program is followed from entrance qualifications to post graduation prospects. Specific aspects of “Kiev English” are listed, and a brief survey is made of overall methodology, some of the textbooks used, and of the physical facilities. An attempt is also made to examine the internal structure of both the student body and the faculty, and of their work loads and financial arrangements. Despite ambiguities, incurred in part by the brevity of the exchange term, the experience has proved beneficial to the Kiev Institute and to the Americans involved.

Introduction

The Kiev State Pedagogical Institute of Foreign Languages (hereafter referred to by its Russian acronym “KGPIIIYa,” or by the colloquial “Pedinstitute”) is one of eleven foreign language teacher training institutes in the USSR. At present, however, it is the only such institute that is privileged to have American teachers on its staff for short periods each year. Since 1973, teams of three teachers from the United States have worked at the KGPIIIYa for two-month sessions (October and November). This is part of the US-Soviet language teacher exchange administered by the Ministry of Education of the USSR and by the American Field Service International Scholarships. Each year, six Soviet teachers of English are sent to teach Russian in high schools throughout the US, and six American teachers of Russian come to the USSR to teach English. The rationale for this exchange is twofold: the exchangers are presumably able to operate in the languages of their respective host countries, and will simultaneously have obvious opportunities to perfect their own skills in these languages. While almost none of the Soviet participants have actually ever taught Russian as a foreign language, more and more of the American teachers have had at least some grounding, if not experience in TEFL before leaving the States.

Mr. Choseed, Associate Professor of EFL and Russian at the School of Languages and Linguistics, Georgetown University, has been involved in the US-Soviet Cultural Exchange as graduate student and teacher at various times since 1962. He has also taught at the University of Michigan, and more recently, in Japan. He is one of the authors of Through the Glass of Soviet Literature, E. J. Simmons, ed. (Columbia University), and editor of Report of the Eleventh Annual Round Table on Linguistics and Language Study (Georgetown University).

Moscow’s Pedinstitute for Foreign Languages was founded in 1930, those in Gorky, Pyatigorsk, and Alma Ata were opened shortly before World War II. In 1948, institutes were inaugurated in Irkutsk, Kiev, Minsk, Tashkent, and Tbilisi. In 1949, two more were opened: in Erevan, and in Gorlovka (also in the Ukraine).
Until 1973, all American teachers were sent to work in Soviet elementary and secondary schools. The assigning of US college-level teachers in that year to the KGYIIYa was a fortunate move and initiated what is by now a regular pattern. Whether other Pedinstitutes will ultimately be included is highly problematical. The Kiev Pedinstitute happens to be under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Education which handles the present exchange. The Moscow and Minsk Pedinstitutes, on the other hand, come directly under the Ministry of Higher Education, along with universities and polytechnic institutes.

**Facts and Figures**

The decision to set up an FL Pedinstitute in Kiev in 1948 came in the midst of the feverish reconstruction of the all but destroyed 2000-year-old “Mother City of Rus.” But the KGPIIIYa, in its relatively short existence, has become the leading training center for FL secondary school teachers in the Ukrainian Republic. By 1973, over 8000 Ukrainian secondary school FL teachers were graduate of the Pedinstitute. In 1971, a graduate division was opened which by now has over 100 “candidates” doing research in Romance-Germanic languages and linguistics and in the methodology of FL teaching. Special attention devoted to a Division of Higher Qualification, which offers one-month “refresher” training courses for professional FL teachers already in the field, in groups of approximately 100 a month, and from all parts of the Soviet Union.

In 1975, the total enrollment in all branches of the KGPIIIYa was approximately 3000. Of these, 1200 were full-time students in the regular day program, which lasts five years. The Pedinstitute specializes in four languages: English, German, French and Spanish; but the current enrollment of 700 in the English Division alone is larger than any two of the others combined. The total number of faculty exceeds 200 teachers, in 16 separate departments. In the language classes, the ratio of teachers per student is very high, with approximately one for every ten students.

Each of the language divisions has its own organization. Thus, the English Division is headed by the Dean, M. P. Dvorzhetskaya, and includes Departments of English Phonetics, Practical English, Grammar and History of the English Language, and a Department of English Lexicology and Stylistic. The First Year program is directed by a member of the Phonetics Dept.; the Second and Third Years, by members of the Practical English Dept.; and the Fourth and Fifth Years are chaired by members of the Dept. of Lexicology and Stylistic. The total English faculty of seventy includes three members of the all-institute Department of Methodology, and four from the Department of Programmed learning.

The members of the English Division, all natives of the USSR, have an impressive command of English. The majority speak British English, but

---

2 As of now, three teachers are routinely assigned to schools in Moscow for one month, and then in Leningrad for the second month.
several have a good grasp of what is called “the American variant” as well. An increasing number of teachers have had some experience in English speaking countries: three have been to the US on the AFS exchange; one was a participant in the IREX Summer Seminar at Cornell University; and one instructor recently surveyed US TESOL programs under a UNESCO study grant. Others have visited England, and there are several who have worked in India.

The Pedinstitute proudly includes the US among its list of direct foreign contacts. But relations with some other countries are even closer. Teachers from France regularly come for one and two year periods, as do German instructors from the German Democratic Republic (East Germany). Kiev also maintains a direct working exchange with the Dresden Pedagogical Institute of Foreign Languages, sending groups of German major to Dresden for one-month summer intensive language programs. These activities are coordinated by the Pedinstitute’s German Club which also operates a pen-pal correspondence network. The Spanish Club arranges for similar contacts with Cuban universities, and also participates in the off-campus “Latin American Seminar” which services the considerable number of students from Central and South America as well as Cuba currently studying in various schools in the Ukrainian capital. Kiev Pedinstitute Spanish majors also have opportunities for one-year work assignments in Cuba.

Students and Course of Study

In 1975, the English Division had an enrollment of 700 full-time students. There were twelve and thirteen sections in the upper years, and sixteen in the first two. Once sectioned, students go through the five-year program in the same section. Until recently, men and women were kept in separate sections (approximately 75% of the students are women), and so the 4th and 5th years in 1975 still had segregated sections. During the first two years, female students take additional training in nursing. The men, in turn, put in one year of military service upon graduation.

There is great demand to enter the KGPIIYa. All high school graduates are eligible, although priority is given to children of “workers and peasants,“ a certain number of whom are even admitted without entrance examinations. Rural students, in turn, must agree in advance to return to their home areas to teach after graduating from the Institute. Children of “professionals”—and this is where most of the urban students fit in—are, of course, also eligible, but must take entrance exams, unless they are so-called “Golden” high school graduates, i.e., all-A students.

The majority of the students come from the Ukraine, and judging from names seem to follow the general distribution of Ukrainians and Russians

3 State University has a “Preparatory Division” where foreign students spend one year mastering Russian, while brushing up on math and the sciences. For students from English speaking environments such as India, Africa, etc., the medium of instruction in this prep year is initially English. There are no foreign students enrolled in the Pedinstitute.
that prevails in the Republic, including Jewish students, and some Polish from the West Ukraine. The Pedinstitute also has an agreement with the Uzbek Republic whereby special efforts are devoted to enrolling Uzbek students. Accordingly, the medium of instruction in the classroom is for the most part, Russian. Russian is also the language used on all official occasions, November the 7th, the Anniversary of the Liberation of the Ukraine, etc. In the corridors, however, most signs and wall-posters are printed in Ukrainian.

The student amateur dance group specializes in Ukrainian folk dances.

The above reference to language does not hold for the core courses in the target language being studied. In the English program, for example, the 10-12 hours a week of “practical” work are conducted solely in English. Theoretical courses are taught in both Russian and English, and the standard Soviet required course (Marxism-Leninism, etc.) are taught in Russian. Overall, the sheer amount of time devoted to English throughout the 5-year course of study is very great. The Fourth Year, for example, consists of a schedule of 30 hours a week in the following breakdown:

- 10 hours: Practical English
- 10 hours: Second Foreign Language
- 2 hours: English stylistic
- 2 hours: Theoretical English grammar
- 2 hours: Methodology of FL teaching
- 2 hours: Marxism-Leninism
- 2 hours: History of the CPSU (first semester)
- Scientific Atheism (second semester)

The above hourly figures have been converted into American usage where a class hour equals a 50-60 minute session. In the USSR a class “hour” means a 120-minute session with a 10-minute break. The “Second Foreign Language” is introduced in the third year of study, with each section choosing the language (French, Spanish, or German) that will be taken by every student in that section. During the Fourth Year, one month is devoted to practice teaching in secondary schools in Kiev proper, and in the Fifth Year a month is spent in practice teaching in village and town schools in the Kiev area. Practice teaching assignments may be in either the major or the minor foreign language.

There is a very pronounced effort to service the rural school systems. Understandably, after five years in the big city, some rural students are reluctant to return home, and urban students may be even less enthusiastic about accepting teaching assignments in outlying areas. All students however, are guaranteed assignments after successful completion of the Pedinstitute program. The assignments come after student-advisor consultation.

4All high school graduates in the Ukraine today are bilingual—whether they have completed the Ukrainian language school system or the Russian.
but are ultimately arbitrary and must be undertaken for a two-year minimal term. These assignments may be turned down, but in that case the Pedinstitute assumes no further responsibility for placing the graduate elsewhere. As a result, although the Pedinstitute's primary task is to turn out secondary school teachers, its graduates can actually be encountered in all fields where a good command of English is required: sitting behind Intourist hotel desks; serving as tour guides; supervising foreign currency shops; and working as translators and interpreters. By now, the number of people in Kiev with a knowledge of English is truly formidable.

Methodology

In the classroom proper, the procedure is for the most part: lecture—explanation—testing. Group and individual repetition is used on occasion, but only to a very limited degree. Much time is given over to individual recitation, followed by detailed public listing of errors by both teachers and fellow students. Additional aural/oral practice is available in the rather large network of language laboratories. There are two kinds. First: the "regular" labs, five in all, each with twenty-five booths equipped with standard Soviet made tape recorders. These labs are for individual, library-system practice and are open weekdays from 11 a.m. to 9 p.m. and Saturdays from 11 a.m. to 4 p.m. (There are also labs in the Pedinstitute student dormitories, in another part of Kiev, which are open evenings and Sundays). The labs are supervised by a lab attendant. Students sign in out in a record book but keep their own lab performance records.

The new TESLA labs are the pride and joy of the Pedinstitute. There are twenty of these: ultra modern labs in soundproofed rooms, each equipped with twenty student booths and one teacher console. All the equipment comes from the famed TESLA electronics works in Czechoslovakia. Students can listen, or record, or do both simultaneously. They can also listen to each other and even be switched into alternate pairs of two for making and recording actual two-way conversations. The TESLA labs are used only for group, class activities and are supervised and monitored by teacher. A demonstration of one such class session was a model lesson in how to activate students into using oral English.

The TESLA and regular labs are serviced by a full-time technical staff of three located in the basement of the main building. This office also contains a recording studio as well as the school's tape library. In 1973, the KGPIIYa boasted of "over 6000" tapes for the four languages being taught. Today the number is much bigger. While the majority of tapes are still designed for listening/comprehension, there are an increasing number of Soviet-made tapes incorporating more active learning procedures. There are no US produced series in use as yet (direct purchase of materials from abroad is a complicated process), but of course, by now the Pedinstitute also has at its disposal the considerable number of tapes recorded by the visiting American teachers.
Textbooks

Similarly, most of the "standard" textbooks in use are Soviet authored and published. The number and quality of these is admirable, to say the least. The newest make use of current US and British literary and newspaper sources, often, understandably, from "progressive" publications. The standard Fifth Year textbook on stylistic, is still centered around Mitchell Wilson's novel Live With Lightening, which is little known to American readers. In all fairness, however, there are by now many, many other Soviet textbooks which deal with many other contemporary authors. A considerable number of texts have been put out by members of the Kiev Pedinstitute staff, including one superbly annotated anthology of American Literature by V. S. Kuznetsova (who did her AFS exchange teaching in Philadelphia). The level of most of the Soviet written textbooks is high indeed, despite some occasional awkwardness in style, some archaisms, and even some novel coinages, e.g. abbreviations like "smth." (something) and "smb." (somebody), that are favored by many Soviet authors.

In the past decade, more and more textbooks from abroad have been reprinted and, in some cases, translated. The Pedinstitute course in Theoretical English Phonology, for examples, uses a Soviet text, O. J. Dikushina, English Phonetics, 1965, along with three British textbooks: Roger Kingdon, Groundwork of English Intonation, 1968; and J. D. O'Connor and G. P. Arnold, The Intonation of Colloquial English, 1970. The Pedinstitute Library has an extensive collection of British textbooks and a sizeable sampling of American publications, as well.

Overall, many of the texts used at the KGPIIIYa are more complex than those used for TESOL in the US. In this case, of course, it must be remembered that we are not dealing with the type of EFL learners we teach in the States or with non-specialized Soviet English students but with future teachers and specialists in the language, many of whom have had a considerable background in English before coming to the Pedinstitute, sometimes as much as eight years of English Language "Special School" training.

"Kiev English"

Not that all Pedinstitute English students can be counted on to become

---

5 Kiev students of English can readily purchase a variety of English periodicals: the daily newspapers of the Communist Parties of England, Canada and the US, and English newspapers and periodicals regularly published in the Soviet Union, such as the Moscow Daily News, etc.

6 Wilson is not only an all-time best-seller in the USSR, but for a number of years was studied as the outstanding contemporary American author.

7 Cf., V. D. Arakin, Practical Course of English (for Third Year), Moscow, 1974, with selections by John Cheever, Cornelia Otis Skinner James Thurber, and Richard Wright. Also, L. Khokarina-Semenya, Advanced English, Kiev, 1973, which includes selections from J. D. Salinger, Hemingway, and Harper Lee.

8 Graduate students also have at hand the much larger collections in the libraries of Kiev State University, the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences. The Pedinstitute maintains a working relationship with Kiev State University, with other universities in the Ukraine (there is a particularly dynamic English Division at Lviv State University), and with other FL Pedinstitutes in the USSR.
perfect speakers of English. As in any group, the range is very great. Some
students are truly phenomenal, particularly in the two experimental sections
being groomed in “American” English. Yet there are specific features that
almost merit the term “Kiev English” (though calling this “Soviet English”
might be even more accurate). There is general confusion of English /v/
and /w/, the result of using the Russian/Ukrainian hi-labial /v/ for the
English labial-dental /v/. Intonation can be another disturbing feature, the
combination of falling pitch on primary stress with the placement of vowels
far in the back of the mouth produces a deadening effect on the native
speaker’s ears. Then there is the matter of Russian/Ukrainian facial kinesics,
which can result in seemingly dour and sullen speakers of English. Fre-
quently, the mouth is kept too tightly closed for comfortably intelligible
English. On the other hand, some otherwise normal English phonetic
features may be overdone to the point of boomeranging. One zealous advocate
of “American” English, while successfully mimicking normal alveolar flap
/r/ for medial /t/ and /d/ in words like “water” and “ladder,” simply
carried this over to every word written with /t/ in the middle, coming out
with things like /wəriŋ, faðriŋ/ or “push the /bəriŋ/.” A more common
habit is the overuse of “well” in cursive discourse. This apparently stems
from learning that Russian “HY” equals English “well.” This is true to a
certain extent, but “HY” is a much higher frequency word in Russian and in
context can just as readily refer to our “hey,” “oh,” “uh,” or can simply
fill a need in Russian that is not essential in English. Here, too, the Kiev
speaker is simply not aware of the boring effect his extra “well’s” may have
on the native speaker’s psyche.

Facilities

Materially, the KGPIIYa today is a flourishing enterprise. In addition
to the imposing main building on one of Kiev’s main streets, Krasnoarmeiskaya,
there is an even larger “new corpus” next door. This as yet unfinished
modern building with banks of elevators and elaborate entrance hall finished
in marble was still only in partial use in 1975. But well under operation were
the large well-furnished library-study hall, the 20 TESLA labs, and a series
of amphitheater lecture halls. The top floor features an auditorium for spe-
cial events and ceremonies. And on the first floor is the show-case “Interna-
tional Room” which houses foreign trophies and souvenirs and which is
opened for functions of the student language clubs and for meetings with
visitors from abroad. When completed, the new building will also contain
physical education facilities. Unfortunately, even the new “corpus” has no
provision for teachers’ offices. As elsewhere in the USSR, each department
has its own office, which has a secretary at a desk in one corner and several
tables, at which the department chairman and faculty members work or
socialize as best they can (all personal belongings are stored in the main

9 Kievites do smile, of course. But the timing is quite different from that expected
in English.
entrance cloakroom. The basement of the old building has a cafeteria open from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m., where substantial hot meals can be obtained for about 40% lower than in city cafeterias. There is also a snack bar on the first floor, and from time to time hot pirozhki and sweet rolls are sold on staircase landings. These landings also feature book and stationery stalls.

**Student Finances and Activities**

Pedinstitute students pay no tuition or fees. During their first two years they receive a monthly stipend of 40 rubles ($54.00) in their third year 50 rs ($67.50), and in the fourth and fifth years 60 rs ($81.00) a month. Out of town students are housed in dormitories at 2 rubles ($2.70) per month. Residents of Kiev are expected to take care of their own housing arrangements.

Most students are members of the Komsomol (Young Communist League). There is also a Student Council which meets with the various deans. In general, student self-government does not play as critical a role as on US campuses. For that matter, student club and other extra-curricular activities (other than sports) seem to be rather sporadically attended, albeit guided by faculty “monitors.”

**Faculty Conditions**

Some of the blame for the lackluster of extra-curricular activities probably lies with the heavy schedules of both students and teachers. In the case of the faculty, the work load is considerably higher than that for teachers in comparable US institutions. Soviet schedules are measured in terms of hours per year, rather than by the week, and so it is difficult to pin down an exact weekly rate, which may vary from 22 to 28 hours at any given period. The yearly teaching load is as follows:

- Assistant and Junior Instructor: 820 hours
- Senior Instructor: 780
- Docent (Asst. Prof.): 720
- Professor: 680

Teachers work on a five-day week, but since the Pedinstitute operates on a six-day schedule, teachers are off on Sundays and one other day (which alternates from week to week). In the summer, they receive two months vacation with pay.

Salaries are determined by the Ministry of Education, and on the following scale:

- Asst. and Jr. Instructors: 120 rs per month ($162.00)
- Senior Instructors: 180 rs ($243.00)
- Docent: 280 rs ($378.00)

---

10 Based on the official exchange rate of 1 ruble = $1.35.
11 These stipends may be suspended temporarily in the case of consistently poor grades and as a disciplinary measure.
There are also budget provisions for part-time instructors, who are paid by the hour and are used to relieve regular teachers for research and special projects. All teachers belong to the Teachers Union, to which they pay monthly dues of 1 ruble ($1.35) for each 100 rubles ($135.00) earned. The union handles working conditions, grievances, medical and retirement benefits, and vacation and sanatorium activities. There is no mandatory retirement rule (women may retire with full pension at 55, and men at 60), but there is also no strict tenure provision. All teachers are subject to a formal re-evaluation every five years, and the possibility of dismissal does exist. Teachers who succeed in publishing textbooks receive legally fixed royalties (which can make a substantial difference in their incomes). Teachers are also eligible for travel-research grants to give papers at conferences, lecture at seminars, and to participate in research projects elsewhere.

As in the case of student affairs, it is difficult for the foreign observer to judge faculty self-government at the Pedinstitute. The multiplicity of the Soviet system itself would seem to be duplicated here in miniature. In addition to the Teachers Union, there is also a formal faculty organization set up in the following order of rank from top to bottom:

- Academic Board
- Board of Representatives of Divisions
- Board of Representatives of Departments

Alongside these various faculty organizations, there is, of course, the Communist Party organization within the Pedinstitute, with its cells and representatives at every level.

The previous remarks do not really cover the internal structure of the KGPIIYa in depth. Even the academic activities have not been described in total detail. There is a great deal of research in various fields going on at the higher levels. The Department of Theoretical Grammar and History of English has a distinguished linguist, Dr. G. G. Pocheptsov, at its head, who is conversant with all the latest developments abroad, with TESOL, with the CAL, and who contributes articles to international linguistic journals. The Department of Programmed Learning, which has representatives from each of the four language divisions, is especially busy preparing materials for individual and group language learning. One member from the English Division, H. S. Chekal, has already put out a programmed text for English: The Sequence of Tenses, published in Kiev in 1972. Research is encouraged at the undergraduate levels also. One session of the Student Philological Society featured papers on “Idiosyncrasies of Australian English,” “Australian Slang,” and “The American Variation of English.”

\[12\] Compared with the average Soviet salary of approx. 140 rs per month ($189.00), and the minimum scale of 110 rs ($148.50).
The Exchange Teachers

The visiting exchange teachers have too little time\(^{13}\) and are too busy to do more than get a taste of all the features of the Pedinstitute. All departments, all teachers, and particularly all students are eager to make use of the native speakers’ presence. The American visitors are used for mass lectures on US customs, life, cultural trends, etc. They also give seminars for the faculty, for the Higher Qualification participants, and sometimes methodology lectures that are open to all school teachers of English in Kiev. Special time is allotted for the recording of materials both for research purposes and for classroom use. While regular class contact hours are scheduled, the demand from each section is so great that the exchange teacher is constantly rotated from section to section and level to level. At best, he can expect to meet with the same group for a maximum of 4 sessions (8 US hours). For a teacher, of course, this is both exciting and frustrating at the same time. Within the all too limited two-month duration of the exchange, the Pedinstitute does its best to make maximum use of its guests.

The latter, while they may never get quite used to the constantly shifting schedules, or to recording phonetic texts marked with British intonation patterns, or to being asked to give a “short” summary of current developments in generative linguistics, or to edit voluminous Russian-thought-out English manuscripts, are actually immersed in one of the most emotionally inspiring and intellectually exhilarating experiences of their professional and personal lives. The eagerness of all Pedinstitute personnel for direct contact with Americans, with native speakers; the constant barrage of serious questions about all phases of English and about American life; the expressions of gratitude, often accompanied by bouquets of flowers and tears; and the total kindness and hospitality are things that one can never forget.

\(^{13}\) The exchange teachers are assigned 14–16 hours of work weekly, consisting of varying combinations of classroom teaching, seminars, individual consultation, lectures, and recording.

\(^{14}\) Interested TESOL’s with training in Russian, should contact Ms. Vee Greisen, AFS International Scholarships, 313 East 43rd Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.
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Drills in English Stress-Patterns is a pronunciation textbook on word stress providing “ear and speech training drills and texts for students of English as a foreign language” (3). It is a text which merits the attention of ESL/EFL teachers as potentially relevant to nearly every aspect of English language instruction. To highlight its values and potential, this review will first outline the content of the text, then proceed to evaluate the content in terms of its scope and presentation.

The nine sections of the text consist of “only statistically important classes” (9) arising out of the author’s computer analysis of some 40,000 words. Over half of the book (§§1, 2, 3, 5) is given to the treatment of the highly uniform set of words having i-endings and u-endings, referred to collectively as ‘strong’ endings. Main stress predictably falls on the syllable before the ending, e.g. erratic, facility, establish, personify, convenient, ambiguous. The next three sections (§§4, 6, 7) deal mainly with the stress of words having ‘weak’ endings, as opposed to the ‘strong’ endings of §§1–3, 5. The general rule is that the main stress of the stem carries over to the derivatives, e.g. depend, dependent; remark, remarkable. The final two sections of the book are treated as stress problems apart from all foregoing generalizations. §8, entitled “Learned Constructions,” covers the various stress patterns found among Greek-origin vocabulary, while §9 lists noun-verb pairs, many of which have a contrasting stress pattern corresponding to syntactic function (verb or noun), e.g. progress (v) - progress (n).

The following evaluation will be concerned with the strengths of the book and how its weaknesses can be eliminated so that the text can better serve the teacher and student.

This book is remarkable in many respects. First, it is the only available EFL text which presents specific word stress rules. As such, it attempts to fill an important, but long-empty gap in pronunciation materials. (For typical approaches to word stress—referring to a dictionary, guessing on the basis of statistical generalizations, and practicing words categorized by pattern—see Prator and Robinett 1972 and Bowen 1975.) Second, the author recognizes the centrality of the alternating stress rhythm in English—“the basic binary opposition between strongly stressed syllables . . . and weakly stressed syllables . . .” (11). In addition to primary or main stress, each unit provides some drillwork on the use of secondary stress, and periodically whole subsections (§§4.5, 6.6) are devoted to this topic. Third, stress is assigned on the basis of the conventional orthographic form of words. No attempt is made to convert spelled forms into a more abstract level of representation. Fourth, the author packs a vast amount of stress information into his small book and clearly indexes the material in a generous table of contents. Fifth, the stress patterns covered are presented in rules which, by and large, are
readily understandable to readers who have had no linguistic training. Finally the units have been carefully graded so that, for the most part, each unit builds on past units.

Given that this text is presently the only source to which a teacher can turn for guidance on the problem of assigning word stress, the features just mentioned make the book even more attractive. However, if a teacher were to choose the text as the basis for work on word stress, there are numerous ways he or she might improve upon its scope and presentation. Four of these improvements are discussed here.

First, it would be a service to the teacher to know that stress is assigned to words by one of three methods: enumeration, evaluation, or derivation. Once these methods are pointed out, the many apparently unrelated segments of the text take on a needed unity, and the commentary gains some cohesion from one segment to the next.

The three methods of stress assignment appear in various technical treatments of word stress. The methods, however, are straightforward. The enumeration method is simply a count of syllables. Given a strong i-ending, the rule is to count one syllable to the left of the ending and place the main stress on that syllable. Or, given a word of three or more syllables and ending in -ate, the stress will fall on the third syllable from the end. The evaluation method involves some judgment about the phonological (or spelled) composition of syllables in order to assign stress. Given a weak ending, the reader must determine whether there is a consonant cluster before the ending. If so, stress is assigned to the vowel preceding the cluster. The derivation method requires the learner to isolate the stem form of a word and use its stress pattern (as determined by either the enumeration or evaluation method) as a clue to the stress pattern of the derivative. These three methods can be identified in the outline of contents given above.

Second, the teacher can use the three stress assignment methods found in the text more efficiently than the author does and thereby improve the presentation of material.

Regarding syllable enumeration, every subsection of the text offers some work on words consisting of strings of endings such as vis[ibility], convén[ant]ion[al]ize, nat[ion(al)iz]at|ion, conspic[uos]ness, individ[ual]ist, techn[ical]ity, objet|tion|able(t)y. There are innumerable ways endings can be concatenated. The author presents these sequences in lesson after lesson as if the stress pattern of each sequence must be learned individually. Nowhere is there a generalization which will guide the student to the correct stress of such multilayered words. Yet, there are some simple and useful generalizations which should be made available to students. One such generalization, applicable to the above words and to others having strong endings (underlined above) is the following in (1).

(1) Stress the syllable immediately before the rightmost strong i- or u-ending.

Regarding syllable evaluation, greater efficiency can be introduced in two
ways. In the first place, the author properly highlights the fact (in §6.1) that verbs which end in a consonant cluster receive main stress on their final syllable: suspénd, intercépt. There is an equally large number of nonsuffixed verbs (i.e. not verbs in -ate or -ize) ending in a syllable containing a long vowel (as indicated by the spelling patterns <VV> or <VCe>) which behave in exactly the same way: révéal, undercoverposé. The author uses these long-vowel verbs repeatedly as the basis for derivatives (in §§6.5–6.8, and 7) but without telling the student how these verbal stems are stressed. A generalization of the following kind in (2) would serve the student well.

(2) Nonsuffixed verbs ending in a ‘heavy’ syllable (a syllable having a cluster or a long vowel) receive stress on the final syllable.

For lack of space, other useful student rules cannot be given here. The reader is directed to the simple generalizations found in Dickerson 1975a.

In the second place, what the student needs is a unified strategy for assigning stress to words by means of the syllable evaluation method. The text provides only a model or set of models for each stress topic, and certain topics are treated differently at different points in the text. For example, words ending in -ace are handled by the enumeration method in §6.3, by the evaluation method in §§5.4 and 6.1, and by the derivation method in §§4.3 and 6.7. Without even the explicit recognition of stress assignment methods, the multitude of models and treatments may lead the learner to assume that each ending has its own unique requirement. This is certainly not the case. This point has been made in the case of strong endings; we can make the case again for weak endings.

The strategy for stressing multisyllabic words terminating in weak endings is the following in (3). In this strategy, the distinction between heavy and light syllables is put to work: A heavy syllable contains a consonant cluster (VCC) or a long vowel (V); a light syllable contains a short vowel plus one optional consonant (V(C)).

(3) Evaluation Strategy for Stressing Weak-Ending Words
A. Identify all weak endings of the word in question.
B. Look at the syllable to the left of the leftmost weak ending (this syllable is indicated below by ††) and ask:

1. Is this syllable the only remaining syllable in the word?
   a. If so, stress it: tén|tive; lá|utory; blá|mable. This rule also applies to endings not treated in this way in the text: bápt|ize; pó|st|age; séns|ory; cycl|ist; bóund|ary; arch|ery; páss|i|ist.
   b. If not, then ask:
2. Is the syllable heavy?
   a. If so, stress it: invés|ment; instinct|i|ve; relúct|ant; affirn|ative; consér|vatory. This rule also applies to endings ††
b. If not, stress the syllable to the left. That is, if the syllable to the left of the leftmost weak ending is light (short vowel plus one optional consonant), stress the syllable to the left. Guierre treats only the case of the light syllables \(<\text{i}C>\) and \(<\text{u}C>\) in the penultimate syllable in §§5.4 and 5.5: \(\text{primi}v\text{tive; principal; currilum; immunize.}\) The rule also applies to any light syllable in any position which is immediately left of the leftmost weak ending: \(\text{r}\text{e}\text{ason}\text{able}n\text{ess; allegory; offeratory; organize; hypnotism; orphanage; itinerary; f}\text{edralist; remunerative.}\) This strategy has many positive features. First, it brings together into a single evaluative framework numerous disparate models and treatments scattered throughout the text. Second, the strategy is far more comprehensive than we find in the text, because heavy syllables of the long-vowel type are included, and because the notion of light syllable is extended beyond \(<\text{i}>\) and \(<\text{u}>\) in the penult. Third, the strategy has great generality, applying to many more endings than are taken up in the text. Fourth, the strategy allows the teacher and student to focus on a single ending, e.g. \(-v\text{ive, -ary, -able, or a set of endings in a single lesson, rather than to find the endings treated in four or five different places in what may appear to be four or five different ways.}\) Finally, the strategy applies equally well to words which have no special endings but terminate in a light syllable. The final light syllable (beginning with the vowel) is disregarded and evaluation begins on the penultimate syllable, e.g. \(\text{citurdel.}\) The application of this strategy to the "learned constructions" in §§8 eliminates most of the special rules used there and shows that these words conform to a broad pattern. Thus, the strategy is an enormously powerful tool for the learner.

There are three cautions to observe when using strategy (3). First, evaluation always begins on the syllable to the left of \(-\text{al and -ary: sentimental, supplemented, struc}tural\text{ism.}\) Second, a syllable terminating in \(<\text{Cr}>\) is light, not heavy. Thus, many Greek-origin words from §§8, such as \(\text{democ}r\text{at and t}\text{elegr}am, and others such as p\text{enet}r\text{able, imm}\text{igrant, and arbitr}ary, will be stressed properly by the evaluation strategy of (3). The third caution concerns heavy syllables of the long-vowel type which cannot be distinguished from light syllables by spelling. The treatment of words like \(\text{adviseory and refut}\text{able is discussed below.}\) Regarding the \textit{derivation} method of stress assignment, there are two main points which should receive attention. First, there are many places in the text where the method should not be used, because the student does not know the stress pattern of the stem word. The stress pattern is not taught for dozens of stem words used for derivatives in §§6.5–6.8, and 7. An equally
serious problem is the task of word analysis. For example, the stress of words like sépar\,able and tóler\,ate is taught (§4.2) with reference to sépar\,ate and tóler\,ate which lose their -ate ending and add -\,able. Later (§7), the stress of words like réason\,able and miser\,able is shown to be related to that of réason and misery. In all of these cases, it is far more direct to simply use strategy (3) without regard for the derivational history of the words.

Second, there is a place for the derivation method. When there is a possibility that a student may overlook a long vowel in using strategy (3), and when the more basic stem of the word is transparent, build-up exercises are appropriate: explóre → expló\,atory, redúce → redú\,able. Such exercises are also helpful when a vowel change has taken place in the derivative obscuring an original long vowel on which the stress of the derivative is based: provóke → provó\,c\,ative, derive → deri\,v\,ative.

A third way the teacher could improve upon the text is by expanding its scope to include the quality of the stressed vowel. A student may well master the stress patterns of the book but still distort the pronunciation of given words because it is not clear whether the stressed vowel is long or short. To remedy this situation, there is a great deal of helpful information which could and should be taught simultaneously with stress rules. This topic is discussed more fully in Dickerson 1975b, so two examples should suffice.

First, strong iv\,- and ev\,-endings have an effect different from strong uv\,-endings on the quality of the stressed vowel. The author, who has segregated endings by these types, might have gone further to point out that all stressed vowels except <i>, when followed by one consonant preceding the iv\,- and ev\,-endings, are long: sal\,ient and extrán\,eous but not suffíc\,ient or hid\,eous. Such vowels are short before uv\,-endings. A second example is taken from §6.3. The point is made that the vowel preceding -sive carries the main stress of the word. But it is also the case that if the only consonant intervening between the stressed vowel and -ive is <s>, the vowel will be long: expló\,sive and obtrú\,sive, but not excés\,sive or offén\,sive.

At this point, the teacher may well wonder how word stress rules and vowel quality information fit into pronunciation instruction. One answer to this question has come out of our experiences at the University of Illinois. Although it is customary to think of ESL/EFL pronunciation instruction as confined to the classroom and the language laboratory, we have come to believe that written, out-of-class exercises are as crucial for teaching pronunciation generalizations as they are for teaching grammatical generalizations. For this reason, our students use a programmed workbook which contains written exercises on stress rules and vowel quality patterns. The rules and patterns are approached through spelling, the level at which students have access to many phonological patterns. The importance of spelling has been touched on above at various points and is illustrated extensively in Dickerson (ms). This pencil-and-paper practice gives students a solid basis for their oral practice in the classroom and language laboratory. In these settings, oral activities range from tightly controlled drills to highly spontaneous communication. At one end of this range, the most controlled ac-
Activities dealing with word stress and vowel quality are put on tape. At the other end of the range, the most contextualized and extemporaneous uses of language are left to the classroom. While free expression is of great importance, we feel it is equally important that students with serious pronunciation difficulties have available to them exercises which focus attention on some of those difficulties. In short, stress rules and vowel quality patterns enter into pronunciation instruction most explicitly in controlled written exercises outside of class and in oral laboratory work. They enter into pronunciation instruction less explicitly in the choice of lexical items used in the classroom for less controlled oral work.

A fourth improvement a teacher would certainly want to bring to the text would be changes in the drill materials and the vocabulary selection. All of the drills are at the word level. The posttests (T2) introduce the sentence level, but the author frankly states: “Throughout the book section T2 will be devoted to connected speech, mostly in nonsensical sentences” (19). Whether the stress generalizations are practiced in a written or an oral context, the teacher would want to go on to use meaningful sentences in transformations, in dialogues, in reading selections, and in spontaneous speech. Furthermore, to avoid the many vocabulary items which are uncommon, the teacher would want to illustrate the same stress assignment principles by using a corpus of learner vocabulary designed for the particular level of a student audience.

In conclusion, Drills in English Stress-Patterns is the only published attempt to bring the regularities of word stress down to the practical ESL/EFL level (see, however, Dickerson, Finney, and Dickerson ms.). (Although Kingdon (1958) is for foreign students (xi), there is no drill material, no guidance for teachers, and, most importantly, no encompassing stress generalizations. The book is useful, however, for its many copious lists of words.) Guierre admits that “the rules offered are only one solution, probably not the best and certainly not the only possible one, to problems of stress” (9). Nevertheless, his text provides a large core of useful and simple rules. To that core, this review has suggested numerous additions and offered a reorganization which teachers could reasonably expect to handle using the text as a basis. The material, appropriately modified, could be integrated with other pronunciation work, with units on vocabulary building, with reading, and with grammar instruction. In short, this book, as a first, should be available to every ESL/EFL teacher if for no more than a handy reference to a neglected area of English phonology.
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PATTERNS OF ENGLISH PRONUNCIATION. J. Donald Bowen. (Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House, 1975. xv + 276 pp.)

Where are innovative ideas in pronunciation teaching coming from? Not from transformational theory, Bowen states (1972). Despite its potential, exponents of transformational analysis have failed so far to make an impact on the teaching of speech. On the contrary, by holding that syntactic and semantics are the elemental units of linguistic analysis, they relegate phonology to a relatively minor role. But this arrangement inverts the order of speech skills promulgated by the structuralists of the 40's and 50's, who made the sounds of language the entry point for both analysis and teaching and on this principle laid the basis for the audio-lingual method. Until the newer theories produce a pedagogy of their own, teachers must continue to sharpen and extend existing techniques if classroom practice is to be improved.

This is Bowen's thesis. Not unexpectedly, Patterns of English Pronunciation cleaves to the structuralist tradition, but it also makes extensive use of a relatively new technique—the contextualization of practice drills.

The nine chapters of this text provide very clear descriptions of the sounds of English—the vowels, consonants, diphthongs and intonation patterns. Drawings of the oral cavity, in sagittal section, show details of articulation such as the position of the tongue in phonation. There are extensive lists of words in each chapter which can be used by the learner to practice the sounds of English in initial, medial and terminal position, and in various phonemic environments. And there are columns of minimal pairs (words that are alike except for one sound) which can be used by the teacher to highlight the phonological feature which differentiates sound-alike words from each other.

But all these techniques, effective though they may be, have shortcomings, the author states (1972), especially when applied to sounds that are virtually indistinguishable to the learner's ear. Then these methods often fail, no matter how much practice is employed. A typical case is the Japanese speaker with his "fled lice." /r/ and /l/ do not contrast in Japanese, but are used interchangeably; so the Japanese speaker, not having experienced /r/ and /l/ as different in his own language, is insensitive to the difference in English. To overcome this problem, Bowen states, pronunciation should be taught in context, that is, with "paired sentences" which use situational reinforcement to assist the learner. This is an innovative technique developed by Bowen in his ESL classes at UCLA; the unusual
feature of Patterns of English Pronunciation is the extensive use it makes of this device.

This technique employs two sentences which contain a minimal pair. For example, “Where’s the dog’s bone/bowl.” Only /n/ and /l/ set these sentences apart, but it is both easier to hear and easier to reproduce the target sounds when they are surrounded by a context which carries differentiating clues than when the sounds are presented in isolation.

It must be noted that contextualized drills per se are not entirely new. Minimal pairs have been included in illustrative sentences before, as, “The sheep are on the ship.” But in Bowen’s sense this sentence, beyond providing the minimal pair with an intonation pattern, supplies so little information that the context is virtually meaningless. Practice of this kind, Bowen says, “more often than not fails to internalize the new habits, to make them actually part of the students’ new-language pronunciation (1972: 86).” “The context for the minimal pair should be an entire situation, supported and reinforced by reasonable and credible visual images, and placed in a setting that can hope to provide a measure of intellectual stimulus and interest” (1972: 88).

The interesting feature of Patterns of English Pronunciation is the number and variety of paired sentences contained in this text, and the ingenious way they are keyed to the other exercises in each chapter.

To make the sentence concrete and alive, the teacher must use every available resource. If the object is mentioned, it should be drawn on the blackboard. The class is asked to identify what it sees. So much the better if this identification is a gradual process. By thinking through and eliminating all but the right word, the learner builds up a series of meaningful associations which involve mental processes in addition to ear training. If the minimal pair include an action, the teacher should mime or gesture. The paraphrase which follows each of the paired sentences can be used as another cue. The sounds are literally acted out, each sentence a little drama.

This technique focuses the student’s attention on what he is saying since he must now attend to meaning as a corollary to the phonological feature being practiced. Rote drilling is reduced to a minimum while the students engage in effective communication. The situation provides mnemonic devices to help the students distinguish and remember the difficult sounds, and in the context of a sentence-situation the student can exploit all available syntactic and semantic clues—quite an advance over practicing sounds in isolation or in lists of words.

All this seems to be a real step forward in pronunciation teaching. This text, which could be used with beginning, intermediate or advanced students, should be seriously considered by every ESL teacher.
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This issue marks the second appearance of the “Research Notes” section. In order to be of service to interested readers, if the notes which appear here are abstracted from a larger work such as a dissertation, the source will be cited following the abstract. If a study is completed and published subsequent to the progress report given here, the reference for the full report will be given in the earliest possible “Research Notes” section. In order to expedite the dissemination of this information, it would be helpful if contributors would inform the editor of this section accordingly.

Of the abstracts published in the first “Research Notes,” (Vol. 10, No. 3) the following are the references for the completed published studies.

“Acquisition of Discourse Strategies: Some Different Levels of Development”
Dennis Godfrey
From a Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Michigan

“An Explanation for the Oral Production Order of Grammatical Morphemes”
Diane Larsen-Freeman
Full report published in Language Learning, June 1976

“Two Measures of Affective Factors as They Relate to Progress in Adult Second Language Acquisition”
Nancy Backman

“A Case Study of a Second Language Learner and Its Implications for Second Language Acquisition Research”
Kenji Hakuta
Full report published in Language Learning, December 1976

“Social Distance as a Factor in Second Language Acquisition”
John Schumann
Full report published in Language Learning, June 1976

ATTITUDES AND ATTAINED PROFICIENCY IN ESL: A SOCIO-LINGUISTIC STUDY OF NATIVE SPEAKERS OF CHINESE IN THE UNITED STATES
John W. Oller, Jr., Alan J. Hudson, and Phyllis Fei Liu, University of New Mexico

The relations between various measures of attitudes toward self, the native language group, the target language group, reasons for learning English as a second language, reasons for traveling to the U. S., and attained proficiency in ESL were investigated. Subjects were Chinese speaking foreign students primarily studying at the graduate level in the U. S. It was hypothesized that positive attitudes, especially positive attitudes toward the target language group, would correspond to higher attainment in the target language, and similarly negative attitudes, especially toward the
target language groups would correspond to lower attainment in the target language. Results of factor analysis of the various attitude scales included in a questionnaire revealed meaningful clusters of attitudinal variables which were related to scores on an English proficiency test (based on the cloze procedure) via a multiple regression analysis. In general, attitudes toward self and the native language group—as well as attitudes toward the target language group—were positively correlated with attained proficiency in ESL. Indirect attitude scales of the type used earlier by Spolsky seemed to produce more meaningful variance than direct attitude questions which fit into the Lambert-Gardner paradigm of attitude research. However, the distinction between integrative and instrumental motives seemed helpful in explaining certain patterns in the data. Generally, learners who were apparently more integratively motivated performed better than those who were less integratively motivated. The relation between attained proficiency and attitudes toward the target language group, however, seemed more complex than the relations between attained proficiency and attitudes toward self, and towards the native language group. The relation between reasons for studying ESL or traveling to the U.S. and attained proficiency was contrary to previous predictions. For instance, there was a significant negative correlation between desire to stay in the U.S. permanently and attained ESL proficiency.

(From a paper presented at the Psycholinguistic and Sociolinguistic Research Colloquium of the 1976 TESOL Convention in New York City)

ERROR ANALYSIS AND ERROR CORRECTION FOR ADULT INTERMEDIATE ESL LEARNERS: AN EXPERIMENT
James M. Hendrickson, The Ohio State University

This study was conducted (1) to identify the most frequent communicative and linguistic errors in the compositions of intermediate ESL learners and (2) to determine the effect of direct teacher correction upon students' writing proficiency in English.

A taxonomy was developed to classify written errors based on Burt and Kiparsky's (1972) global/local error distinction. Twenty-four foreign-born adults, representing twelve different native languages, enrolled in a non-credit intermediate ESL course at The Ohio State University. These students were administered two pretests: one to measure English grammar, vocabulary and reading comprehension, and one to measure communicative and linguistic proficiency in written English. On the basis of the latter test, students were identified as having "high communicative" or "low communicative" proficiency in writing. Students from both communicative groupings were then randomly assigned to one of two treatments: correction of written global errors only, or correction of written global and local errors. Each week for six consecutive weeks, students wrote descriptions of picture stories in English. These written descriptions were collected, corrected according to assigned treatment, returned for self-study, and collected once again. Following this treatment phase students were again given the identical
RESEARCH NOTES

measures used for the pretest. An analysis of variance was used to test for significant treatment effects upon students’ written communicative and linguistic proficiency at the .05 level.

It was found that most communicative errors resulted from inadequate lexical knowledge, misuse of prepositions and pronouns, and seriously misspelled lexical items. Most linguistic errors were caused by inappropriate lexical choice, lack of subject-verb agreement, misuse and omission of prepositions, faulty word order, and misspelled words. The effect of the differential error correction treatment upon students’ written proficiency in English was statistically insignificant.

(From a Ph.D. dissertation, The Ohio State University)

ATTITUDES AND ATTAINED PROFICIENCY IN EFL: A SOCIO-LINGUISTIC STUDY OF ADULT JAPANESE LEARNERS
Tetsuro Chihara and John Oller, University of New Mexico

Attitudes of Japanese learners of EFL toward themselves, toward other Japanese speakers, toward English speakers, toward travel to an English speaking country, and finally toward learning English were studied in relation to attained EFL proficiency. The research reported replicates certain aspects of earlier research with a population of native speakers of Chinese studying at the graduate level in the U.S. Among the questions asked were: (1) Is there a substantial correlation between attitudes and attained proficiency? (2) Is the pattern of relationships for foreign language learners (as in the case of the Japanese) similar to the pattern for second language learners (as in the case of the Chinese)? (3) Are indirect methods of assessing attitudes more informative than direct questions about motives for learning a language? The results revealed substantial intercorrelations between the various measures of EFL proficiency examined and significant correlations between factors distilled from attitude measures and the criterion EFL proficiency measure (a cloze test). However, the pattern of relationships between attitudes and attained proficiency did not fit the usual theoretical predictions (e.g. integrative motives being supported to produce higher achievement than instrumental ones). The relationship between attitudes and attained level of proficiency did not seem to be as strong in this foreign language context as in the previous second language context. There was no great contrast in direct and indirect methods of measuring attitude.

(From a paper presented at the Psycholinguistic and Sociolinguistic Research Colloquium of the 1976 TESOL Convention in New York City)

A PILOT STUDY CONCERNING THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE READING SKILL VIA LISTENING
Seid M. Ziahosseiny, The Free University of Iran

The purpose of this study was to determine how much learning transfers from listening into reading, and how laboratory use could be made effective
in teaching comprehension. The hypothesis was that laboratory practice would affect favorably not only the ability to speak and understand the spoken language, but also the ability to read and comprehend materials similar in structure and vocabulary to the ones they were presented in the lab.

An experiment was conducted, comparing groups using the laboratory (lab group) with groups not using the laboratory (classroom group). The subjects were randomly selected from the freshman students at Pahlavi University learning English as a second language. The amount of instruction for the lab group was five weekly class periods and that of the classroom group was six weekly class periods. The total amount of class time was 80 hours for the lab group and 96 hours for the classroom group. Work in the lab group included listening to the tapes which were prepared in accordance with course requirements, with adaptations appropriate for audio presentation. Work in the classroom group included conventional activities (reading, writing, and pattern practice). The lab group was not assigned any homework as opposed to the classroom group in which the conventional pattern of homework assignment was followed. The English patterns and vocabulary taught in both lab and classroom groups were the same.

Following instruction, both groups were given a reading test prepared by the English Department of Pahlavi University for its freshman students. The results of this test are shown in the chart below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grades</th>
<th>Classroom Group</th>
<th>Lab Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings indicate that not only did the lab group develop a reading skill competency but that they were superior to the classroom group. This suggests that laboratory work, listening specifically, can supplement the usual “live” reading class, and that time spent in the laboratory contributes to conventional learning as well as to listening and speaking skills.

The results also indicate that the concept of the teacher as a giver and the student as a receiver of information must change. Less time should be spent in direct instruction, more in the student’s self-impelled practice under the direction and guidance of the teacher.

Diane Larsen-Freeman
UCLA
The Forum

The TESOL Quarterly welcomes questions from readers regarding specific aspects or practices of our profession. Questions will be answered in this section of the Quarterly from time to time by members of the profession who have experience related to the question. Comments on published articles and reviews are also welcome. Comments, rebuttals, and answers should normally be limited to five double-spaced typed pages.

On November 22, 1976, the New York Times published an editorial entitled “Bilingual Danger.” Professor Joshua Fishman wrote a reply which the Times did not publish. The editorial is reprinted below, followed by Professor Fishman’s reply. Ed.

Bilingual Danger

The disconcerting strength gathered by separatism in Canada contains a relevant lesson for the United States and its approach to bilingual education. While language is by no means the only factor in the Canadian discord, there can be no question that the linguistic division between French- and English-speaking Canadians has severely intensified their other differences.

It would be ludicrous distortion to suggest that the United States confronts any danger of actual political separatism as a result of the possible growth of Spanish-speaking enclaves. But it is no exaggeration to warn that the present encouragement given to making such enclaves permanent, in the mistaken view that they are an expression of positive pluralism, points the road to cultural, economic and political divisiveness.

The reason why such a warning appears appropriate is that political splinter groups within the Spanish-speaking community, and among educators, are misinterpreting the goals of bilingual education in New York as a means of creating a Spanish-speaking power base.

We fully support the proper use of bilingual teaching as a pedagogically sound means of easing pupils’ way toward full mastery of English and of making possible effective participation in the general business of learning from the very moment a non-English-speaking youngster enters school. But the purpose of such instruction must be to create English-speaking Americans with the least possible delay.

Concern over divisions created by the absence of a common language has played a vital part in the building of a cohesive nation from the time of America’s birth. In 1753, Benjamin Franklin feared that German settlers in Pennsylvania would endanger the preservation of our language and even of our Government unless schools in English were established for all children.

Without exaggerating the threat to America’s nationhood now that English has prevailed, it nevertheless remains pertinent to warn against a misguided linguistic separatism that, while it may seem to promise its advocates limited political and ideological power, can only have the effect of condemning
to permanent economic and social disadvantage those who cut themselves off from the majority culture.

November 22, 1976

Letters to the Editor
New York Times

Dear Sir:

Your editorial “Bilingual Danger” (November 22) not only errs in its analysis but does so at the expense of “the Spanish speaking community,” one of the most disadvantaged in the country.

In the same issue of The New York Times William Safire, also reacting to the recent success of the Parti Québécois, does a little better than your editorial when he suggests that “Canadians . . . start making it clear that whatever autonomous and culture-respecting arrangements are made for the Québécois, they flow from the font of one divers but unified nation (p. 25).” Certainly this approach to the demands of disadvantaged but mobilized ethno-cultural minorities is more enlightened than the editorial prescription simply to “create English-speaking Americans with the least possible delay.”

The New York Times seems to fear that something divisive (admittedly, not quite as divisive as the possible French-English split in Canada) might grow out of bilingual education in the USA. Having spent many years studying bilingual education throughout the world (see my Bilingual Education: An International Sociological Perspective, 1976, for a report on 117 countries) I consider this to be highly unlikely, both because ethno-cultural divisiveness, where it obtains, is far too deeply imbedded in a pervasive socio-economic matrix to be “caused” by any kind of education, as well as because bilingual education per se is unfailingly unifying rather than divisive. The hallmark of all bilingual education (including its compensatory USA variant) is that it includes a unifying supra-ethnic language of wider communication (in our case: English, as reported on page B1 of your issue of the very same November 22). Indeed, if any educational pattern can be said to typify Quebec it is the absence (historically as well as currently) of bilingual education (education via two media of instruction), rather than its presence.

All of which is not to say that there is no striving for “a Spanish-speaking power base” in the USA, or that such strivings may not be justified. However, such strivings as may exist (here or elsewhere where minorities organize to overcome their disadvantages) are fundamentally unrelated to bilingual education and will not be counteracted one iota by the discontinuation of education utilizing both Spanish and English as media of instruction. What might counteract such strivings would be genuine opportunity for Hispanic participation in “political power” and a genuine end to the “economic and social disadvantage” of Hispanics in the USA, all of the foregoing having long been promised in theory and so obviously denied in practice by the monolingual English establishment.
If Hispanic (or other minority) “divisiveness” increases in the USA it will be because of the long tradition of English-dominated inequality, such as that long practiced in Quebec, rather than because of bilingual education which functions to link together populations that might otherwise be totally estranged. Rather than discontinue it let us hope that American bilingual education will be strengthened and not be yet another example of “too little and too late.”

S/Joshua A. Fishman, Ph.D.
Distinguished University Research Professor, Social Sciences
Yeshiva University

Bilingual Educators, Present and Future

STUDY IN PUERTO RICO
AND EARN 12 CREDITS TOWARD THE M.A. DEGREE
JULY-AUGUST 1977

For details, call or write:

Helen J. Kelly, Director
Office of Off-Campus Programs
School of Education, Health, Nursing, and Arts Professions
New York University
64 Press Annex, Washington Square
New York, N.Y. 10003, (212) 398-2696
FORTHCOMING SPRING BOOKS  □ Expanding Reading Skills: Advanced / Markstein & Hirasawa / Practice English reading materials (with exercises) from “real world” newspapers, magazines, books, to keep college and adult ESL students interested / $4.95 . . . thus providing a change-of-pace alternative to the widely used ESL reader □ Developing Reading Skills: Advanced / $4.95 . . . □ The Dyad Learning Program / Pack / A basic ESL grammar course in which students pair off to teach each other prepositions, verbs, determiners and conditionals / $4.95 . . . □ It’s All in a Day’s Work / Draper & Sather / An intermediate ESL reading-grammar-composition course based on fascinating introductions to eight professions or vocations / $4.95 . . . □ English Structure in Focus / Davis / Over 50 intermediate reading selections for adults, with exercises which provide an intensive grammar review / $6.95 . . . □ Composition Steps / Horn & Rosman / A 20-unit adult course in the types of expository writing people really need to do in normal life / $3.95 . . . □ Points of View / Pifer & Mutha / Reading- and-discussion materials which entice ESL students to form and express their own views on timely topics while learning oral English / $3.95 . . . ALREADY IN USE □ English I / Schmidt-Mackey / A basic course meeting the immediate needs of adult learners / $2.75 / □ Teacher’s Manual $6.95 . . . □ Advanced English Vocabulary / Barnard / Five progressive workbooks beyond the first 1,000 words / Each $4.95 / □ Teacher’s Guide $1.50 . . . □ Reading Your Way to English / Fitzgerald / Three volumes of selections from outstanding writers to extend vocabularies beyond 2,500 words / Each $4.95 . . . □ A First Book in Comprehension, Precis, and Composition / Alexander / Consolidating the advanced beginner’s achievements / $1.95 . . . □ Idioms in Action / Reeves / A situational dialogue workbook / $3.95 . . . □ Intermediate Comprehension Passages / Byrne / Accelerating self-confidence / $1.95 . . . □ Techniques in Language Control / Richards & Gibson / Introduction to “Every Man’s English” / $10.95 / □ Paperback $5.95 . . . □ From Substitution to Substance / Paulston & Bruder / Goldmine of model grammar patterns / $5.95 . . . □ Effective Techniques for English Conversation Groups / Dodson / Developing ESL confidence plus competence / $3.50 . . . □ Patterns of English Pronunciation / Bowen / A student guidebook, with emphasis on informal, colloquial speech / $6.95 . . . □ The Goofoicon / Burt & Kiparsky / Common ESL speech errors, and how to treat them / $4.95 . . . □ Ilyin Oral Interview Test / Identifying ESL students’ levels and needs without reading or writing / Test book and manual $15.95 / 50 answer-score sheets $3.95 . . . □ Structure Tests—English Language (STEL) / Best & Ilyin / Six progressive tests for use with above oral test for precise level-placement (two each for beginning, intermediate advanced levels) / $5.95 each test / □ Answer keys $6.95

Examine them all at Booth 106-7 TESOL Convention

□ I enclose $_____ for the books checked above. Please ship them promptly to:
Name ________________________________
School ______________________________
Address ________________________________ Zip __________

□ Please send me a complete catalog of Newbury House books.

Newbury House Publishers
68-A Middle Road * Rowley, Massachusetts 01969
Language Science / Language Teaching / Language Learning
Announcements

Fulbright-Hays Awards in Linguistics and TEFL

For thirty years the Fulbright-Hays program has provided opportunities for university lecturing and advanced research abroad. In recent years 450-500 awards per year have been made to American scholars and other professionals—about 40 to specialists in linguistics and English as a foreign language. The program also includes awards to foreign scholars for lecturing and advanced research at U.S. institutions.

Announcement of the awards available for 1978-79, in the 31st annual competition, will be published in March, 1977. The general composition of the program involving more than 70 countries is expected to be similar to that of recent years. Registration for personal copies of the announcement is now open; forms are available from the Council of International Exchange of Scholars, Suite 300, Eleven Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036.

Meetings of Interest to TESOL Members

April 26–May 1 Eleventh Annual TESOL Convention. Miami Beach, Florida.
May 3–6. International Reading Association. Miami Beach, Florida. (write: IRA, 800 Barksdale Road, Newark, Delaware 19711.)
WHY
are there more than 4,000,000 copies of our ESL/EFL series in print?. Because we wrote it with expertise accumulated over the past 30 years. That's how long we've been teaching English to Spanish speakers in Mexico. And we are one of the largest English language teaching institutes in the world. 8,500 students register every two months! We know what we are talking AND teaching about!

WANT TO
learn more about us. Visit us at Booth 13 in the Exhibit Hall at the 1977 TESOL Convention. We'll be glad to talk to you about our series of nine graded texts and the NEW SERIES that we are developing.

OR
send in the request below and we'll send you a free catalog!

Name ____________________________

Address __________________________

School name and address

¿ESPAÑOL?
We teach that too. Visit us at our booth and we'll tell you about our intensive Spanish summer courses. We also teach Spanish throughout the year and arrange Latin American Studies programs for groups from U.S. universities.

WHO
are we? We're the Mexican North American Binational Cultural Center. One of the oldest and largest in Latin America, receiving the cooperation of the United States Government.

HAMBURGO 115
MEXICO 6, D.F.
TEL. (905) 511-47-20

Instituto mexicano norteamericano de relaciones culturales, a. c.
Publications Received


_Idiom_ 7, 1, Winter 1976. The New York State Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages and Bilingual Educators Association.


_The Interlanguage Studies Bulletin—Utrecht_ 1, 2 & 3, September 1976.

_Language Learning_ 26, 1, June 1976.


_MEXTESOL Newsletter_ 1, 3, July 1976. Mexican Association of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.

_MEXTESOL Newsletter_ 1, 4, August 1976. Mexican Association of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.


SR Grammar for Use, Volumes I and II, by Eugene J. Hall, is ideal for advanced high school and college English courses, for classes in expository writing, for advanced English as a Second Language students, for self-study, and for everyday reference use. A particular strength of Grammar for Use is the guidance it gives, in workbook/textbook format, for the writing of paragraphs and the outlining and organization of all kinds of school papers, professional memoranda, and reports.

The 15 chapters of Volume I deal with: Language and Experience; Word Order; and the Substantive and Adjective Slots. Volume II covers: The Verb Slot; Adverbs and Adverbial Concepts; and Connectors and Sentence Types. Each chapter conveys a lesson, provides questions for Conversation and Discussion, and contains a section for Thinking and Writing.

**Volumes I and II**
- For high school
- For college
- For native speakers
- For advanced ESL students
- For the love of language

**Gentlemen:**
P lease send me _______ copy(ies) of Grammar for Use, Volume I, and _______ copy(ies) of Volume II, $4.95 each volume.*

Name & Position ____________________________________________________________
Institution _____________________________
Address ________________________________________________________________
City/State ______________________ Zip ____________

☐ Payment is enclosed
☐ Please bill me.

*plus $1.50 per book for postage and handling

IML The Language People
Institute of Modern Languages, Inc.
2622 Pittman Drive · Silver Spring, Md. 20910 · (301) 565-2580

ESL, ENGLISH, FOREIGN LANGUAGES, BILINGUAL & CAREER EDUCATION
PUBLICATIONS AVAILABLE FROM THE TESOL CENTRAL OFFICE

Reference Guidelines . . .


Other TESOL Publications . . .


Graduate Theses and Dissertations in English as a Second Language, 1975-76. Stephen Cooper, ed. & comp. Published jointly with the ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics. 1977. 27 pp. Paper $1.00.


Program of the Ninth Annual TESOL Convention, March 4-9, 1975, Los Angeles. Contains 96 abstracts of papers presented at the Convention. 183 pp. Paper $1.50 to TESOL members, $2.00 to nonmembers.

Program of the Eighth Annual TESOL Convention, March 5-10, 1974, Denver, Colorado. Contains the abstracts of papers presented at the Convention, and art from the Southwest, 139 pp. Paper $1.00 to TESOL members, $1.25 to nonmembers.


From Other Publishers . . .


Back Issues of the TESOL QUARTERLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Vol. 1</td>
<td>#2,4</td>
<td>$1.00 each number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Vol. 2</td>
<td>#1,2,3,4</td>
<td>$1.00 each number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Vol. 3</td>
<td>#1,2,3,4</td>
<td>$1.00 each number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Vol. 4</td>
<td>#2,4</td>
<td>$2.00 each number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Vol. 5</td>
<td>#1,2,3,4</td>
<td>$2.00 each number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Vol. 6</td>
<td>#1,4</td>
<td>$2.00 each number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Vol. 7</td>
<td>#2,3,4</td>
<td>$2.00 each number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Vol. 8</td>
<td>#1,4</td>
<td>$3.00 each number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Vol. 9</td>
<td>#1,2,3,4</td>
<td>$3.00 each number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Vol. 10</td>
<td>#1,2,3,4</td>
<td>$3.00 each number</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total for All Volumes, 1-10 $62.00
ORDER FORM

TESOL

455 Nevils Building
Georgetown University
Washington, D.C. 20057

Date_________________________

Please ship to:__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

ZIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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</tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL $_________________________

____ Check, cash, or money order for $_________ enclosed (POSTPAID).

ORDERS FOR LESS THAN $10.00 MUST BE PREPAID.

____ Please bill me (a postage charge will be added to orders not prepaid).

____ I am a TESOL member.

Please make checks payable to TESOL. When sending funds from outside the U.S., please remit in the form of a U.S. Postal Money Order, a check drawn on a U.S. bank or a foreign bank draft on a U.S. bank. Do not send checks drawn on foreign banks.

Prices subject to change.
TESOL ESTABLISHES MEMORIAL FUND

The Executive Committee of TESOL has voted to establish a fund to commemorate the late Albert H. Marckwardt, who died in August 1975, and whose influence on the professional organization and on the larger community of language teachers and scholars will be lasting. The TESOL organization has inaugurated the memorial fund by itself making an initial contribution of $1000.

The intent is to use monies from this fund to assist graduate students in TESOL/TEFL/TESL to attend the annual convention. Such awards already exist for graduate students from foreign lands, through the Asia Foundation and the Institute for International Education. We would now like to make similar help available to graduate students who are U.S. citizens.

We invite your contributions to this fund. Please make checks payable to TESOL, specify that they are intended for the Marckwardt Memorial Fund, and mail to:

DR. JAMES E. ALATIS
Executive Secretary, TESOL
455 Nevils Building
Georgetown University
Washington, DC 20057
KEEP YOUR HOME/SCHOOL LIBRARY UP TO TESOL DATE

With the addition of the two newest TESOL Publications

ON TESOL '76
Edited by John Fanselow and Ruth Crymes, ON TESOL '76 is a sampling of the Teaching done at the 1976 TESOL Convention in New York City. It reflects the present state of the art in TESOL!

Here are a few of the authors and subjects in the book;

  Bushman and Madsen on SUGGESTOPEDIA
  Gettegno on THE SILENT WAY
  Melvin and Rivers on MEMORY STUDIES
  Raimies on COMPOSITION
  Frank Smith on MAKING SENSE OF LANGUAGE LEARNING
  Stevick on ENGLISH AS AN ALIEN LANGUAGE
  Widdowson on THE AUTHENTICITY OF DATA

276 pages  $6.50  ($5.50 to TESOL members)

TEACHING ENGLISH TO SPEAKERS OF OTHER LANGUAGES IN THE UNITED STATES, 1975: A DIPSTICK PAPER
By Christina Bratt Paulston. This paper is a discussion of recent developments of language teaching in the U.S. which are seen as most significant for TESOL. The author writes from her point of view as university professor, teacher trainer, and member for five years of the Executive Committee of TESOL (President 1976-77).

26 pages  $1.00 each

PLEASE NOTE THE SPECIAL ORDER FEATURE FOR LIBRARIES AND INSTITUTIONS:
Before filling out the order form for your personal library, photocopy this ad and send the order form to your institution's library. By checking the appropriate space your institution will automatically receive ON TESOL each year of publication. This feature is not available to individual members.

Please send the books marked below to:

____ ON TESOL '76
____ Dipstick Paper

Name ________________________________
Address ______________________________

Quantity
☐ I am a TESOL Member
☐ Standing order to automatically receive yearly ON TESOL

TESOL
GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY
Washington, D.C. 20057
Measure their language dominance naturally... with the BILINGUAL SYNTAX MEASURE.

For analyzing structural proficiency in English and Spanish.

Now you can use a child’s natural speech to determine oral language proficiency so you'll know whether to teach in English or Spanish.

With easy questions and cartoon pictures, the Bilingual Syntax Measure (BSM) encourages a simple conversation with the child. As the child expresses himself freely, BSM shows you how to analyze his or her structural proficiency in English or Spanish.

Then you'll be able to place the child in one of five proficiency levels that indicate in which language to start teaching.

Find out more today about the best way to discover the instructional needs of your bilingual students.

It could save you — and them — from learning the hard way.

The Psychological Corporation
A Subsidiary of Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.
757 Third Avenue, New York, New York 10017

BILINGUAL SYNTAX MEASURE
For English/Spanish instruction in grades K-2, ages 4-9.

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL CORPORATION
A Subsidiary of Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.
757 Third Avenue, New York, New York 10017

YES! I want to be able to measure and place my bilingual students quickly. Please send me details on the BILINGUAL SYNTAX MEASURE.

Name
Title
School
School Address
City State Zip TO-3/77
Requests concerning advertising should be directed to:

AARON BERMAN
TESOL Development and Promotions
Instituto Mexicano Norteamericano de Relaciones Culturales, a.c.
Hamburgo 115
México 6, D.F., MEXICO
(905) 511-47-20 Ext. 132
(Air Mail Preferred)
English For Careers

A New Program in ENGLISH FOR SPECIAL PURPOSES

A Comprehensive Series on Vocational and Professional Fields

in Which English is Widely Used Throughout the World.

A great deal of successful language learning comes from experiences the students find personally significant. English For Careers is the means by which students can apply their English language skills to career-oriented, high interest content.

THE LANGUAGE OF:
Air Travel in English
Hospital Services in English
The Petroleum Industry in English
Computer Programming in English
International Finance in English
The Air Force in English
The Navy in English
Tourism in English
Hosts in English

Restaurants and Catering in English
Accounting in English
Civil Engineering in English
Electrical and Electronic Engineering in English
Mining and Metallurgy in English
International Trade in English
The Army in English

National Defense in English
Chemical Engineering in English
The Merchant Marine in English
Advertising and Merchandising in English
Aviation: Flying and Traffic Control
Agriculture in English
Publishing in English
The Environment in English
Space Technology in English
Medicine in English

REGENTS PUBLISHING CO., INC. Two Park Avenue New York, N. Y. 10016
COMING IN 1977

FORESTVILLE TALES
By Aaron Berman
The newest addition to the Collier Macmillan English Readers series is written for young ESL students. It contains eight international folktales told in pictures as well as words. The sequential illustrations highlight the main action of each story to help students make the transfer from reading to speaking skills.

WRITE AWAY
By Gloria Gallingane and Donald R.H. Byrd
The first two titles in a series of three books that give students controlled practice in order to build writing skills. Book 1 includes two kinds of activities: rewriting model paragraphs and combining several small sentences into a single complex sentence (some of the sentences are cued to illustrations). There is an answer key that allows for several choices when appropriate and an index to the grammatical operations.

SPECIAL ENGLISH FOR BUSINESS
By Sharon Abrams and Hugh Wales
The newest addition to the Special English series is for the management-oriented business person. Intermediate-level students of English will improve their command of the language through dialogs and readings on business theory and concepts, and general office procedure.

All the dialogs and selected exercises will be available on reel-to-reel or cassette tape recordings.

Watch for a new six-level basal series for upper elementary through senior high school students.

Senior Author: Dr. Gloria P. Sampson, Associate Professor, Faculty of Education, University of Alberta, Canada

COLLIER MACMILLAN INTERNATIONAL, INC.
866 Third Avenue
New York, New York 10022