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Listening for Note-Taking in EST

Stanley A. Otto

This article suggests answers to the following questions: What kinds of listening exercises are appropriate for EST? How can study skills, such as note-taking and outlining, be incorporated into such exercises? In what ways can productive activities be used to develop a nominally receptive skill?

Four types of listening exercises are presented, taken from a spiraling sequence of similar exercises developed at Arya-Mehr University of Technology in Isfahan, Iran. They represent one loop in this sequence. The intention here is to provide the reader with a complete set of useable materials from listening text to exercises which may also serve as a model for subsequent materials development.

Teachers of ESL classes frequently find themselves carrying out activities for which they feel—sometimes rather vaguely—there is a need, but which have no real focus or direction. Listening exercises are often served up to students in just this way, in the form of fill-in activities in class or long, repetitious drills in the lab, or even more uninspiring ways.

The listening exercises presented in this article are meant to demonstrate the fact that listening exercises need not be unfocused but can be directed towards very specific student needs in university level courses, those (in this instance) related to science and technology.

1. Theoretical Basis

Before introducing the listening exercises, let us take a brief look at the theory behind them. What do we want to do in listening exercises? For our purposes in Isfahan, the answer was two-fold: 1) skill development, and 2) topic coverage.

Skill development suggests something beyond the initial step of simple listening. When we listen to some kind of discourse, we are generally trying to extract information, either factual or affective, but this is not the goal. This information must be applied to some further need, which might be one of casual conversation, technical writing or perhaps just answering test questions. The ability to listen for a certain kind of information and apply it to one of these needs is a skill which can be learned and practiced. In our program we were aiming at study skills, especially note-taking, needed for handling university lectures.

The skills we were trying to develop in our students were of four types in order of difficulty in mental processing: 1) The transfer of spoken word to...
written text, 2) listening for key words and phrases, 3) selecting out relevant details, and 4) recognizing topics and main ideas. We tried to work on one of these in each listening exercise, immediately applying the information from the listening passage to some content questions to make sure the student saw the utility of developing the skill.

As for topic coverage, it is well-known in EST that certain topics bring along with them a specialized vocabulary, logical structure, rhetorical style and even frequency of grammatical patterns. Thus our listening exercises were built around the topics desired in this case, including basic concepts in university mathematics, physics and chemistry.

The students themselves already had a good basis in the sciences in their own language, Persian, but had not generally covered these topics in English.

2. Listening Passages

Given this theoretical direction, we can now look at how the individual exercises in the sequence of four were structured. Again, we should remember that they are intended to take the student through four related skill areas, all aimed at increasing proficiency in individual note-taking.

The first exercise is a listening dictation, very much in the traditional style and one used by Morley in her listening comprehension exercises. The listening passage is followed by true/false questions. The sentences in this dictation are oriented towards chemistry. This exercise is directed towards relating the spoken word to the written word in a functional way in the mind of the student.

The second is a cloze exercise on a mini-lecture. This is a short talk of the kind developed by Jan Montassir in the American University in Cairo. The mini-lecture is followed by multiple-choice questions keyed on the missing elements in the cloze. Deleted words are usually content words or logic carriers. Here the intent is to concentrate on certain words and phrases in a lecture-like passage in order to write them down during the lecture.

Third, there is a mini-lecture accompanied by a note-taking fill-in exercise. It is assumed that the student will need some help in learning how to organize notes and that it is better to present the general form for note-taking many times before requiring the student to start from scratch. So some notes are given, but key points are left blank and must be filled in from the tape. Comprehension questions follow, which must be answered with reference to the notes. At this stage we are asking the student to listen for relevant details in an on-going passage, again writing while continuing to listen.

Finally, a mini-lecture is presented and accompanied by an outline fill-in exercise. Some details and main points are left blank and must be filled in from the tape. Comprehension questions follow which also include determining main ideas and inference from the facts. This is the final step along the way towards making the student more independent and self-organized in listening. In subsequent loops in this sequence of exercises, less and less information and structure are given until the student is finally able to listen and take notes with no help at all.
I should point out here that there is no special novelty in the types of exercises presented here; each of them has been used many times before. What is novel is the fact that they are brought together under a specific system and with a purpose, qualities listening exercises so often lack. If there is any crime in using this sort of purposeful exercise on students, at least we have the satisfaction of being sure that it is premeditated.

3. Final Word

This kind of listening exercise may be used in a number of ways: 1) It can be presented in class under the control of the instructor with review of any part of the tape possible; 2) It can be done in the language lab with students recording from the master tape and then working independently on the passage to focus on their own weaknesses; 3) It can be duplicated on individual cassettes and made available to students to use on their own, at home or wherever they choose. This can be assigned as homework and even extended to include recorded answers for teacher correction.

We have tried to show here a combination of listening exercises with both study skills development and topic coverage. It is hoped that this will encourage others to develop similar exercises in order to make listening exercises better focused for their students and helpful in those areas of student need which are seldom systematically treated.

Demonstration Listening Passage 1:

Chemical Formulas and Equations

1. Today we’re going to talk about chemical equations.
2. We will look at how chemical equations describe chemical reactions.
3. Most reactions are complicated, so a chemist will write them down in the form of an equation.
4. As an example, let’s write the equation, $2H_2 + O_2 = 2H_2O$.
5. If a chemical equation is like a mathematical equation, then both sides of the equation must balance.
6. In order to understand this better, we will look at another chemical equation.
7. If sodium is dropped into water, it will react violently.
8. The equation for this is the following: $Na + H_2O = NaOH + H_2$.
9. However, this equation does not balance, that is, the two sides are not equal.
10. When balanced, the equation will be the following: $2Na + 2H_2O = 2NaOH + H_2$.

Demonstration Answer Sheet 1-a:

Chemical Formulas and Equations

Directions: Listen to the tape. Write down each sentence after it is spoken. It will be said two (2) times.

Demonstration Answer Sheet 1-b:

Chemical Formulas and Equations

Directions: Decide if these statements are true (T) or false (F).
—1. This tape is about chemical reactions.
—2. Chemical reactions are shown by equations.
—3. Chemical equations are helpful because they describe complex reactions.
—4. The first equation on the tape is $2H_2 + 2O_2 = H_2O$. 
5. Mathematical and chemical equations do not have to balance.
6. Another example of a chemical equation is given on the tape.
7. Sodium and water do not affect each other.
8. The second equation is \( \text{Na} + \text{H}_2\text{O} = \text{NaOH} + \text{H}_2 \).
9. The second equation has unequal sides.
10. The balanced equation is \( 2\text{Na} + 2\text{H}_2\text{O} = 2\text{NaOH} + \text{H}_2\text{O} \).

Demonstration Listening Passage 2:

**Functions**

Today, before I tell you what the subject is that I'm going to talk about, let me try a little game with you. I will give you pairs of numbers, such as \((2,6)\) or \((5,16)\), and these pairs of numbers will be in a sequence. After you hear these numbers, you have to try and guess what the relationship is between the pairs. It should be the same relationship for all of the pairs. Here's the first sequence: \((1,1), (2,4), (3,9), (4,16), \ldots\).

Now I think it should have been very clear to you after the third pair of numbers already that the relationship between the pairs was—did you guess it?—the squaring of the first number to give you the second. Thus, 1 squared was 1, 2 squared was 4, and so on. Let's try another one, but this one will be harder. Listen carefully: \((0,1), (1,0), (0,-1), (-1,0), \ldots\).

Did you see what the relationship between the pairs of numbers was this time? Well, I'm sure some of you must have recognized this as the relation of the numbers in a circle, that is, with the mathematical equation: \(x^2 + y^2 = 1\). But this is only one possible relation, given this sequence of pairs of numbers. What I'm trying to get at here is that there are certain important relations between numbers that mathematicians love to think about. What are these called in mathematical language? We call these relations functions.

Now you should notice that when we write a function, we only put down the "f" on paper, and then after it we write the variable, such as \(x\) or \(y\) or anything else, in parentheses like this: \(f(x)\). Which we read as "the function of \(x\)."

If the function is the first one we had, that is, the square function, we would write it this way: \(f(x) = x^2\), which we read as "the function of \(x\) equals \(x\) squared."

One thing that is very important about functions is that they can be made up of any pairs of numbers, with any relation or rule between them. In addition, functions don't have to include all the numbers that exist in mathematics. They might include only a few. So we could have a function with only one pair of numbers, such as \((300, 21)\), and that would be just as good as the function \(f(x) = x^2\).

The last thing that I would like to tell you about functions for today is that there is a name or definition for the group of all the first numbers in this sequence of pairs. In other words, in our first sequence, the first numbers were 1, 2, 3, 4, etc. while the second numbers were 1, 4, 9, 16, etc. These first numbers are called the domain of the function. There is also a name for the second numbers, which is the range of the function.

I see that I've run out of time so I'll stop here, but I hope you now understand what a function is, and what its parts are called.

Demonstration Answer Sheet 2-a:

**Functions**

Directions: Listen to the tape and write down the missing words in this text.

Today, before I tell you what the ______ is that I'm going to talk about, let me try a little ______ with you. I will give you ______ of numbers, such as \((2,6)\) or \((5,16)\), and these pairs of numbers will be in a______.
hear these numbers, you have to try and guess the ______ between the pairs.
Here's the first sequence:

Now I think it should have been very clear to you after the third pair of numbers already that the ______ between the pairs was—did you guess it?—the ______ of the first number to give you the second. Thus, 1 ______ was 1, 2 squared was 4, and so on. Let's try another one, but this one will be harder. Listen carefully:

Did you see what the relation between the pairs of numbers was this time? Well, I'm sure some of you must have ______ this as the relation of the numbers in a ______, that is with the mathematical equation:

_______ + _______ = 1
But this is only one ______, given this sequence of pairs of numbers. What I'm trying to get at here is that there are certain important relations between numbers that ______ love to think about. What are these called in mathematical language? We call these relations ______.

Now you should notice that when we ______ a function, we only put down the "______" on paper, and then after it we write the variable such as ______ or ______ or anything else, in parentheses like this:

f (x) which we read as "the ______ of ______"
If the function is the first one we had, that is, the ______ function, we would write it this way:

_______ = _______ which we read as "the f of x equals x squared".

One thing that is ______ about functions is that they can be made up of ______ pairs of numbers, with ______ relation or rule between them. ______ functions don't have to include all the numbers that exist in mathematics. They might include only a ______. So we could have a function with only _______ pair of numbers, such as (_______), and that would be just as good as the function _______

The ______ thing that I would like to tell you about functions for today is that there is a name or ______ for the group of all the first numbers in this sequence of pairs. In other words, in our first sequence, the first numbers were ______, ______, ______. These first numbers are called the ______ of the function. There is also a name for the second numbers, which is the ______ of the function.

Demonstration Answer Sheet 2-b:

Functions

Directions: Read the sentences and choose the correct answer. Circle the letter in front of your answer.

1. "Ordered pairs" are the same as ______
   a. functions   c. squared numbers
   b. number sequences   d. two numbers in order
2. A circle is described by the function
   a. f(x)
   b. x² + y² = l
   c. (0,1)
   d. (1,1)

3. A “function” is defined as
   a. relations between numbers
   b. a mathematical equation
   c. a sequence
   d. the domain

4. According to the lecture, what kinds of number pairs can make up a function?
   a. only squares
   b. squares and circles only
   c. pairs like (300,21) only
   d. any pairs

5. In the pair (0,1) the ‘1’ is part of
   a. the domain
   b. the variable
   c. the range
   d. the definition

Demonstration Listening Passage 3:

Brownian Movement

Before I tell you exactly what we’re going to talk about today, I’d like to tell you a story about a certain drunk, that is, someone who drinks too much whiskey or beer or something similar. Now, a certain man had had so much to drink that he couldn’t even walk in a straight line. He walked out of the door of his house and kept moving around, changing directions every three steps, and after an hour, where did he find himself? That’s right, not very far from his house. If he had walked in the same direction for an hour he could have been several kilometers away, but because his movement was random, changing without any order or system, he didn’t get very far. Maybe some of you have seen this yourselves...

So, what can we learn from this story? Well, surprisingly enough, we can compare the drunkard to a molecule in a gas. “How can we compare him to a tiny particle?” you may ask. If we look at any gas, we see that it is full of molecules moving around. How are they moving? A Scottish botanist, Robert Brown, who lived from 1773 to 1858, studied the movement of molecules in water, and he found that they moved around randomly, just like our friend, the drunkard. The same is true of molecules in air; they move about in no special order, running into each other and bouncing off in different directions all the time. This motion of molecules was called Brownian movement, or Brownian motion.

Now let’s look at this Brownian movement in detail. In the earth’s atmosphere, gas molecules are constantly running into each other. In fact, each molecule is involved in about 10,000 million collisions every second. This is quite a bit more than the number of traffic accidents in the whole world since the invention of the car. Now, how far do these molecules go before they run into another molecule? In scientific terms, we would ask, “What is the mean free path of the molecules?” The average distance traveled by a molecule between collisions in air at normal temperature is about 1,000 Angstrom units. As you may know, it takes 100 million Angstrom units to equal one centimeter. So the mean free path of molecules in the atmosphere is about 1/100,000 of a centimeter, Very short! In addition, these molecules are moving fairly fast, around 500 meters per second. But they can’t get very far because the time between collisions is so short. It is interesting to think that air molecules also hit us at a speed of 500 meters per second. Why don’t we feel them? Well, in fact, we do feel them, but not each molecule separately. Molecules have so little mass that the effect of a million of them hitting us in the face every second is felt as nothing more than a little air pressure.

In conclusion, then, we have seen that thinking about our drinking friend was useful for us in understanding something about the properties of gases. The concepts of Brownian movement, mean free path, the speed of molecules and collisions are all very basic to understanding how gases behave the way they do. So the next time you have something alcoholic to drink, think about Mr. Brown and his random movement.
Demonstration Answer Sheet 3-a:

Brownian Movement

Directions: Listen to the tape and fill in the missing words or phrases on the note sheet.

I. Introduction
   first a story about ________________
   drank so much that he ________________
   ended up ________________ his house

II. Comparison between ___ and ________________
   Scottish botanist ________________
   lived from___ to _________
   studied ________________

   known as ______

III. Details about this motion
   molecules run into ________________

   __________ per second
   how far do they go?______________
   known as _____
   about ______
   one Angstrom = ______
   speed: ______
   we feel them as ______

IV. Conclusion
   example of drunk helped us to ________________
   looked at ____________________________

Demonstration Answer Sheet 3-b:

Brownian Movement

Directions: Answer these questions using your memory and the note sheet.

1. Where was the drunkard after an hour's walk?
   He was ________________

2. How is the drunkard's walk related to the properties of gas?
   The movement of the drunkard and of gas molecules are both ______

3. Why is the motion of molecules in a gas called "Brownian movement?"
   This is because ______

4. How many collisions does a molecule have per second and what is its mean free path?
   A molecule has ________________
   and its mean free path is ________________
5. If the molecules of gas on one side of a balloon were heated by the sun, how would this affect the movement of the other molecules? If this happened, the gas molecules __________

Demonstration Listening Passage 4:

Forces

Today I think it would be good for us to talk about one aspect of particle dynamics which is very much at the center of this subject. I would like to talk about the different kinds of forces that exist in nature.

But before I go into these different forces, let me review the basic terms. First, I think that you know that dynamics is the science of motion, and more specifically, it’s the science of why things move in certain ways. So particle dynamics talks about the causes of the motion of particles, as well as the motion of most bodies which are bigger than particles.

Now, what are the different kinds of forces which can have an effect on particles? Well, there are four major categories of forces, and we’ll talk about them in order, from the weakest to the strongest. Strangely enough, this is almost the opposite of the sequence of range or distance of effect. What this means is that the strongest force has the shortest range and the weakest force has the longest range. Very strange, isn’t it? And no one knows why.

The weakest force in the universe is—does anyone know?—gravity. Yes, gravity is very weak, but it has a very great range and acts on every kind of particle which has mass. In addition, it is the kind of force which is always attractive, which means that it always pulls things together and never pushes them apart from each other.

Well, what comes after gravity? The second weakest force in the universe is what is known as the “weak force.” It is not as weak as gravity, but its range is extremely short. By short I mean that it only has effect at distances smaller than the size of an atom. And instead of affecting any kind of particle, like gravity does, the weak force affects only electrons and neutrinos. Again, different from gravity, the weak force repels these particles: it never attracts or has any other force other than one of repulsion.

The third kind of force we’re going to talk about today is familiar to all of you. It is electromagnetic force. This includes all kinds of electrical and magnetic forces, which were shown, by Maxwell, to be the same kind of force. As you know, the range of electromagnetic forces is very long, although not as long as gravity. Unlike gravity and the weak force, however, they are fairly strong, and they act on any electrically charged particles. Electromagnetic forces can either attract or repel. I should also add that they are sometimes seen as a form of matter known as photons.

Let us now turn to the fourth and strongest type of force, which physicists call the “strong force.” Where does this occur? Well, you can only find the strong force in the center of the atom, in the nucleus. And it only affects particles which are found in the nucleus. But this doesn’t keep it from being the strongest in nature. If we compare it to the force of gravity, it is about 10^39 times stronger! This number is 1 followed by 39 zeros, so you can see how much stronger the strong force is than gravity.

After looking at these four forces, you may ask yourself why there are so many different forces. For now, no one knows, but finding out about the relation between these forces is one of the biggest problems in modern physics.

Demonstration Answer Sheet 4-a:

Forces

Directions: Listen to the lecture on the tape and fill in the missing words, phrases and outline headings on the note sheet.

1. Introduction

look at part of ___________
talk about kinds of __________ in nature
basic __________: dynamics means science of __________
__________ categories presented
in order, from __________ to __________
this is nearly opposite of __________

II. First force: __________
very __________ force
but large __________ and acts on __________
always __________

III. Second force: __________
stronger than __________
range __________ and affects only __________
and —
direction: __________ only

IV. __________
includes __________ and __________ forces
Maxwell showed these are __________
range: __________ strength: __________
direction: __________
other form is __________

V. __________
where: __________ affects: __________
__________ stronger than __________

VI. Final word

Demonstration Answer Sheet 4-b:

Forces

Directions: Read the statements and choose the correct answer using your memory and the note sheet. Circle the letter in front of your answer.

1. Particle dynamics and the different forces are related
   a. only in the laboratory
   b. in all sciences
   c. only in bodies like particles
   d. very greatly in physics

2. The meaning of “dynamics” is the following:
   a. the science of the reasons for things moving
   b. special forces of motion
   c. the science of forces
   d. the types of motion in particles

3. In the lecture, the forces are presented
   a. in the order of range of effect
   b. in order of particles affected
   c. in order of strength
   d. in order of strangeness
4. The lecture states that the relation of range to force is strange because
   a. they are so close to each other
   b. they are almost opposite to each other
   c. they never change
   d. they are not understood

5. The properties of gravity are that
   a. it attracts only and acts over a large range
   b. it repels only and acts over great distances
   c. it only attracts over short distances
   d. it affects all particles only over large distances

6. The range of the weak force is
   a. the same as that of gravity
   b. only inside the atom
   c. limited by its forces
   d. much greater than other forces

7. Electromagnetic forces are different from gravity because
   a. they only repel and gravity attracts
   b. they are stronger and have a larger range
   c. they can affect any kind of particle
   d. they have a shorter range and are stronger

8. The “strong force” is
   a. slightly stronger than gravity
   b. a major force between stars
   c. $10^{39}$ times more powerful than the “weak force”
   d. the strongest and most limited force

9. The exact relation between these four forces is
   a. not well understood
   b. of little interest to particle dynamics
   c. not useful to know
   d. already well-known

10. A good title for this lecture would be the following:
    a. Strong and Weak Forces
    b. Ranges of Forces in Nature
    c. The Relation between Forces
    d. Four Forces in Particle Dynamics
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Love and Death in Eden: Teaching English Literature to ESL Students

Madeleine Marshall

The several problems of cross-cultural teaching of English literature to Puerto Rican students whose second language is English are suggested by the obvious unfamiliarity of cyclical seasonal change which provides the fundamental mutability mythology of English literature. Compensation for this experiential lack is found in the cultural background of the students, their familiarity with nursing the sick and mourning the dead, and the recognized importance of procreation and extended family. Beyond compensation, student understanding of insularity, alienation, deviant behavior, etiquette, technology, sex, religion, and race are in many instances highly useful to the comprehension of English literature of the past.

The profit in this discovery lies in the constructive humiliation of accepted modern critical and professorial perspective as bound by cultural presuppositions which are no more useful or similar to those of Chaucer or Spenser than those of Latin English majors—perhaps less so.

There is continuall spring, and harvest there
Continuall, both meeting at one time:
For both the boughes doe laughing blossomes beare,
And with fresh colours decke the wanton Prime,
And eke attonce the heavy trees they clime,
Which seeme to labour under their fruits lode:
The whiles the joyous birdes make their pastime
Emongst the shadie leaves, their sweet abode,
And their true loves without suspition tell abrode.

(The Faerie Queene III, vi, 42)

One hardly need experience life in the tropics to appreciate that the absence of snow and the springtime that follows must affect the impact on the reader of much imagery which is thought of as essential to an appreciation of English literature. It is a commonplace that the generative cycle of annual death and rebirth, flowers and harvest, constitutes a primal mythology to that segment of humanity living in a temperate climate, usually seen as normative for human culture. What happens in the Puerto Rican classroom to the substance of Hopkins’ sonnet “Spring and Fall,” in which the falling of leaves and approaching death become one and the same? What happens to the Wasteland, with its ex-

---
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ploration of desolation in terms of seasonal change? What do students and professors make of the summertime ideals of Shakespeare in a climate in which the ideal is the actual? While one inclined to argue might maintain that the subtle seasonal changes of Lenten winds and dry and wet are fertility-related, their authority as mutability analogues is certainly very modest.¹

It is proposed in these pages that the apparent difficulty of teaching and reading English literature in the Latin tropics is balanced by a generous number of compensating factors, which the careful teacher can exploit, enhancing the students’ appreciation of the material and simultaneously refining his or her own understanding of the complex relationship between the literature of the past and modern critical perspective. The tropical climate and its actualization of the poet’s ideal is the most obvious and perhaps the most difficult barrier to be negotiated. Beyond a moderate familiarity with tourist propaganda, our students do not appreciate that they are living in paradise. Indeed, the Fall is no less evident to them than it is to their northern counterparts.

The challenge of this particular cross-cultural teaching heightens the instructor’s awareness of those barriers of time and culture across which all literature functions. The undeniable differences, through history, of basic human experience of love and life and death are suggested by the differences in basic human experience between, for example, Mayaguez, Puerto Rico, and Madison, Wisconsin. A North American, Protestant professor of English literature in Puerto Rico comes to realize the extravagant diversity of cultural experience each of us in any situation brings to the classroom. The students bring to what they read a complexity of experience that may in many instances be more in touch with the spirit of the text, in many instances more alien than one’s own, but it is nonetheless useful to the explanatory task. Contrary to my graduate school persona, I am not a perfectly-modelled eighteenth-century sensibility, and by recognizing my own sympathetic limitations and admitting sympathies the students may possess and I lack, we can collectively broaden our historical understanding. My experience is no less alien, only different. Renaissance or eighteenth-century English literature, however knowledgeable I am of it, may be as foreign to me as it is to my Puerto Rican students. Their cultural background perhaps makes it less so. The progress described here is my own realization, over the years, that great literature will not be limited by the critical-cultural accounts we attempt to impose on it, to one affective mode.

Not only is my perception of a particular historical milieu of the past affected by such cross-cultural classroom exchange, I am also less inclined to reduce the diversity of modern culture and narrow critical perspective to the values reflected in critical journals and reviews. A certain libertarian, angst-ridden, agnostic vision of the world, whether genuine or affected, directs a large measure of current writing about literature, including introductions found

¹The hostility of nature to humanity of the north is integral to the Old English laments and reflected in much subsequent English literature. The observation provided a springboard for J. W. Lever’s work on the Elizabethan love sonnet, particularly its difference from the Italian prototype.
Modern humanity is not necessarily distanced from the literature of the past in this particular direction. Awareness of other perspectives helps us see the work in itself in sharper detail. Such a polyvalent perspective certainly does not help simplify our view of the past, but then that is not what we want after all, particularly on the edge of a third world.

The development of my understanding has generally proceeded in three stages as 1) I recognized a serious problem the students were having, or ought to be having; 2) the difficult details were clarified and the practical pedagogic solutions suggested themselves; 3) my own appreciation of the text and its alien historical context was clarified, incidentally enhancing my respect for the students’ cultural frame. Observations on the language deficiencies and advantages of these particular ESL students illustrate this revelatory process:

Stage one: At first I was struck by the students’ weakness in simple monosyllabic Anglo-Saxon vocabulary, the first, most native words of the native speaker. The students favored affection over love, obese over fat, and mature over ripe. Holes were cavities, profound rather than deep. A light illuminated rather than shone, and revealed the obscurity rather than lit up the dark. Vocabulary building helped fill in the missing Germanic words but failed to make them more natural than their Latinate counterparts. Stage two: particularly when teaching Milton and the neoclassical poets, I realized that the students had to strain to catch the stylistic patterns of Latinate and Anglo-Saxon vocabulary and syntax. Even for accomplished English majors, the familiarity-unfamiliarity was reversed, and the household Anglo-Saxon vocabulary was the foreign element. Stage three: I have come to appreciate that Milton and his scholarly Renaissance and Medieval predecessors were, like my students, more comfortable writing with a Latin syntax and vocabulary, or at least referring to it. The students are to an extent closer in language to the poet’s mind than I am, or at least they have their own useful access.

Turning to a second example, given the obstacles of language and culture, one worries about teaching comedy. We are sensitized to the verbal wit of English drama and conditioned to being amused even with the need of footnote consultations. We are told, moreover, that humor translates poorly. To make matters worse, farcical and situational humor has been so usually dismissed as unworthy of the erudite mind, as grounding stuff, that the graduate student is often trained to overlook the farcical and bawdy and to concentrate on ingenious rhetorical exchanges. Students, particularly ESL students who have special problems with verbal wit, understand and delight in coarse comedy. The result is that, in reading a comedy, the farcical element assumes its due—apparent also on stage—as fine, complete entertainment. Language like that used by Falstaff is best examined in the context of the more obvious farce. Certainly the spectator’s experience supports this approach.

---

2 The introductions in The Literature of Medieval England by J. W. Robertson, Jr., for example, frequently strain to explain what is obvious to any Catholic high school student.

3 The value of feminist literary history, black criticism, or any other consciously-assumed critical perspective is similar, as it provides more data and analytic depth of field.
A final example of language obstacles turned to advantage proceeds from the observation that many second language students delight in syllable counting and solving metrical puzzles. This enjoyment of quantitative feats is both a transfer from Spanish poetics and a reminder of the appreciation of ingenuity which inspired “To the Immortal Memory and Friendship of That Noble Pair, Sir Henry Morrison.”

One takes comfort in the observation that trans-cultural teaching of literature to non-native speakers is the historical academic norm rather than an unfortunate deviation. In ages past, one didn’t have to study one’s own literature; one simply read it. Indeed, the traditional study of classical language and literature is a useful analogue. Courses in modern and contemporary literature have only recently been felt necessary as barriers have been erected which make the so-called literature inaccessible to many of its readers. We are further reminded that at no time in literary history have the values of authors and all potential readers coincided. Within a given historical period, people saw with different eyes. The monks rejected secular poetry, the Puritans detested Shakespeare’s theater, Dryden was misunderstood, Blake was unknown. In short, even the accurate establishment of historical context may be too simple, as values still interfere. The professorial task extends to values as well, as we build sympathy with literary sensibilities alien in time or attitude, to allow enjoyment and broaden understanding.

While the tropical climate may have failed to provide our students with an important meteorological analogy to the human experience of mutability, the Puerto Rican students seem to have a stronger appreciation of death and dying than their counterparts in the United States, and this appreciation provides part of the alternative to falling leaves and freezing cold. The reality of the extended family and the funeral customs of the island guarantee that virtually every young child has seen a corpse and witnessed open grief first hand. Mourners wear black and anniversary masses are said for the dead. Hamlet’s horror at his mother’s hasty remarriage is natural, not psychopathic, to our students. The suggestion of thrift, “the funeral bak’d meats/Did coldly furnish forth the marriage tables,” is shocking to an extent that must approximate its original effect.

Not only death, but also disease and dying are more real to individuals in a country in which family members provide twenty-four hour nursing care to relatives in hospitals and in which old age homes are almost unknown. Goneril and Regan’s hateful and contemptuous treatment of their father is horrifying in the extreme, not just a reminder of a familiar social problem. Their hatred of each other may be understood as far more unnatural than it appears in a society in which sibling rivalry and resentment are acceptable feelings.

In Puerto Rico the aged and the dying are no less a part of visible society
than the very poor, the severely handicapped, and the feeble-minded. It is no
doubt to be lamented that social welfare is inadequate, but the biproduct is a
remarkable acceptance of imperfect human specimens and their right to live
freely. The advantage in the literature classroom is that Bedlam beggars and a
whole unit on the Romantics may be appreciated without extended explanation
of how life has changed. The distinction made in *Piers Ploughman* between
lazy and deserving beggars is vital and meaningful. That madness and retarda-
tion are often laughing matters in Puerto Rico is not so much an indication of
callous insensitivity as of familiarity and even acceptance.

The sense of belonging to an extensive family and knowing one’s second
cousins and their children has a small practical benefit: Puerto Rican students
master genealogical tables with amazing ease. More importantly, they obtain
a significant cultural edge in reading literature of the past. Anglo-Saxon ideas of
kinship are not so strange. Profound alienation in Medieval and Renaissance
literature, the fact of being outcast and cut off, is horrible, as intended, rather
than a fact of the human condition. Illegitimacy and intrafamilial adoption for
various reasons are familiar phenomena, as they are to the majority of humanity
and always have been.

Returning for a moment to the kindly climate, one feels that the other lack
the tropical students suffer is an unfamiliarity with new life and returned fer-
tility after desolation, represented by spring, with April as the cruelest month.
The compensation, paralleling the students’ experience of death, lies in a perva-
sive honest delight in pregnancy, childbirth, and small children, which may spell
ecological ruin, but is close in sympathy to the joyous celebration of fertility
founded in much poetry. (The balance of Hopkins’ title reads “to a young child.”)
On the other hand, that humor which despises children and dogs is not under-
stood here. Tropical fertility as a natural constant, not to be withdrawn except
by hatred, age, or death, renders certain Spenserian allegory transparent. Medi-
terranean nature mythology as it is traced in English literature is close in sense
and spirit to the Puerto Rican students’ experience.

While the cyclical mythology of season following season is familiar in a
stale, videotaped fashion from Christmas songs and cinema, the smell of thawing
earth or the poignance of falling leaves are unfamiliar items, perhaps known
from literary shadows, more likely not. Certainly Puerto Ricans, like many urban
students in the United States, have only a greeting-card acquaintance with violets
and primroses and only a Biblical knowledge of the habits of sheep and shep-
herds. Like snowstorms, their suggestive figurative power is only appreciated
with effort, although one might suggest that the ice and snow of Anglo-Saxon
poetry may be more powerfully horrible as they are unfamiliar. On the other
hand, the symbolism of waves and insularity works very well and is more im-
mediate by far than it can be to English majors at the University of Wisconsin.
Indeed, Donne’s most famous meditation, “no man is an island,” is doubly effec-
tive in Puerto Rico, as alienation is deviant and insularity known first hand,
rather than the reverse.
If alienation is deviant in Puerto Rico, so much more are filial and fraternal hatred, marital infidelity, homosexuality, and suicide. Of course they exist and are acknowledged as psychological and social ills, but it is not self-evident that subconscious forces of rejection, rivalry, aggression, and self-destruction must be both acknowledged and accepted for mental health. Our initial reaction is unavoidably superior: minimum familiarity with modern psychology informs us of our drives and their origins, and so on. (We tell our children they may hate us and their siblings because such rejection and rivalry are normal.) Our more complex second reaction is more understanding, particularly in light of the texts: Shakespeare and his fellow poets evidently condemned such self-destructive and antisocial behavior as wrong, sinful, unnatural in the most complex sense of the word. Once again, the different values of the students have provided a source of genuine insight. Commentary inspired by modern psychology may or may not be essential, but it ought not to be allowed to take over the whole critical stage.

The intricacies of Puerto Rican etiquette and protocol and the experience of a rigidly stratified society living in geographically close quarters are further bridges to the literature of the past. Kent’s rudeness to Lear needs no commentary and the ceremonial patterns of Beowulf prove fascinating. The society bound by ritual and propriety, in which family relationships and even fosterparenthood are of central importance, is not so distant in time or removed in attitude from present experience. The idea of service cars be made immediate and real to students with a strong respect for social orderliness.

A multitude of minor features of life in Puerto Rico facilitate the explanatory task and compensate for obvious difficulties. Herbal medicine and spiritualism are alive and familiar to the students. Women are recognized both as sexual beings and as particularly capable of sacrifice, a complex attitude which has ramifications touching on much characterization of women in English literature of all time. Ideals of honor, to good and bad ends, are acknowledged, refining one’s appreciation of the values of Hotspur—at Falstaff’s expense. Comprehending these attributes of life facilitates the explanation of texts and in turn clarifies the explainer’s understanding of the world view of the author as he wrote.

Attitudes toward technology and ecology are a telling item in this survey. Even in the urban United States, of course, response to technology is very complex, and in Detroit one must hesitate before assuming some ideals of pastoral peace. The issue becomes even more problematic in Puerto Rico, which is touted as a Latin American showplace of industrial development. One’s first inclination is to rhapsodize on the beauty of untouched nature, perhaps turning for contrast

---

6 Cf. Robertson’s “General Introduction,” p. 5. “Medieval men were likely to think of their problems as community problems and of their own behavior in moral rather than in psychological terms. It is a mistake, therefore, to seek psychological profundity in medieval art or to expect characters in medieval literature to display personality in the modern sense of the word. There is no reason why this fact should be disappointing. The same shortcoming, if we wish to call it that, characterizes most classical literature and art as well. The better able we are to refrain from reading our own conventions into earlier literature and art, the better we shall be able to understand and, actually, to appreciate that literature and art and to understand the peculiar appeal of the literature and art of our own time.”
to Blake’s depictions of industrial horror, or otherwise to attempt to inspire
disgust at the false god Progress. Refineries, automobiles, plastic culture are
waiting for literate demolition. On reconsideration, the students’ values, as they
have been educated toward future ideals I may not share, are more congruent
with the ideals of the Royal Society or the Victorian progressives. The presup-
positions of The Whole Earth Catalog are no more modern. The secret must
lie in orienting the text, the students and their values, and one’s professorial self
in useful relation to one another, toward our mutual enlightenment.  

One major feature of life in Puerto Rico which tacitly affects much class-
room exchange about literature is the prevalent Roman Catholicism of the island.
The Catholicism is cultural as much as it is individual and we confront a quan-
tity of presuppositions about religion which are very different from either the
North American or the British norm. It is not necessary to explain the doctrine
of Original Sin as though it were science fiction or to marvel at the phenomenon
of celibacy. Mariolatry is accepted both as a theological fact and a manifestation
of a larger cultural complex regarding women, purity, and generation, which
affects reading but is too complex to explore here. Suffice it to say that sexuality
as primarily procreative joins seamlessly with an appreciation of feminine
mystique and of machismo. The English literary past is more easily explained
than the agnostic present.

In this context, the challenge is to present Protestantism, the Reformation,
and Puritanism in terms that make them living historical forces. This task is
fortunately simplified by the moderate religious heterogeneity of Puerto Rico,
the Protestant presence seen in various sects which are actively proselytizing.
Then too, pietism, puritanism, and reform are items familiar to all religious
traditions. The key seems to lie in exploitation of student interest in religion
and extrapolation from student experience.

Racial prejudices that find regular expression in English literature are, at
first encounter, profoundly disturbing to the instructor. One cringes at “The
Little Black Boy,” at Othello’s self-contempt, and of course at the blond ideal
female. With further experience, the burden becomes heavier, as the realization
hits that the majority of the students, like the poets, idealize fairness. We work
on that together, my modern sensibility once again in the minority. It even
occurs to me that liberal professors in the U.S. classroom can rarely confront
racial opinions as squarely, decently hidden as they are supposed to be, from
view.

Perhaps the most fascinating meeting ground of English literary text and
Latin mind is in the English literature which makes conscious use of classical
or Mediterranean material. Byron’s facetious lines on sexual behavior in sunny
climates, Milton’s and Spenser’s descriptions of paradise and the Garden of
Adonis, Shakespeare’s Italian settings—all remind us that the cultural com-
munication is one of mutual fascination and great complexity through history.
As an American raised in the Middle West I am no more of the English

---

7 In this context, our ESL students have shown notable interest in science fiction.
Renaissance than my students are of Petrarch’s Italy. Beyond any such account of instructive similarities and pedagogically useful sympathies, we value the humbling of modern critical sensibility which results from such cross-cultural confrontation. To read the balcony scene in *Romeo and Juliet* with perfect sensitivity to its imagery, we all must consciously construct an alien urban world without electric streetlights. To appreciate Juliet’s value to her parents, we all must imagine an almost unbelievable infant mortality rate and an appreciation of daughters as mothers in potentia. (Here we move toward the Latin pole.) To grasp the social anthropology of extended families and feuding and a peculiar combination of sexual flagrancy and restriction evident in the female characters of the play, one must either read the right articles or be Latin. To absorb the symbols of April and the heel of limping Winter, one must either know snow and the joy of spring or cultivate a literary familiarity with their meaning. The literature professor’s obligation is to know the several available avenues to understanding and, explaining the landmarks and sketching in unfamiliar features, to take the nearest way.
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Using Radio Commercials as Supplementary Materials in ESL Listening Classes

Johnnie Johnson Hafernik and Harold Surguine

This article examines the pedagogical rationale for using radio commercials to teach listening comprehension to ESL students. Practical advantages, classroom techniques, and possible follow-up exercises are presented. The adaptability of radio commercials to multi-level classes is emphasized.

We ESL teachers are always trying to make our classes more interesting, more relevant and more characteristic of the actual English speaking world: our goal is to prepare our students to cope with English outside the classroom. One area of particular difficulty for most ESL students is listening comprehension. Students often panic when they hear English on television, radio or in situations in which speech is fast and nothing is repeated. In order to recreate these situations in the listening class, we have adopted radio commercials (see Olson 1977). After using them several times we realized that radio commercials held greater possibilities than we had imagined, and found them applicable to levels from low-intermediate to advanced. (Here low-intermediate refers to students who have a very basic command of English, scoring approximately 375 on the TOEFL.) While we advocate using these media advertisements as supplementary materials, they are not recommended for the bulk of the class material.

A number of characteristics make radio commercials pedagogically sound tools for teaching listening: 1) close correspondence to everyday spoken English, 2) sound clarity, 3) length, 4) redundancy, 5) adaptability to multi-level classes, 6) general entertainment, and 7) their representation of mainstream American culture.

Radio commercials provide examples of English used for natural communication rather than English used only for ESL classrooms. Yet, many students avoid listening to the radio because they feel their English is not adequate; when they do try, they are usually frustrated. Students do complain that radio announcers and speakers in commercials talk faster than normal. This turns out not to be the case, however. The dialogue or monologue in a radio commercial is usually spoken at a normal pace, so using radio commercials in class can help students feel more at ease with this pace. Commercials also provide...
students with current, often essential, vocabulary in context. For example, Contac or other cold medicine commercials introduce or reinforce common medical vocabulary such as *tablets, congested, symptoms,* and *runny nose.* Familiarity with these words can help our students when they need to describe how they feel to a doctor or friend. Students realize that radio commercials are preparing them to cope with English outside the classroom, one reason for their popularity.

Certain features of commercials help to keep student frustration level low during learning. For example, the clarity of sound in radio commercials is excellent; sponsors spend a great deal of money to make a technically high-quality commercial because they are trying to sell us their products. Unlike some tapes that teachers make in backrooms while competing with typewriters and pencil sharpeners for sonic space, radio commercials contain only selected sounds. Since our students should be exposed to a variety of listening experiences and situations it’s advantageous to present them with listening exercises both with and without background noise. Some radio commercials provide special effects (hard to come by for the language teacher) that help students visualize the setting of the dialogue. For example, in one Master Charge commercial, a wife picks up her husband after work and a conversation ensues as they drive home. Traffic noise is very loud at first, then a door slams and it diminishes. Students can use these clues to answer the question, “Where do the husband and wife meet?”

The length of radio commercials is another feature that keeps the frustration level low. In order to keep the listener’s attention, radio commercials are usually short—about 60 seconds. Most students can and will concentrate for such a short period, even if the material is difficult. It has amazed us to note how strong the students’ interest is, even after the n-th playing.

One of the best features of radio commercials is their redundancy. Although native speakers of English often find this a nuisance, the paraphrasing and repetition of certain phrases gives students more opportunities to understand, thus, even low-intermediate students can feel successful rather than frustrated. Teachers, though, play a large role in the degree of the students’ success. They must gear the exercises to the students, acknowledging their needs and weaknesses as much as their potential capabilities. Subtle humor, idiomatic usage, and examples of dialect which may be too difficult for the lower students can be used as topics with a more advanced class. A low-intermediate class can hear a radio commercial twice, and still be able to answer only one question, “What’s being advertised?” Yet this is a great accomplishment for those students, and they should be made to feel proud and encouraged by this first step. If the students gain self-confidence by listening to radio commercials in class, they then might tackle English outside the classroom with more assurance.

As mentioned earlier, students enjoy radio commercials because they present actual, everyday English. However, students also like them because they are entertaining. The music often played at the beginning and end of the commercials is relaxing and some lyrics are redundant and catchy enough that
many students can sing them by the time class ends. The level of humor and sarcasm found in commercials can be entertaining as well; some humor is obvious and transgresses cultural lines, other humor is more culture-bound and provides a good way to teach American culture. Because most students are interested in learning about American culture, radio commercials become an ideal pedagogical tool. Furthermore, commercials generally present the values and mores of the main-stream American public, containing recognizable and amusing American stereotypes. They provide examples of different registers and usages, depending upon the target audience, and in addition they touch on controversial topics. Through radio commercials, students are exposed to diverse sketches of our multi-faceted society. It is best, however, for teachers to present the radio commercial first without showing their own cultural biases or prejudices, since teachers should be concerned initially only with the students’ comprehension of the material. After the straightforward comprehension exercises have been completed, more subjective exercises can be given. Related information, along with views and opinions differing from those presented in the radio commercial, can be presented and discussed. Teachers can state their beliefs, but students should be encouraged to think for themselves and reach their own conclusions (Seelye 1974).

The types of exercises that can be done with radio commercials are many: 1) true/false, 2) multiple choice, 3) short answer, 4) matching, 5) cloze-dictation, 6) adapted role play, 7) values clarification, 8) discussion, and 9) contact assignments. The first four types can be used for simple comprehension questions; they should progress from general questions (usually about three) to more specific questions (usually from three to five). In a very low class most of the questions should be general; if advanced, most should be specific and/or inference questions. Students should be listening to rather than reading these questions as much as possible.

One step beyond simple comprehension exercises is a cloze-dictation exercise for which the text of the commercial is needed. By listening to it and marking where the speakers pause, one can more easily discern which words should be blanked out, but care must be taken to space the blanks sufficiently far apart from each other. (A formula we have found successful is one blank for every ten seconds.) Content and function words may be blanked out. And, for example, all of the blanks could be the same part of speech or have the same vowel or consonant sound or be a reduced form, and so forth.

The last four types of exercises are more cognitive and should follow the comprehension or cloze-dictation exercises. Many radio commercials lend themselves to adapted role play. For example, after doing a Contac commercial have students act out a visit to a doctor’s office or a trip to a drugstore for cold medicine. Another technique is a values clarification exercise that can serve as a way to get into discussions in which students are encouraged to talk about themselves, their countries, their experiences and beliefs (Simon et al. 1972). Finally, contact assignments are especially good for getting students to use what they have learned outside of class (Kettering 1975). After the Contac
commercial students could ask Americans such questions as: 1) About how many colds do you get each winter? 2) Do you usually go to the doctor when you have a cold? 3) Do you usually miss school/work when you are sick? Of course, not all exercises mentioned should be used with every commercial.

Before starting, you might spend a little time explaining to your students the reasons for using radio commercials. Students generally respond favorably to an explanation like this: “Radio commercials will give you practice listening to everyday, current English spoken at a normal pace, and will help you learn something about the United States and its people. Also, I think you will enjoy them.” Students should understand that they are not being urged to buy any of the products advertised, and that teachers are not getting a commission.

We have found it best to use radio commercials no more than once a week. (A radio commercial with exercises usually takes about 40 minutes.) As we’ve mentioned, teachers have numerous options when choosing exercises. Below is a sample classroom technique.

**LOW-INTERMEDIATE**

1. Play the commercial. Watch facial expressions, etc. for clues to students’ comprehension.
2. Dictate general comprehension short-answer questions (about three). Handle any new vocabulary found in the dictated questions. Make sure the questions are understood by all students.
3. Play the tape again, perhaps two or three times, so the students can write the answers as they listen. They should write short answers, not sentences.
4. Check the answers together.
5. Either hand out a ditto or dictate the more specific questions (three-five). (The questions can be made more general for lower classes.)
6. Play the tape again.
7. Allow time for students to write the answers to the questions. Students may need to hear the tape several times.
8. Check the answers. Answer any questions.
9. Hand out the text/cloze-dictation exercise.
10. Play the tape again several times, so the students can complete the cloze-dictation exercise while listening.

**INTERMEDIATE-ADVANCED**

1. Play the commercial. Watch facial expressions, etc. for clues to students’ comprehension.
2. Ask for oral responses to general short-answer questions. Handle any new vocabulary found in the questions or their answers.
3. Hand out the ditto with the more specific questions or dictate them.
4. Play the tape as many times as needed while students write the answers. They should write short answers, not sentences.
5. Check the answers. Handle any vocabulary questions or problems.
6. Hand out the cloze-dictation exercise.
7. Play the tape again several times so the students can complete the cloze-dictation exercise while listening.
8. Collect the cloze-dictation exercise.
9. Do values clarification/discussion questions as a class or subdivided into groups.
10. Do adapted role-play and/or explain the dittoed contact assignment.
In order to obtain radio commercials to use in your listening class, simply connect the tape recorder to the radio, then tape the commercial you want. The sound quality is best at 7½ i.p.s. Often a commercial is played at the same time everyday, so listen for your favorite commercials, then tape them.

We have found the use of radio commercials to be an exciting, practical pedagogical tool for the listening class. The language is common and content applicable to many varying student needs, and new possibilities are continually presenting themselves to us. We think you’ll have the same experience.
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The Disjunctive Fallacy between Discrete-Point and Integrative Tests

Hossein Farhady

Since 1961, when Carroll introduced the concept of integrative tests, there has been ongoing controversy between advocates of discrete-point and integrative tests. This paper briefly reviews the history of the development of different theories and types of tests. Empirical evidence is provided which casts doubt on the validity of the theoretical opposition between discrete-point and integrative tests. The evidence provides a basis for arguing that there are no statistically revealing differences between them. Since previous research indicates that foreign students perform differently on these two types of tests, arguments are made that these differences may be due to factors which are not directly relevant to language proficiency. Finally, the implications of the findings to areas such as placement and language acquisition tests are discussed and some guidelines are suggested in order to avoid unfair decisions made on the basis of test scores.

This article presents evidence of underlying similarities between discrete-point and integrative tests and questions the validity of special claims for distinguishing one from the other. The procedures followed are 1) to give a brief historical account of the development of the tests in question, 2) to present statistical evidence for the similarities between the two types of tests, 3) to discuss the potential variables which may influence test results and create test bias, 4) to consider the applications of the findings to areas such as placement and language acquisition tests, and 5) to suggest some guidelines in order to avoid making unfair decisions on the basis of test scores.

1. Historical Development

The testing of second language proficiency tends to follow teaching methodologies (Davies, 1968). In testing as in teaching there have been swift changes from one approach to another. One strongly recommended method has succeeded another, with proponents of each denouncing the validity of all preceding methods. The result has been a tendency on the part of teachers and administrators to swing from one extreme to another in their testing strategies. Prator (1975) has referred to this tendency in teaching as the “pendulum syndrome;” the same term may also be applicable to testing. This has made testing language proficiency both controversial and complex.

Spolsky (1978) has discussed three distinct but overlapping periods in the field of testing: the pre-scientific, the psychometric-structuralist, and the in...
The pre-scientific approach stemmed from the old grammar-translation method, in which little attention was paid to the statistical characteristics of the tests. Students were given a passage and were simply required to translate it either into or from the target language. In other cases, essay questions were given and scored on the basis of purely subjective evaluations of one or two teachers. The accuracy and fairness of those evaluations were often questionable.

Then, under the influence of the audio-lingual approach and structural linguists, teaching and testing procedures were fundamentally modified, ushering in what is called the psychometric-structuralist period. The theory of language testing developed by Lado and his followers assumed that language is a system of habits which involves matters of form, meaning, and distribution at several levels of structure, i.e., the sentence, clause, phrase, word, morpheme, and phoneme. The cooperation of behavioral psychologists and structural linguists enhanced the development of precise and objective language tests with reasonably sound statistical attributes. This type of testing, which swept almost all educational fields, including English language testing, was later referred to as the discrete-point approach. In some foreign countries it became the only reliable and scientific way of measuring the language proficiency of ESL/EFL learners.

The basic tenet of the discrete-point approach involved each point of language (grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, or other linguistic properties) being tested separately. The proponents of this approach viewed language as a system composed of an infinite number of items; they felt testing a representative sample of these hypothetical items would provide an accurate estimate of examinees' language proficiency. However, like the shifts in language teaching, this testing approach was also subject to challenge and modification.

The shortcomings of discrete-point tests have been fully discussed in other places (Oller 1975; Carroll 1961; Jakobovits 1970). In spite of their practicality, opponents of discrete-point tests point out that answering individual items, regardless of their actual function in communication, may not be of much value. Furthermore, the contribution of any item to assessing total language communication may be neither significant nor identifiable (Spolsky 1973). The first of these criticisms was advanced by Carroll (1961) when he suggested using types of tests which focus on the total communicative effect of an utterance rather than its discrete linguistic components. Carroll referred to this type of test as integrative. This was the start of the third and most recent shift in language testing.

Integrative tests in contrast to discrete-point tests are intended to tap the total communicative abilities of second language learners. Oller has noted that integrative tests assess the skills which are involved in normal communication. He also claims that the two types of tests, though theoretically different, could be placed along a continuum ranging from highly integrative at the one end to highly discrete-point at the other (Oller 1973). Some well known integrative
tests are the cloze test, dictation, listening and reading comprehension, and oral interviews. Examples of discrete-point tests are: grammar, vocabulary, and auditory discrimination tasks. It should be noted that labeling a given grammar or vocabulary test as discrete-point does not mean that all such tests are necessarily discrete-point in nature. For example, one could develop a grammar test which is highly integrative. As a matter of fact, such a test was developed by Bowen (1976) and was reportedly successful.

The shift from discrete-point to integrative tests is not yet fully accomplished, so they still tend to compete as separate avenues of testing. And, at the same time, another trend in the development of language proficiency testing has emerged. It was soon realized that not all integrative tests were assessing the communicative abilities of the students, nor were all of them as true to life as had been assumed. Consequently, in line with the pragmatic approach to teaching, Oller (1978) introduced the pragmatic testing approach. Although pragmatic tests have been considered interchangeable with integrative tests, Oller (1979) defines them more precisely:

> ... any procedure or task that causes the learner to process sequences of elements in a language that conform to the normal constraints of that language, and which requires the learner to relate sequences of linguistic elements via pragmatic mapping to extra-linguistic context.

(Oller, 1979:6)

In other words, he believes that pragmatic tests should meet two requirements: first, they must require context, i.e., the meaning requirement. Second, they must require the processing to take place “under temporal constraints,” i.e., the time requirement. Oller concludes that integrative tests are a much broader class of tests which are usually pragmatic, but pragmatic tests as a subclass of integrative tests are always integrative (Oller 1978).

So far, we have briefly looked at the historical development of different types of tests which have dominated the field of second language measurement and mentioned reasons why some scholars have advocated one particular approach over another. However, such discussions have been almost entirely theoretical. Statistical evidence from previous research which was conducted to differentiate between the two types of tests will now be provided. It will be demonstrated that actual differences between the two theoretically opposing types of tests are not as statistically distinct as has been assumed. In fact, these tests might be so similar that, without labeling, one could hardly distinguish them on the basis of the results.

2. Statistical Evidence of Similarities

The many studies conducted on development of integrative and pragmatic tests have almost always used statistically well-established discrete-point tests as the validation criteria. Most of the researchers seem to be satisfied with the high correlations obtained between integrative tests and discrete-point criterion tests. The simplest way to statistically compare the two types of tests would be to examine the correlation coefficients reported in the literature.
It should be mentioned that in this article grammar (structure) and vocabulary are considered discrete-point, and cloze, dictation, reading, and listening comprehension are considered integrative. As stated before, this categorization does not imply that all grammar or vocabulary tests are always discrete-point, nor that all reading or listening comprehension tests always integrative.

The data presented in all of the following tables are organized into three columns. In the first column, the correlation coefficients associated with the two discrete-point tests (DP₁ and DP₂) are reported. In the last column, the same is done for the two integrative tests (IN₁ and IN₂). In the middle column, the intercorrelations among the four tests (DP₁ and IN₁, DP₁ and IN₂, DP₂ and IN₁, and DP₂ and IN₂, respectively) are presented. Discussion of the data follows the tables.

The first piece of evidence is an analysis of the English as a Second Language Placement Examination (ESLPE) at UCLA. Rand correlated the scores on different subtests of the ESLPE, of which a subsection of the results is reported in Table 1.

**TABLE 1**
Correlation Coefficients from Rand (1976)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discrete-Point (DP)</th>
<th>Integrative (IN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gram.</td>
<td>Vocab.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP₁</td>
<td>DP₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Available in UCLA ESLTE files

The second piece of evidence is from Oller and Inal (1975). They developed a special cloze test for English prepositions and correlated the scores on the cloze test with other subtests of the ESLPE. Since this type of cloze test may not be totally integrative, other integrative measures are selected and presented in Table 2.

**TABLE 2**
Correlation Coefficients from Oller and Inal (1975)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discrete-Point (DP)</th>
<th>Integrative (IN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gram.</td>
<td>Vocab.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP₁</td>
<td>DP₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The third piece of evidence from Oller (1975), involves comprehensive data on assessing reading competence in ESL. The parts of the data relevant here are presented in Table 3.
### TABLE 3
Correlation Coefficients from Oller (1975)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Discrete-Point (DP)</th>
<th>Integrative (IN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DP₁</td>
<td>DP₂</td>
<td>DP₁IN₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESLPE FORM 2 A</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESLPE FORM 2 B</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESLPE FORM 2 C</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESLPE FORM 2 D</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Oller (1976) provides evidence for a general language proficiency factor. Data from this article, further evidence of the similarities between discrete-point and integrative tests, are presented in Table 4.

### TABLE 4
Correlation Coefficients from Oller (1976)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Discrete-Point (DP)</th>
<th>Integrative (IN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DP₁</td>
<td>DP₂</td>
<td>DP₁IN₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy Cloze</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med. Cloze</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diff. Cloze</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 represents some of the correlation coefficients reported by Bowen (1976). He compared his integrative grammar test to other well established tests such as the Michigan Test of English Language Proficiency.

### TABLE 5
Correlation Coefficients from Bowen (1976)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Discrete-Point (DP)</th>
<th>Integrative (IN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gram.</td>
<td>Vocab.</td>
<td>Read.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP₁</td>
<td>DP₂</td>
<td>DP₁IN₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 is a partial representation of statistical information from Krzyzanowski (1976).

### TABLE 6
Correlation Coefficients from Krzyzanowski (1976)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Discrete-Point (DP)</th>
<th>Integrative (IN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gram.</td>
<td>Vocab.</td>
<td>Cloze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP₁</td>
<td>DP₂</td>
<td>DP₁IN₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP 1</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP 2</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP 3</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP 4</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Farhady (1978) found a correlation coefficient of .87 between the integrative and discrete-point subsections of the Fall-77 ESLPE. He also demonstrated that, of the eight subtests included in the ESLPE (four discrete-point and four integrative, all of equal weight), any two integrative subtests accounted for the total predictable variation in the discrete-point subsection. Furthermore, the grammar and vocabulary subtests accounted for the total possible variation in the integrative subsection. Table 7 is a part of the correlation coefficients obtained from the ESLPE in the Fall of '77.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discrete-Point (DP)</th>
<th>Integrative (IN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gram.</td>
<td>Vocab.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP₁</td>
<td>DP₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP₁IN₁</td>
<td>DP₁IN₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP₂IN₁</td>
<td>DP₂IN₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN₃</td>
<td>IN₄</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Space considerations preclude mentioning all of the studies reported in the literature. However, all of the results cited above indicate that the correlation coefficients between the two discrete-point tests are roughly the same as the correlation coefficients between the two integrative tests, which in turn are quite similar to the intercorrelations among discrete-point and integrative tests. For example, by looking at Table 3 (ESLPE Form 2A), it is apparent that the correlation coefficient between the two discrete-point tests (.83) is equal to the correlation coefficient between the two integrative tests (.83). Also, the intercorrelations among discrete-point and integrative tests are quite the same.

What do these findings imply? Let us assume that the correlation coefficient between two discrete-point tests is .80. This means that 64 percent of the variation in either test is accounted for by the other test. In other words, the unreliable variance which is not accounted for (and depends on other uncontrolled variables) is 36 percent of the total variation. The same is true for any two integrative tests. Thus, the proportion of the reliable variance to the unreliable variance in both types of tests is virtually the same.

However, the same magnitude of intercorrelation (.80) between an integrative and a discrete-point test can be interpreted differently. It could mean that substituting one test for the other does not make any difference in the amount of the common variance accounted for, nor does it make any difference in the amount of the unreliable variance. Therefore, one can conclude, with a fair amount of confidence, that these tests, which are theoretically labeled as the two opposing extremes of a continuum, may provide the same results.

It is sometimes erroneously assumed that two highly correlated tests assess similar abilities. It should be mentioned that a correlation coefficient is an indication of the “go-togetherness” of the two measures. They may provide similar information but not necessarily be testing the same thing. In fact, it is quite possible that the high correlation between two tests could be due to independent
and unrelated underlying factors which may be present in the tests. A hypothetical example may help clarify the point.

Suppose there are two tests (A and B) and each test is comprised of three different underlying factors. According to the theorem of factor analysis, the correlation coefficient between the two tests is equal to the sum of the cross product of their common-factor loadings. Thus, the correlation coefficient between the two hypothetical tests presented in Table 8 would be:

$$r_{AB} = (.70) (.40) + (.30) (.70) + (.62) (.50) = .80$$

Furthermore, the reliability of each test, which is the sum of proportions of nonerror variance (the sum of the squares of the common factors), is calculated to be .96 and .90 respectively. Data in Table 8 indicate that the correlation coefficient between the two tests is .80. This high correlation is due to their common-factor loadings. However, the proportion of these factors for each test is quite different. This implies that they do not test the same underlying factors in the same way, though they correlate highly with each other and will probably provide overall similar results. Thus, a high correlation between two given tests should not be interpreted as though they tested the same thing.

One way to tap the underlying constructs of a given test, however, is to utilize the factor analysis technique. By factor analyzing the results of tests, it is possible to account for the components of the correlations and identify whether they are assessing the same factors. This technique was employed by Oller (1976) to analyze the results of several administrations of the ESLPE. Based on the data from the ESLPE (referred to in Table 9 as experiments 1, 2, and 3 respectively), Oller has convincingly argued for the existence of a general language proficiency factor stating that “... possibly all language skills are based on a rather unitary proficiency factor or internalized grammar” (p. 166). Parts of his findings are represented in Table 9.

The data presented in Table 9 strongly support Oller’s position that there is a common factor in all language tests. However, they also indicate that the general language proficiency factor (whatever it might be) present in the cloze, dictation, and reading comprehension subtests (integrative) is equally evident in the grammar and vocabulary subtests (discrete-point). Oller and Perkins (1978) have further demonstrated the existence of a general factor, which they
TABLE 9
General Language Proficiency Factor Loadings
from Oller (1976)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtest</th>
<th>ESLPE</th>
<th>General Factor Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EXPER.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictation</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloze</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

call the language proficiency factor, occurring in achievement and even intelligence tests, as well as among the subtests of various language proficiency tests.

The preponderance of evidence presented in this paper seems to support the hypothesis that there is virtually no difference between discrete-point and integrative tests in what they measure or their results. Nevertheless, there are many cases in which these two almost statistically identical tests yield far different outcomes which, if not taken into account, may have serious consequences for both administrators and ESL students. The following section illustrates some of these problems.

3. Problems with Selecting a Test

Decisions made on the basis of test scores have substantial effects on those taking a test; inaccurate decisions may create serious problems. For example, one of the well known functions of language proficiency tests is to help decide whether or not to place foreign students into ESL courses. I have argued elsewhere (Farhady 1979) that there is a significant difference in the performance of foreign students from different language and educational backgrounds on how they score on discrete-point and integrative tests. Two groups of ESL students (Israeli & Taiwanese) at similar levels of proficiency as indicated by their total scores, had significantly different profiles on these two types of tests. I have also speculated that the sex factor could contribute to the differences in the obtained scores. Such systematic differences in the performance of foreign students on different skills could also be implied from the results reported by Hisama (1977) and Upshur and Palmer (1972).

In this paper, however, it has been shown that these two types of tests are assessing the same thing and that there are no statistically revealing differences in the results they provide. Therefore, the following questions seem pertinent and call for empirical investigation:

1. Why do students from different countries differ in their performance on these tests?
2. Why do male and female students perform differently from each other on these tests?
3. What is/are the reason(s) that students from a foreign country such as Taiwan score significantly higher on discrete-point tests than on integrative tests?
tive tests, while students from another country such as Israel score in just the opposite way?

4. Are we creating an artificial bias by selecting one test over the other?

5. Is it true that a discrete-point test with a sufficient number of items may virtually function as an integrative test?

6. Should we develop a correction formula to adjust for these unidentified sources of differences?

One possible explanation for the difference in performance between students from different countries could be the form of the test. Form, in this context, refers to the physical appearance of a given test (multiple choice vs. fill in the blank vs. dictation). For example, a foreign student who has not experienced a cloze type test probably should not be expected to do well on it regardless of his/her language proficiency. On the other hand, a student from another country who has not received sufficient experience on multiple-choice type grammar tests, probably should not be expected to do as well on this test as on more familiar test forms. Of course, this assumption does not imply that multiple-choice tests are all discrete-point in nature. One could develop decent integrative multiple-choice items, though this possibility has not been empirically investigated.

4. Implications

Let us now return to the placement function of language proficiency tests. If a test is composed solely of either integrative or discrete-point subtests, some of the students (regardless of their overall proficiency but depending on their previous educational and linguistic backgrounds) will perform better or worse and may consequently be placed into inappropriate ESL classes. This would create considerable problems for both ESL teachers and students.

Language acquisition is another area to which the findings of this research may apply, at least on one relevant point. One of the many models proposed for second language acquisition is the Monitor Model introduced by Krashen (Krashen 1977a, 1977b). Krashen distinguishes between language acquisition, which takes place in both natural or classroom situations, and language learning, which is possible only through formal instruction. One of his claims is that whenever learners have enough time and focus on the form of the utterance, they will monitor the outcome of their performance. The Monitor Model, then, predicts that highly discrete-point tests would be monitored by language learners, whereas integrative tests would not. This hypothesis has received considerable support from the research in the second language acquisition area. However, if there is no practical difference between these two types of tests, one of the arguments for the Monitor Model, which is based on such a prediction greatly diminishes. Also, this would imply that the data in second language acquisition research should be reconsidered by taking into account some of the psychometric factors involved in discrete-point and integrative tests. Of course, this does not mean that there is no distinction between acquisition and learning. However, it might be safer to look for such differences in areas other than
those which emphasize the difference between discrete-point and integrative tests.

It should also be made clear that the claims made in this paper are not recommendations for any particular type of test. It seems that integrative and pragmatic tests enjoy a theoretical but not statistical or practical superiority over discrete-point tests. However, it is also true that ignoring one type over the other, given the present state of affairs, may create some unwanted and unreliable biases for or against students from different countries.

5. Suggestions

Administrators and teachers who use test scores to make decisions on students must keep many factors in mind. Regardless of the similarities between discrete-point and integrative tests, linguistic, educational, and cultural background variables, as well as gender are related to the students’ differing performances. As Ingram (1978) has mentioned, the underlying processes of the language are too complex to be easily identified. Thus, it is very unlikely that a single type of test will reflect any full assessment of the facets of those very intricate and complicated language processes. She states:

It is, in any case, quite unnecessary to suppose that one has to make an either/or choice, that if one approves of integrative tests, one should therefore disapprove of discrete-point ones. This ‘disjunctive fallacy,’ as Carroll calls it, stems, it seems to me, from misunderstanding about the nature of language command.

(Ingram 1978:12)

Therefore, it seems quite reasonable to assume that a number of different types of subtests are more likely to give an accurate picture of the examinees’ language abilities than any single measure. Alternatively, it might be helpful to weight different subsections, or even different items (and their responses), on the basis of the above mentioned and other relevant variables. This would require carefully designed research and detailed statistically sophisticated analyses. In any case, the problem seems important enough to receive serious attention in future administrations of language proficiency tests, especially those used for placement purposes.

REFERENCES


MAKE AN ADDITIONAL CONTRIBUTION TO THE ALBERT H. MARCKWARDT SCHOLARSHIP FUND

by sending away for a beautiful, large TESOL International poster*

This highly attractive poster announces the 1980 TESOL International Convention. The theme for the convention is "Building Bridges" and the poster consists of eight images of a stylized Golden Gate Bridge with the TESOL Globe as the setting sun. The lettering, in the spirit of San Francisco, is "Old West—Gay Nineties" style. The poster is suitable for permanent hanging in your home or office.

3.50

Send your cheque or money order in U.S. funds to:
TESOL International
455 Nevils Building
GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY
Washington, D.C. 20057

*As customary, in early fall TESOL will be sending without charge to all members an 11 x 17 wall poster announcing the convention. This poster will not be in three colors, will contain folds and will have a different format.

Please send me ______ 1980 TESOL International Posters
$_______U.S. enclosed (No Billing)

NAME

ADDRESS

CITY STATE ZIP

(You may avoid cutting this page by photocopying this ad)
On the Nature and Function of Language Rules in Language Teaching*

Herbert W. Seliger

This article examines claims made for the monitor model with regard to the function of conscious grammar rules as mechanisms which control the quality of the learner's language production under certain conditions. An experiment is reported in which subjects were asked to perform a language task which required the use of the indefinite article. After the task, subjects, including children and adults, were asked to explain their performance. Their verbal explanations were assumed to represent their conscious knowledge. The adequacy of these "conscious rules" was compared to the subjects' performance. As expected, no relationship was found for "good" and "bad" rules and quality of the learners' performance on the task. The second portion of the paper attempts to explain these results in light of what is known about language learning in particular, learning from a cognitive viewpoint, and the nature of language. Lastly, it is suggested that conscious rules do have a function, but not as monitors.

A riddle: What is edible, found in grammar books, sounds right, is alive, and opens and closes like an umbrella?
Answer: The rule for the indefinite article.

A considerable body of research proposes that learners actually do what they say they do; that is, external explanations have psychological reality. This premise which underlies much of what is called monitor theory (see Krashen 1978a, for a recent in-print version of this theory) raises very important questions about the relationship between conscious verbalized explanations and language output or performance. Do the things that people claim they do actually take place in the internal language device, the internal grammar? Can external verbalizations represent thought processes? If they do, then how do we explain the fact that there are many different external explanations for the same language phenomenon? If our external explanations do not have psychological reality, then the monitor and similar models (Bialystok 1979) must be taken as metaphors and evaluated on logical grounds as well.

This paper will explore claims made for the monitor on two levels: first will be a discussion of empirical evidence from children acquiring English as a first language, children acquiring English as a second language, and adults acquiring English as a second language. This evidence indicates that external conscious explanations are unlikely to have psychological reality, that speak-
ers’ rules do not match their performance, that speakers often do not do what they think they are doing even if they report on this immediately after performance, and that the mismatch between conscious explanations and performance is the result of other internal structures or factors in the learner. Then some explanations will be offered as to why it is unlikely that conscious rules, either those invented by the learner or those provided by teachers and grammar books, can be said to function as output devices in a separate learned, as compared to acquired, grammar system. Last, it will be suggested that pedagogical rules do have a role in language teaching and learning, not as language production devices or monitors but as cognitive focussing devices to facilitate acquisition and as mnemonic tags to facilitate retrieval under certain conditions.

An essential question for the language teacher (or anyone) considering the effectiveness of language teaching materials is concerned with the value and function of language rules that are formally taught. These rules are sometimes referred to as pedagogical grammar rules to distinguish them from linguistic grammar rules. Linguistic grammar rules are written with the goal of adequately and scientifically describing some linguistic phenomenon in order to try to represent in a formal way the knowledge that exists in the human mind which allows speakers to produce and comprehend that linguistic phenomenon. Pedagogical grammar rules have as their goal causing someone to produce a language form, that is, getting a learner to perform consistently with regard to some aspect of language behavior, whether it is a rule for forming a voiceless th or a yes/no question. Pedagogical grammars attempt to instill someone with the knowledge that native speakers unconsciously have in their mind. Linguistic grammars try to provide a description of that knowledge in its completed state.

Questions for research then arise: Can the rules which are taught in language lessons or pedagogical grammar rules be used to control or edit output in some way? Can these rules which represent language performance function as rules of language knowledge? Are these rules stored separately and used under specified conditions? It is the conclusion of this paper that pedagogical rules are useful in language teaching in order to get learners to do things with language in an efficient manner, to focus on those aspects of the language phenomenon that must be acquired, and to avoid inefficient testing of false hypotheses. However, this is not to claim that such rules can function as production and comprehension devices.

1. The Experiment

The general goal of the experiment was to examine the relationship between the external explanations (verbalized language rules) which learners give for their language behavior, and actual language performance. Does having a conscious rule either from a teacher, grammar book, or formulated by the learner, mean that the learner knows what to do with it? Does having a good
rule that one can verbalize result in good performance, and conversely, does having a clearly bad rule mean that bad performance will necessarily result? What are the similarities and differences between first and second language learners with regard to the quality and function of conscious language rules?

The study reported here questioned first and second language child learners and adult second language learners about their use of the indefinite article. The indefinite article was chosen because of the simplicity of the pedagogical rules which are normally employed to teach it. The rules governing the allomorphs of the indefinite, a and an, are simple or first level in the sense used by Krashen (1978b) and therefore good candidates for testing hypotheses about the function of conscious rules and monitoring. Brown (1973) notes that grammatical morphemes differ with regard to their semantic or lexical content. For example, the difference between the definite and indefinite articles is quite complex and requires semantic or lexical information in order to know when to use one or the other. The rules governing the phonological variants of the indefinite, however, are straightforward and require simply the prerequisite ability to distinguish between consonant and vowel sounds.

Another reason for selecting the indefinite article is that this bit of grammar is usually taught at the beginning of an ESL sequence. The reasons for this lie both with the relative simplicity of this particular rule and with the fact that learners need to function with nouns from the very beginning. As is well known, the use of the definite article is more difficult to acquire and often remains as a fossilization error among advanced level learners.

2. Subjects

Three groups of subjects were tested for their use of the indefinite and their ability to verbalize this use. One group, 29 monolingual children, were all speakers of standard English who ranged in age from three years to ten years, eight months. A second group, eleven bilingual children, spoke different home languages such as Armenian, Greek, Hebrew, Italian, and Russian; these children ranged in age from four to ten years. The third group, fifteen adult ESL learners, were at various levels of proficiency and had varying years of exposure to English. Most were students in the Queens College English Language Institute, Language backgrounds represented in this group included Arabic, German, Greek, Italian, Hungarian, Japanese, Persian and Spanish.

3. Methodology

Tarone (1979) has stressed the importance of specifying experimental situations and elicitation devices in order to be able to better understand causal relationships and interactions of variables within the experimental situation. Indeed, Krashen (1978b) has specified that some of these conditions, such as sufficient time and focus on form, are necessary prerequisites to the learner’s supposed utilization of conscious rules. The experiment reported here allowed enough time for the subject to focus on form. The task consisted of naming
objects represented in pictures. In short, the subject was asked to produce only a noun accompanied by its proper indefinite article and was given enough time to do so. It is difficult to claim that the subjects focused entirely on form since they could have focused on the content of the picture cues (to be described below). However, it is obvious that such an experiment is not a sample of language within a natural context or in a natural environment. The environment was formal and in a testing atmosphere. It would be expected, therefore, that such a setting would be ideal for the use of a monitor if one exists.

Each subject was questioned individually by the interviewer. Subjects were shown a set of twenty randomly ordered pictures of common objects such as an apple, a leaf, a car, an umbrella, a chair, an egg, etc. Subjects were simply asked to name the objects in the pictures as the interviewer pointed to each picture. It was noted on a separate sheet whether subjects used no article or one of the allomorphs of the indefinite in their responses.

If subjects made any distinction at all between the two kinds of indefinite articles, _a_ and _an_, they were asked, after completing the series, if they had noticed that sometimes _a_ is used and sometimes _an_. If they stated that they did notice this, they were asked to state their reasons for such a distinction. Their responses to this last question were recorded. These responses were interpreted as the subjects’ verbalized conscious rules. (In studies on monitoring, subjects claimed after performance that they had thought of conscious rules (Krashen 1978b).) It is assumed that if a learner does monitor in the sense used by Krashen, it would be such a conscious rule that he would use.

### 3. Findings

**TABLE 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Score for <em>an</em> (average of 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>English L1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>English L2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 presents general aspects of the acquisition of the two groups of children for performance on the task. The children in the monolingual and bilingual groups were organized according to age intervals listed in the left-hand column. The figures for Table 1 were computed on the basis of the mean number of cases in which the subjects selected the correct allomorph in obligatory contexts. Of the twenty instances of obligatory use of the indefinite, 12
required *a* and 8 required *an*. A third possibility, of course, is that no article (Ø) be used. All of the test pictures required the use of *a* or *an* and with all age groups it was rare to find any case where no article was inserted. From the data it is obvious that the first aspect of the indefinite article rule, that some form must be used, was acquired by a large majority of the subjects. Further, that the overriding preference was to use *a* in both environments.

Table 1 therefore gives a mean score for the correct use of *an* in eight obligatory contexts. Unless otherwise stated, it may be assumed that *a* was the substituted allomorph. From Table 1 it may be seen that there is a progression for the monolingual group according to age intervals from almost no use to an average of more than five correct uses out of eight. Bilingual children seem to have scored somewhat but not significantly better.

It may be recalled that Brown (1973) scored the article tenth in the order of acquisition for the three monolingual children that he studied. He did not, however, consider differences between definite and indefinite articles. If one considers this distinction, Table 1 indicates that the indefinite is acquired rather late. Why it should take so long to acquire the sound rule when the semantic and lexical features of the rule are acquired earlier should be cause for further research by those interested in L1 acquisition.

In addition, the mean statistic, as is often the case, masks some interesting variability in the acquisition of the indefinite. One three-year-old monolingual achieved a perfect score on the picture test while two ten-year-old monolingual distinguished between the two allomorphs in only half the cases. More research on an individual case study basis is needed in order to discover the reasons for such variability.

Table 2 provides a picture of the relationship between having a rule (either self-derived or provided through a school context) and actual performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>English L1</th>
<th>English L2</th>
<th>Yrs. in U.S.</th>
<th>Yrs. EFL/ESL</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Normal Rules:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:8</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6 mo.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>12 most schooling in English</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anomalous Rules:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>11/2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Performance and background for subjects who produced normal and anomalous rules.

No relationship was found between performance and having a rule. It should be noted that Table 2 shows only those cases in which subjects were
able to provide some kind of rule. There were many more cases where subjects provided no rule, but again their not giving a rule was no guarantee of good performance. Most monolingual and bilingual children could only state that their performance sounded right if they understood the question about why we distinguish between the two allomorphs. For the most part, younger children simply disregarded the experimenter’s question. Where subjects produced what might be called the normal pedagogical rule it was of the type- “Use an before words beginning with vowels and a before words beginning with consonants.”

Table 2 shows that being able to state a rule is no assurance of good performance just as not being able to state any rule is not an induction of poor performance. It is interesting to note that one native monolingual child, age ten years eight months, while producing the rule, did not follow it in his performance on the picture test. This child stated: “If it begins with a vowel, use an,” and then added that his teacher had told him this in the third grade. None of the bilingual children produced a normal pedagogical rule.

The performance of adults who could give the rule was even more erratic. Three of the four who knew the rule produced no instances on the picture test to show that they understood how the rule was to be used. The fourth adult was a high level bilingual who had been in the United States since early adolescence.

Three subjects, two children and one adult, produced what might be called anomolous rules to explain their language performance. In all three cases, the subjects performed perfectly on the picture test. As will be seen, it is unlikely that the rules which they verbalized could have been responsible for their performance.

The important point to keep in mind is that, while the rules which these subjects claimed explained their performance are not valid, the subjects apparently believed that the rule guided their behavior. This finding raises obvious questions with regard to the validity of subjects self-reporting that they utilize a particular rule to monitor their performance.

From a bilingual child, age nine: “Everybody knows that. You use an for something that’s alive and a for something that’s not.” The experimenter then pointed out to the child that he had said an umbrella on the picture test. The child paused, looked at the picture of the umbrella and replied that perhaps we use an with the word umbrella because people think it’s alive when it opens and closes.

From a bilingual child, age thirteen: “Because an apple you can eat, a leaf you can’t,” This subject then paused and said, “Wait, I’ll tell you in a minute if you let me look in my English book.”

Adult ESL learner: This subject looked at the picture of an ear and said, “Perhaps you use an with people.” Then she realized that this hypothesis was wrong because she had used an with the picture of an apple. Finally she stated that we use an with a,e,i and o. While the second part of her rule begins to approach what is normally taught as a pedagogical rule, it is still incomplete.
4. Discussion

It is interesting to note that the anomalous rules produced by children and adults are somewhat akin to pedagogical rules that are taught in ESL classes. That is, while the rule that is taught or learned from a grammar book can usually be shown to be inadequate or invalid for explaining what learners seem to know if we use formal linguistic criteria, learners themselves (and their teachers) believe that these pseudo-rules guide performance. In truth, such pseudo-rules are an aid in language performance but this does not mean that they are the devices which control or are directly responsible for language output.

It is important to distinguish pedagogical rules from those rules written by linguists. Both are conscious verbalizations of some abstract linguistic rule; however no one would want to teach the formal linguistic description of yes/no questions to a class of ESL learners even though this formal description might be closer than the pedagogical rule to representing the knowledge that we have in our minds. In fact, if we surveyed language teachers we would find that few ever consult formal linguistic descriptions before deciding what and how to teach. Those teachers who do use rules seem to rely on a combination of intuition, what is found in grammar books, and what they themselves have been taught. Based on these sources of knowledge and their familiarity with their particular class, they develop their own conscious verbalizations of the language concept they wish to teach.

In this sense, the pedagogical rules presented to learners in formal instructional environments are really the result of the verbalized inductions of the teacher based on such input factors as perception of the learners’ level of language proficiency, the specific context of the lesson (limited rules versus inclusive rules), the focus of the lesson (a focus on form versus some communicative task) and so on. It is probable that, as there are many learner representations for the same language phenomenon, there are many teacher representations for the same language concept, depending on the above factors and perhaps others. (The effect of such factors on the way teachers represent conscious language rules to learners is itself a topic for further research.)

Conscious, learner-derived anomalous rules and teacher-derived pedagogical rules have the following characteristics in common:

1. Both the learner and the teacher go beyond the information given. Perceptions, presuppositions and pragmatics of the situation affect the formulation of the rule.

2. In neither case does the rule describe reality. That is, neither conscious, learner-derived rules nor pedagogical rules describe the speaker’s internal knowledge.

3. In neither case is the rule actually responsible for language behavior. However, even if pedagogical rules contained all the information necessary to generate actually produced sentences, it is unlikely that we would want to
use these rules in language classes for language teachers realize that there can be too much of a good thing. Knowledge embodied in formal linguistic descriptions, while more complete, is far too complex to be absorbed by the learner. This knowledge, while useful to the teacher for understanding the language concept to be taught, cannot be useful to the learner until he is cognitively prepared for it. Paradoxically, if learners were able to use all the information necessary to explain their performance, in the form of a complex pedagogical rule, they would no longer need such a rule because they would have to be native speakers, probably professional linguists.

Should it be surprising to find a lack of agreement between verbalized conscious rules and actual language performance? Many intervening variables would prevent the direct representation and storage of verbalized language rules in a learner’s internal grammar. Therefore, when a teacher presents a pedagogical rule to a class of fifteen L2 learners, it is probable that the rule is perceived and stored in fifteen different ways.

It should not surprise us that learners cannot really be using the pedagogical rules they claim to use even if they can repeat back a memorized form of that rule, as has been shown in this study. Claiming that learners store and use pedagogical rules in a holistic and unchanged way is reminiscent of empty organism psychology which saw learners as having little or no effect on the material presented to them. Those who hold present views of language learning do not see the acquisition process as the passive reception of conscious rules but as an active process of reconstructing an internal model and the entire literature on error analysis supports these views. Some of the new information which is represented by the pedagogical rule is recoded and assimilated into the learners’ already existing cognitive systems in accordance with how that rule is perceived by them but, some of this information is quickly forgotten because the learners’ systems are not yet ready to absorb it.

Why is it that some speakers are more successful than others in controlling the quality of their output? The quality of output from individual language learners may vary according to stylistic variation or interlanguage registers, a continuum of attention to various aspects of the output (Tarone 1979), or variable rules during acquisition (Dickerson 1975; Huebner 1979), to mention just a few possible causes. We all monitor but we must distinguish between an activity, carried out regardless of the input of conscious rules, and the implications of claiming that monitoring consists of using conscious rules learned in formal environments as output control devices. Such a literal interpretation of the monitoring or editing process we all carry out is improbable for the following reasons:

1. There can be many different conscious or verbalized representations of the same language concept. In many cases, it appears that bad explanations work as well as good ones.

2. Strategies used by learners in the acquisition process are, in the cognitive sense, reconstructive. Therefore, different learners would tend to have very
different internal representations for the same external conscious rule. Language
learning, as all learning, is not just decoding but recoding in terms of already
existing internal knowledge so that new information may be assimilated for
later retrieval (Bower 1975; Bruner 1973).

3. While it may be claimed that pedagogical rules do aid learning (Seliger
1975), the level of L2 proficiency at the time of rule presentation to linguistically
heterogeneous classes will also determine how much of input (the pedagogical
rule) becomes intake (the internal representation).

4. Attitude and motivational set affect rule learning. Some learners, be-
cause of educational, cultural or perhaps cognitive style variables, like conscious
rules and like to talk about them. Indeed some language learners identify gram-
mar learning with language learning. But, as we have seen in the study re-
ported here, there does not seem to be any discernible correlation between
knowing specific rules and performance.

5. Conscious pedagogical rules are presented to learners in many different
ways. Rules may be presented in L1 to a linguistically homogeneous class. How
does the presentation of an L2 rule in L1 affect the way such a rule is per-
ceived and stored? Rules may be presented without language at all but through,
for instance, the use of little wooden colored rods, as in the Silent Way. It is
difficult to conceive of a learner having images of rods dancing through his
head when he attempts to monitor his language output and it is highly unlikely
that such rules are stored ironically but rather are recoded in terms of the
learner’s already existing systems. External stimuli, be they rods or conscious
verbalized rules, cannot get inside a learner’s mind without being recoded.

6. There are very few useful pedagogical rules which one might claim
learners utilize to control output. In fact, compared to the vast body of gram-
matical knowledge that learners quickly acquire, the amount of pedagogically
adequate rules which we can provide are too insignificant to justify storage
in an independent grammar as suggested by models such as the monitor. Yet
it is obvious that, even without these rules, beginning level learners monitor
their output.

There have been a number of studies, notably Larsen-Freeman (1975),
which have shown that general performance is different under different condi-
tions of time and modes of expression, but none have examined the relationship
between the conscious knowledge of specific rules, the quality of these rules
and the appropriateness of their application. Much further research is necessary
before it can be claimed that such performance differences are the result of
conscious rule learning.

In addition, the monitor model itself is concerned only with output but
it does not suggest how input is to be handled. Given the conditions placed on
the monitoring activity, it must be concluded that this model is not equipped
for input processing. It would not be appropriate to consider speech input
within the monitor model because it cannot be controlled for focus on form,
nor does it allow time to apply conscious rules. Reading, because it can be
controlled for both focus on form and time, might be considered a good candidate for testing the use of conscious rules for input, but no such study (at least to the knowledge of this author) has been conducted.

All of this leads to the conclusion that such a model is modality dependent. The function of conscious rules is limited to the role of superficial performance—even if such rules can be said to control performance, which they cannot. One is forced to conclude that the monitor is a performance modality model and is relegated to superficial and limited levels of language behavior and performance. A mechanism which is limited to a specific performance channel (output) and specific modalities such as writing, but which cannot explain the other performance channels except under very carefully confined conditions, cannot be considered a representation of the learner’s grammar or his internal knowledge of the language. To view it as such we would have to postulate a separate performance device to handle these very few and specific cases which would meet all of the requirements for monitoring, another performance device to handle all other situations, and still a third underlying competence grammar where everything supposedly is unified under the grammar. Such an elaborate model implied by the monitor, even without the empirical arguments presented in this paper against it, is cumbersome and of little explanatory value.

5. The Use of Pedagogical Rules

Monitoring, in the general non-theoretical sense, is an observable activity. We all do it. Adults and children (see, e.g., Clark 1977), monolingual and bilingual and those with or without formal instruction monitor their output under specifiable conditions. It is obvious, however, that most learning depends on the inductive abilities of the learner. When pedagogical rules or conscious rules are used in language teaching, be they those that satisfy the requirements of the latest revised standard version of the latest linguistic theory, old invalid rules left over from the grammar-translation era, or rules which the teacher has made up for the learner, they most likely serve as a mechanism to facilitate the learner’s focusing on those criterial attributes of the real language concept that must be induced. That is, conscious or pedagogical rules make the inductive hypothesis testing process more efficient (see Seliger 1975).

It is important therefore to distinguish between the use of pedagogical or conscious rules as acquisition facilitators and their use as output control devices as suggested by the monitor model. Pedagogical rules themselves are not stored or internalized into the grammar of the learner. What does become stored in the internal grammar is the result of the inductive process interacting with variables previously described. A conscious rule presented to a language class can be memorized and become part of the metalinguistics as distinguished from the linguistic knowledge of the learner. Such knowledge in the form of pedagogical rules and grammatical terminology allows the learner to talk about what he knows or thinks he knows ("consciousness raising" to use d’Anglejan’s (1979) term).
In addition, the conscious or pedagogical rule can function as a mnemonic device to retrieve features of an internal grammar rule which are rarely used. We all do this when we switch registers or speaking styles.

6. Summary

It has been shown that pedagogical or conscious verbalizations of underlying language knowledge cannot fully represent that knowledge and therefore cannot be said to be responsible for output. In the experiment reported here the ability to state a conscious rule and the rule’s adequacy were not directly related to the learner’s ability to perform a task related to the knowledge which the rule supposedly represents. In addition to the empirical evidence presented in the experiment, arguments were presented which demonstrate that claims made for the monitor model are improbable in light of what is known about the nature of language learning and language knowledge. Finally, it was suggested that conscious or pedagogical rules serve an important function as acquisition facilitators but that this role must be distinguished from the possibility that such rules serve as actual output control mechanisms in the learner’s internal grammar.
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English for Cross-Cultural Communication: The Question of Intelligibility*

Larry E. Smith and Khalilullah Rafiqzad

When people talk about the use of English as a language for cross-cultural communication, the one question which is asked most frequently is “How can we insure mutual intelligibility among speakers from different cultures?” This paper is a report of an empirical study on this question involving 1,386 people from eleven countries. There is no claim that the question has been fully answered, but hopefully the report does provide insights into the question and information towards the answer.

In discussions of the use of English for cross-cultural communication, it is often maintained that the educated native speaker is more likely to be intelligible to others than the educated non-native speaker. These people therefore claim that a native-speaker variety of English should be the model for production, as well as the standard with which to compare all other varieties. People of this opinion are also often concerned that the use of other models will lead to such a great diversity of non-native varieties of educated English that soon persons speaking English may not be intelligible to their listeners.

In order to see whether or not these propositions are well founded, we designed a study to compare the degree of intelligibility between native and non-native varieties of educated English. We recruited collaborators in five Asian nations, who constructed and tested survey instruments according to a common design. We then recruited a new (and overlapping) set of collaborators in 11 countries who administered the instruments to 1,386 people.

* Some of this material was presented orally to the Conference on English as an International/Auxiliary Language, held at the East-West Center, Honolulu, Hawaii, April 1978.

Mr. Smith, Research Associate at the East-West Center, Hawaii, has published in the RELC Journal and is currently developing a program at the Center to study the use of English as a language of wider communication.

Mr. Rafiqzad is a Research Intern at the East-West Center.

1 Educated here refers to formal education, usually up to and including the tertiary level. Since educated English, wherever it is found, almost always has the same grammar, this paper is primarily concerned with the pronunciation, intonation, stress, pitch, and rhythm which differ from place to place.

2 Our operational definition for intelligibility is capacity for understanding a word or words when spoken/read in the context of a sentence being spoken/read at natural speed. We felt the degree of this capacity for understanding, i.e. the intelligibility, could be checked by constructing a cloze-procedure test of the passage spoken/read and asking listeners to attempt to fill in the blanks of this test. The more words the listeners were able to accurately write in, the greater the speaker’s intelligibility. This cloze test was not a check on comprehension since we feel comprehension involves a great deal more than intelligibility; however we realize that the greater the comprehension of the context material, the more likely intelligibility will occur. To check subjective reactions concerning comprehension, we devised a Listening Comprehension Questionnaire to see how the results from this questionnaire would compare with the intelligibility results of the cloze procedure test.
1. Construction and Administration of Test Instruments

To obtain a sample of different varieties of educated English, we asked collaborators in five Asian countries to choose an educated person (preferably a teacher) between the ages of 20 and 40 who was willing to give a short speech which could be taped. To insure that the people taped were speakers of their own educated variety of English and that they had not been overly influenced by native speakers, we insisted that none: 1) had spent more than four consecutive months in any English speaking country; 2) had been formally educated in schools directed by native speakers of English; or 3) had ever lived with English speaking families or groups. Each speaker was to be taped while giving a ten minute speech to a group of educated fellow countrymen. To insure that the tape was a valid sample of educated English, each collaborator prepared a cloze procedure test of the speech. This was done by transcribing the passage and deleting every sixth word beginning at the end of the first page of the transcription and continuing throughout the passage until the last sentence. The test, along with a Listening Comprehension Questionnaire, was administered to 30-40 educated speakers selected by the collaborator. The respondents had to fill in at least 80% of the blanks of the cloze procedure test correctly, with no regard to spelling, in order for the sample to be acceptable. When the collaborator was satisfied that his tape contained a valid sample of educated English, it was sent to us. From the material we received, we learned that each speaker had read a selection for a classroom audience and that the range of difficulty of the material read was wide because the audiences to whom it was read varied greatly. 3

We had three additional recordings done in Honolulu at the East-West Center where people from India, Nepal, and Sri Lanka could be found who fulfilled our requirements and were willing to be taped. We asked them to choose material and read it as if it were being read to an educated audience in their country. To get a taped sample from an educated native speaker, we wrote to a speaker of so called “general American English” who was a graduate student and asked him to choose material appropriate for an educated, but not technically oriented, audience in the United States and read it as if it were being read to that audience. To check the validity of these four tapes representing India, Nepal, Sri Lanka, and the United States, we tested them on 19 Asian and nine American educators at the 1977 Linguistic Institute of the Linguistic Society of America, where we administered a cloze procedure test and a Listening Comprehension Questionnaire for each one and found them to be acceptable as representative samples of educated English. This gave us a total of nine tapes representing speakers from Hong Kong, India, Japan, Korea, Malaysia, Nepal, the Philippines, Sri Lanka, and the United States.

3 We had expected the range of difficulty to be great. When we designed the study we decided not to attempt to control for difficulty because we felt that it was most important for each speaker to be free to choose any topic he wanted for a talk, lecture, or speech and that he should be free to aim this to the level of his own particular audience, either real or imagined.
We prepared a packet of materials consisting of 1) the directions for using the material; 2) tapes of the nine listening selections; 3) the cloze procedure test, the Listening Comprehension Questionnaire and a Personal Data Sheet for each selection; and 4) a tabulation sheet for the Listening Comprehension Questionnaire. This packet of materials was sent to collaborators in 12 countries with a request that a group of at least 30 educated people be selected to listen to each tape and fill in the cloze procedure tests, the Listening Comprehension Questionnaires, and the Personal Data Sheets. These people could be teachers, university students, or university trained people, but we asked that the people be of different disciplines (e.g., not all English teachers or all engineers). The same group could be used for all the listening selections or a different group for each one, but we emphasized that all the listeners should be considered educated by a majority of their countrymen. Because of the length of the taped selections we requested that not more than two selections be completed at one sitting. We mentioned that, although the listening selections were listed from one to nine, it was not necessary to follow that order since each taped packet was self-contained. In grading the cloze procedure test, only the word listed in the listening selection key was to be accepted, but no attention was to be given to spelling.

2. Findings and Discussion

We expected the listeners to find the native speaker sample and the sample of the fellow countryman, if there was one, equally intelligible. We thought that these would be followed by the sample of a geographically close neighbor. For example, we expected that in Korea the native speaker of American English would be as intelligible as the Korean speaker and that the Japanese speaker would be somewhat less intelligible than either, though more than, say, an Indonesian. We had no firm expectation of how well the respondents’ own estimates of their comprehension would correlate with the cloze procedure test results. We expected the listeners to be able to identify the nationality of one or two of the speakers correctly but not many more than that. Since there was a great deal of variability in the difficulty level of the passages according to the SMOG Grading readability formula, we expected this to influence the degree of intelligibility and understanding of the speakers.

We received all of the requested material from eleven countries. Table 1 summarizes the finding from the cloze procedure test.

The countries of the nine speakers are listed on the left hand side of the table, and the eleven countries of the listeners are on the top. Thus, the average Indonesian listener was 66% accurate when filling in the cloze procedure test of the native speaker from the United States and 63% accurate for the Chinese

---

4 We realized that this would be a subjective judgment on the part of the collaborators but suspected that they would primarily choose people who had received at least a formal education up to the tertiary level. That is in fact what happened.

5 The study was carried out in the twelfth country, but due to mailing difficulties the completed forms did not arrive in time to be tabulated.
TABLE 1
Intelligibility as Measured by the Cloze Procedure Test
(The number listed is the average percentage of accuracy in filling in the cloze procedure test.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Listeners</th>
<th>Bangladesh</th>
<th>Republic of China</th>
<th>Hong Kong</th>
<th>India</th>
<th>Indonesia</th>
<th>Japan</th>
<th>Korea</th>
<th>Malaysia</th>
<th>Nepal</th>
<th>The Philippines</th>
<th>Thailand</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speakers</td>
<td>CPT</td>
<td>CPT</td>
<td>CPT</td>
<td>CPT</td>
<td>CPT</td>
<td>CPT</td>
<td>CPT</td>
<td>CPT</td>
<td>CPT</td>
<td>CPT</td>
<td>CPT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Philippines</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. S. A.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
speaker from Hong Kong. The overall averages for the listeners are listed on the bottom line of the table, and those for the speakers are listed in the last column on the right. For example, the Japanese listeners averaged 70% accuracy in filling in the cloze procedure tests for all nine speakers while the Japanese speaker was, on an average, found to be intelligible 75% of the time by the listeners from eleven countries. (That is, on an average, the listeners from eleven countries were able to fill in the cloze procedure test of the Japanese speaker with 75% accuracy.)

Clearly the results did not correspond well with our expectations. Most important, the native speaker was always found to be among the least intelligible speakers, scoring so low (average of 55%) in fact that we re-computed the results we had obtained at the LSA 1977 Linguistic Institute. These results are listed in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speakers</th>
<th>Listeners</th>
<th>Republic of China</th>
<th>Japan</th>
<th>Korea</th>
<th>Thailand</th>
<th>United States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>CPT</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As is obvious from the table, the taped native speaker sample was found to be highly intelligible as judged from the results of the cloze procedure test of the listeners from five countries. In checking the results of question number 1 of the Listening Comprehension Questionnaire we found most people also had said they understood the speaker easily. These results reassured us that the sample of the native speaker was a reasonable sample of educated American English. With this increased confidence in the test, it put a new perspective on the fact that in seven of the eleven countries the listeners had averaged 60% accuracy and above in filling in the cloze procedure test of the American speaker. We had simply expected a much higher average. We expected the listeners to find their fellow countryman more intelligible than the other non-native speakers, but this was true in only two cases (Japan and Korea) out of a possible seven.

What interested us greatly was the basic consistency of the degree of intelligibility among the listeners for all the speakers. The native speaking American and the Hong Kong Chinese were always among the bottom three in degree of intelligibility while the Japanese was always among the top five and ten out of eleven times the Indian and the Malaysian were also in the top five. In every country except one (Korea) the listeners were able to fill in the cloze procedure test of their fellow countryman’s text with 75% accuracy or above. If we rank order, from highest to lowest, the countries of the nine speakers...
based on the intelligibility averages in eleven countries, the ordering would be as follows: Sri Lanka 79%, India 78%, Japan 75%, Malaysia 73%, Nepal 72%, Korea 68%, Philippines 61%, United States 55%, Hong Kong 44%. The speaker from the Philippines appears to be in the middle of the intelligibility scale since his rating is 18 percentage points from the top and 17 percentage points from the bottom. There is an eleven percentage point span among the top six and an eleven percentage point span among the bottom two.

To investigate how well the respondents’ estimates of their comprehension correlated with the cloze procedure test results, we tabulated the responses to question number 2 of the Listening Comprehension Questionnaire and averaged the results by country. Table 3 compares the cloze procedure test average (CPT) with the understanding average (U) for each of the nine speakers in eleven countries.

As in Table 1, the nine speakers’ countries are listed on the left hand side of the table and the eleven countries listed on the top are those of the listeners. For example, the average Indonesian listener was 66% accurate when filling in the cloze procedure test of the native speaker from the United States and he felt he understood 70% of what he had heard. The overall averages for the speakers are listed in the last column on the right. For example, the Japanese listeners averaged 70% accuracy in filling in the cloze procedure tests for all nine speakers and they felt they understood on an average of 60% of what they heard. The Japanese speaker was, on an average, found to be intelligible (CPT) 75% of the time by all the listeners in eleven countries. In comparing the speaker averages (on the right) we found that in all cases except one (Hong Kong) the averages of “CPT” and “U” were within nine percentage points or less. In four cases they were separated by three percentage points or less.

If we rank order, from highest to lowest, the countries of the nine speakers based on how well they were thought to be understood in eleven countries, the ordering would be as follows: India, Sri Lanka, and Malaysia 76%, Japan 75%, Philippines 6%, Nepal 67%, United States 64%, Korea 61%, Hong Kong 57%. It was of interest to us to discover that the top four (India, Sri Lanka, Malaysia and Japan) of this ranking are the same as the top four of the intelligibility ranking on this page, although not in the exact order, and that two countries (the U.S. and Hong Kong) were in the bottom three of both lists. Table 4 lists the rank correlation coefficient, which in eight out of the eleven countries was above +.75.

As expected, the variability in the difficulty level of the passages influenced the degree of intelligibility and understanding of the speakers. If we allow the countries to represent the passages, and rank order them from least to most

---

*In computing the average, “less than 50%” was counted as 40%. We felt this was adequate since a check in this column would lower the average a great deal. We believe that when understanding is 50% or below, communication becomes extremely difficult if not impossible; therefore we felt it was unnecessary to have categories marked 40%, 30%, 20%, 10% and 0% since the communication possibilities for any of these categories would be virtually the same.*
### TABLE 3
A Comparison of the Cloze Procedure Test Averages With the “Understanding” Averages from Question Number 2 of the Listening Comprehension Questionnaire
(The number listed is the percentage average.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speakers</th>
<th>Bangladeshi</th>
<th>Republic of China</th>
<th>Hong Kong</th>
<th>India</th>
<th>Indonesia</th>
<th>Japan</th>
<th>Korea</th>
<th>Malaysia</th>
<th>Nepal</th>
<th>The Philippines</th>
<th>Thailand</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CPT</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>CPT</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>CPT</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>CPT</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>CPT</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>CPT</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Philippines</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. S. A.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 4
The Correlation of Rank Orders of CPT and U
The Spearman’s Correlation Coefficient

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bangladesh</th>
<th>Republic of China</th>
<th>Hong Kong</th>
<th>India</th>
<th>Indonesia</th>
<th>Japan</th>
<th>Korea</th>
<th>Malaysia</th>
<th>Nepal</th>
<th>The Philippines</th>
<th>Thailand</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+.896</td>
<td>+.488</td>
<td>+.358</td>
<td>+.829</td>
<td>+.950</td>
<td>+.788</td>
<td>+.754</td>
<td>+.767</td>
<td>+.917</td>
<td>+.838</td>
<td>+.846</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
difficult according to the SMOG Grading readability formula, the ordering would be as follows: India, Japan, Malaysia, Sri Lanka, Philippines, Nepal, United States, Korea, Hong Kong.

It was not surprising that the top four (India, Japan, Malaysia and Sri Lanka) of this ranking are the same as the top four of both the intelligibility ranking and the understanding ranking on page 376, and that once again the United States and Hong Kong are in the bottom three. Listed below are the three rank orderings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difficulty (least to most)</th>
<th>Intelligibility (Most to least)</th>
<th>Understanding (Most to least)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>Nepal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We did a rank order correlation comparing the difficulty level to the intelligibility ranking and the understanding ranking. The Spearman’s correlation coefficients between the difficulty and the intelligibility was + .817 and between the difficulty and the understanding was + .863.

We mentioned earlier that we expected the listeners to be able to determine the nationality of one or two of the speakers. Table 5 shows the tabulated results of question number 5 on the Listening Comprehension Questionnaire.

In seven of the eleven countries, the listeners heard a fellow countryman along with eight other speakers. The Korean, Malaysian, and Japanese were able to identify their fellow countryman with an accuracy average of 87%. That was the highest percentage followed by the Nepalese, who were able to identify their fellow countryman on an average of 70%. We accepted “Chinese” as the nationality of the Hong Kong speaker but still the average was low. In Hong Kong, the listeners were accurate in identifying the Hong Kong speaker 57% of the time. In India, the listeners correctly identified their fellow countryman 47% of the time and the listeners in the Philippines were able to identify their countryman 43% of the time. Although we expected almost all of the listeners to recognize the native speaker as an American, in eight of the eleven countries he was identified with an accuracy average of 30% or less. He was most frequently identified by the Japanese (67%), the Indians (63%), and the Chinese in Hong Kong (40%).

3. Conclusions

To compare the degree of intelligibility between educated native and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Listeners</th>
<th>Bangladesh</th>
<th>Republic of China</th>
<th>Hong Kong</th>
<th>India</th>
<th>Indonesia</th>
<th>Japan</th>
<th>Korea</th>
<th>Malaysia</th>
<th>Nepal</th>
<th>Philippines</th>
<th>Thailand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correct</td>
<td>Incorrect</td>
<td>Correct</td>
<td>Incorrect</td>
<td>Correct</td>
<td>Incorrect</td>
<td>Correct</td>
<td>Incorrect</td>
<td>Correct</td>
<td>Incorrect</td>
<td>Correct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Philippines</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.A.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 5
Results of Listening Comprehension Question Number 5
(Numbers listed are percentages.)
educated non-native varieties of English, a study was done with 1,386 people in eleven countries in Asia. We found that there was a high level of consistency among the listeners as to the degree of intelligibility of the nine speakers tested. A speaker found to be highly intelligible in one country was likely to be found so in another. In fact, in each country when the speakers were rank ordered according to their degree of intelligibility, that ranking was very similar. We also found there was generally a high correlation between how much listeners felt they understood of the passages heard, and how well they did on a cloze procedure test of that passage. No attempt was made to control the difficulty factor of the passages heard and, as expected, the difficulty rank ordering correlated highly with the rank ordering of both intelligibility and understanding.

We discovered that listeners from four out of a possible seven countries could identify their own countryman 70% or better but only twice in these cases did they find their countryman to be the most intelligible. Since the listeners were seldom able to accurately identify the nationalities of the speakers other than their fellow countryman, it seems unlikely that national bias played any part.

Since native speaker phonology doesn’t appear to be more intelligible than non-native phonology, there seems to be no reason to insist that the performance target in the English classroom be a native speaker. Diversity in varieties of educated English certainly exists but international interactions in business, diplomacy, education, travel, and politics basically limit this diversity to phonology and vocabulary, not grammar. As long as this takes place, a person speaking any variety of educated English, although phonologically non-native, can expect to be intelligible to his listeners.7

7Copies of the various tests and questionnaires used in this study are available from the authors on request.
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Procedure: The Key to Developing an ESP Curriculum

David M. Litwack

There is a need for specially designed ESP curricula to support the transfer of technology and for an efficient procedure for designing such curricula. The focus in this article is on industrial training that includes language training as an essential component. Technical trainers (and language-training organizations devoted to supporting them) believe that a specific purposes curriculum is necessary to the training process for two reasons: (1) Trainees will eventually use a narrowly focused stratum of English and certain, specifiable language skills on the job; (2) Trainees are often recruited from among the less educated population, are hired with limited proficiency, and can be given only limited time in which to master the language they need.

The six steps delineated in this article describe the procedure for developing skill-based ESP curricula for intensive, technology-oriented training programs. The steps include 1) analyzing client needs, 2) sourcing classroom material, 3) writing/editing the material, 4) exercising the material, 5) editing the product, and 6) piloting/revising the product. The details for each step include descriptions of lesson formats and editing techniques. This procedural guideline is based on nearly four years of language training and curriculum development experience in the U.S. and abroad.

The users of English language training organizations devoted to supporting industrial training programs abroad have become preoccupied with obtaining English for Specific Purposes curricula. Industrial training managers who are sensitive to, but not well-informed about, the peculiarities of EFL are certain that an ESP curriculum or a single textbook exists to fit their needs. We have known them to express disbelief that an ESP curriculum developed to support the requirements of a polymar chemistry program, for example, and addressing the needs of either beginning, intermediate or advanced English trainees is not already on the shelf. In their chagrin they admonish language training professionals to beware of reinventing the wheel.

It is possible to convince such management that necessary curricula and textbooks most often do not exist, particularly at the lower English proficiency levels, but that such curricula and texts can be written and written professionally with careful consideration given to the linguistic peculiarities of the technological literature in question. Rather than fruitlessly searching for commercially available (or as the watchword in industry would have it, cost effective) ESP material—material which never quite seems to meet the specific

Mr. Litwack, a manager of language training at General Telephone and Electronics, has had ESP experience in Chad, France, Algeria and Iran, as well as the U.S.
needs—we have attempted to evolve an efficient procedure for developing EFL/ESP material and designing ESP curricula. This procedure occurs in six steps: 1) Analyze trainee and job needs; 2) Source classroom material; 3) Write/edit the material; 4) Write exercises to teach the material; 5) Edit the material; 6) Pilot and revise the material. While these steps may seem commonplace enough—given that target dates, design/development objectives for each step, and manpower needs are accurately established and time is available for each step (unfortunately often not the case)—the procedure can still prove cumbersome.

It is therefore important to establish a time-lined set of goals (an analysis bar chart which sets out in graphic form the tasks and time limits per task is useful in this procedure and meaningful to an industrial organization) based on the six steps. Training organization management must be convinced of the value of a specially designed program as well as of the validity of the six steps, their time requirements and the cost/time factors involved. Then the management (in effect a paying customer) must be kept abreast of developments with reference to each step.

Using our own recent experience as a guideline, a more precise accounting of the steps can be given as follows:

1. Analyze Trainee and Job Needs

The English language training design staff must determine what English communication needs trainees will have, that is, what English will be used for on-the-job or in further (job-oriented) training. The staff must determine what the environmental, skill and knowledge requirements are.

For knowledge requirements a task analysis, a kind of itemized list of duties for each job category usually performed by industrial trainers, should provide the necessary information. (See Appendix A for an abbreviated form of task analysis). For skill requirements, the task analyses can provide language training professionals with essential clues regarding the priorities of language skill needs: oral versus written, or receptive versus productive skill needs. Regarding environmental factors, the past learning situations of trainees should be analyzed with the intention of designing some material to fit trainee learning styles without completely compromising the cultural transition implicit in technology transfer.

The language training professionals must then write performance objectives. We have approached this task by analyzing the actual English content to be used by employee-trainees, categorizing the linguistic elements by skill, listing them in acceptable order of difficulty and then combining them into terminal performance objectives. Thus we have established a set of terminal objectives (in ten steps for ease of computation) for each of these skill areas: 1) Reading Comprehension, 2) Listening Comprehension, 3) Oral Production, 4) Writing. Comprehensive or terminal objectives look like the following examples.
Reading Comprehension Objective:
Terminal Objective No. 4
Trainee will be able to understand unfamiliar controlled content in semi-formal and formal expository style (physical description, definition and description of functions), instructions and outlines, with controlled unfamiliar vocabulary in context (3 items) and the use of a dictionary (4 items) and limited to 1 unfamiliar structure at 100 words per minute reading for full understanding; scan lists or long texts for factual information or main ideas at 150 words per minute.

In addition, each objective is supported by a set of discrete enabling objectives to call the instructor's attention to those details of language (with regard to words, grammatical structures and rhetoric) implied but not mentioned in the terminal objectives. Because language is cumulative and mastery of a language element is not always an either/or consequence, the enablings will often continue to back 3 or 4 terminal objectives. Thus an element of language introduced to support one objective might be exercised through a second objective and only mastered at the time of the third objective. Enabling objectives can be established within each of the skill areas and look like this:

Reading Comprehension Enabling Objectives
For Terminal Objective No. 4

Word Level
II. Given sentences with the appropriate elements, the trainee will be able to:

D. Understand vocabulary
   1) Word structure
      a) Roots
      b) Prefixes
      c) Part of speech marker
   2) Context
      a) Restatement-synonym: Synonym appears in the same sentence as the word
      b) Restatement-antonym: The clue to the meaning is provided through the use of contrast
      c) Explanation: The meaning of the word is explained
      d) Example: A specific example is given which acts as a clue to the meaning
      e) Definition: The meaning of the word is defined
      f) Situation: The correct choice from among multiple meanings can be discovered through the context in which the word is used
      g) Grammatical clues
      h) Punctuation clues
         1) Punctuation
         2) Capitalization

Listening Comprehension Objective:
Terminal Objective No. 4
Trainee will be able to comprehend (increasingly complex) instructions; focus attention on and comprehend selected aspects of natural speech as it occurs in the media of instruction; comprehend, given an outline, a 4-minute edited narrative delivered live and dealing with definition, physical description or description of functions with controlled unfamiliar vocabulary in context (2 items) and limited to 1 unfamiliar structure.
III. Given a dictionary, the trainee will be able to:
   A. Understand letter order within the word
   B. Identify main entry words
      1) Arrangement of entries
      2) Variant spellings and forms
      3) Cross references
      4) Homographs (main entries spelled alike but having different meanings)
      5) Prefixes, suffixes and combining forms
         a) Prefix indicated by hyphen followed the entry form
         b) Suffixes and terminal combinations—indicated by a hyphen before the entry
         c) Syllabification

Rhetorical Level

VI. Given paragraphs using referents, trainee will be to:
   A. Identify pronoun referents
      1) Demonstratives
   B. Identify and understand words and phrases of location
      1) Place (above, below, the following, the former, the latter)
      2) Time (what preceded)
   C. Understand “such,” “so”, etc.

IX. Given graphic and tabular presentations, the trainee will be able to:
   A. Use the titles and legends
   B. Understand the purpose of the graph
   C. Understand specific information from one graph, drawing conclusions.

Listening Comprehension Enabling Objectives
For Terminal Objective No. 4

Subword/Word Level

III. Given a modelled string of words in context, the trainee will be able to properly identify morphemes:
   A. Plural
   B. Past tense of regular verbs

IV. Given a modelled word or string of words, the trainee will be able to identify the reduced vowels.

VI. Given a sentence-level utterance, the trainee will be able to identify the word(s) which emphasize(s) the stress of the sentences.

VIII. Given unfamiliar words, the trainee will be able to use context clues to achieve word recognition:
   A. Definition
      1. Examples
   B. Physical description
      1. Comparison and contrast
      2. Synonyms and antonyms
   D. Summary

Rhetorical Level

XI. Given an edited narrative, the trainee will be able to focus attention on the following for the purpose of note-taking:
   A. Focus on the important aspects
      1) Verbs
      2) Nouns in the subject/complement positions
B. Fact selection
1) Figures
2) Formulas
3) Dates, names, other details
   a) Quantitative terms
   b) Attributes
4) Actions
   a) function
   b) activity
C. Plan identification
1) Identification of the main idea
2) Identification of the topics of the following parts:
   a) Introduction
   b) Body
   c) Conclusion

By establishing a comprehensive set of terminal and enabling objectives the language training staff can deal with the varying proficiencies which trainees may demonstrate upon entry into a program, and eventually have available a corpus of training objectives to support a wide variety of curriculum development efforts. Having established a set of terminal and enabling objectives, we are then able to peg trainee needs in terms both of priority skill areas and requisite exit proficiency level (for each skill on the 1 to 10 scale of terminal objectives). In all cases, the industrial organization for which the curriculum is being developed should be asked to agree to the established objectives and exit criteria.

2. Source Classroom Material

Once objectives are agreed upon, the design staff can locate authentic material to provide lesson texts and evaluation instruments against which mastery of the objectives can be measured. Part of the task is to edit the material to control lexis, structure and rhetoric. In language training, where the content is cumulative and interdependent, every piece of material is in essence an evaluation instrument; thus objectives can be time-phased so that at given points along the stream of lessons, a certain lesson or group of lessons measures a trainee’s proficiency corresponding to a point on the scale in a given skill area. In our program the comprehensive or terminal objective is mirrored in the lesson text; the enabling objectives are mirrored in the exercises accompanying the lesson text.

The material to attack linguistic skills can best support the objectives by approximating authenticity and, if the industrial organization using such training is English language based, its manuals can often serve as a basis for that material. In virtually every area of technology the literature is plentiful, if not always accessible conceptually to the language training professional. It is therefore useful (and feasible) to have available an expert in the given field or, better, a staff member well-versed or specially trained in that technology.

3. Write/Edit the Material

Writing/editing the material dovetails off the sourcing process. The two
tasks are necessarily interrelated since identifying, controlling and sequencing the material depends on a variety of factors:

A. Vocabulary. This factor requires attention to the number of unfamiliar lexical items in a given passage best controlled by both editing the passage and keeping a running glossary to help maintain a smooth continuum of vocabulary acquisition.

B. Grammatical Structures. In our organization we have employed a traditional approach to, and traditional texts for, teaching grammatical structures in a stream concurrent with the skill area focus. (We are less than satisfied with this approach and intend to implement a procedure for developing a grammatical structure text consistent with our other skill area texts.) At present, lessons for the skill area streams highlight those structures most pertinent to the lesson; the exercises dealing with those structures are intended for review and assume that the structures have been previously addressed in the more traditional grammar stream.

C. Rhetoric. This factor requires identifying rhetorical functions and techniques that support them within the passages of “authentic” material. Our staff has identified very short passages that employed one function and one technique for its earliest lessons. In addition, passages have been sequenced with regard to the assumed difficulty of rhetorical functions as follows: 1) Definition, 2) Physical Description, 3) Function Description, 4) Classification, 5) Process Description.

Once a function has been introduced and repeated via a group of lessons, the function is allowed to appear at random in later lessons in order to help reinforce trainee ability to identify rhetorical elements as an aid to deriving meaning from a text. The material is then edited for length and to effect a final sequencing which attempts to insure content continuity as well as an appropriate continuum of language acquisition.

4. Write Exercises to Teach the Material

The passages, once sequenced, then form the basis for the development of exercises in terms of the factors discussed in 3. In Reading and Listening Comprehension each passage consists of a pre-stage, a stage attacking the passage directly, and a post-stage.

In Reading Comprehension, for example, the pre-and post-stages mirror each other. The pre-reading stage teaches the vocabulary, pertinent grammar and rhetoric of the lesson; the post-reading stage evaluates student acquisition in those three areas. The middle stage, itself in three stages, attacks the skill directly and consists of scan questions, a timed reading, and a brief follow-up evaluation of comprehension. (The front page of the instructor’s guide copy of a typical reading lesson is shown in Appendix B.) As trainees grow more sophisticated linguistically, passages may lengthen and demonstrate a complexity that does not always yield the above-described format. Variations on that format highlight those aspects most important for deriving the essential information from the passage.
The above-described procedure has most recently permitted the development of 220 lessons in three course streams, supporting two skill areas with 20 man-months (4 designers for 5 months) of effort. Specifically, the procedure led to the development of the following:

—Subtechnical reading lessons: 82 complete, 40 reserve lessons, approximately one and one-half hours of instruction each.
—Sub-technical listening lessons: 82 complete lessons, approximately one-half hour of instruction each.
—Electricity reading lessons (Electron Flow, Ohm’s Law, Magnetism, Power): 56 complete lessons, approximately two and one-half hours of instruction each.
—Telephony-specific listening lessons (The Telephone Set): 9 complete lessons, approximately one hour of instruction each.
—Telephony-specific reading lessons (The Telephone Network, Digital Computers): 21 lessons, approximately two and one-half hours of instruction each.
—Instructor Guides for all the above.

Such lessons as these can interact with those taken from commercially available materials to form the corpus of an intensive language program.

5. Edit the Material

The draft product should be first passed to at least two editors (one editing horizontally, that is within the lesson for continuity, and one vertically, that is among lessons for consistency), then to a cosmetic editor (layout and proof) and finally back to the original sourcer (perhaps the task manager) who gives final approval. By adopting this approach and interchanging tasks a tight staff of five (any larger yields diminishing returns) can be producing several modules or course streams at once.

6. Pilot and Revise the Material

Pride of authorship is an important ingredient in curriculum implementation. A training staff consisting of a reasonable mix of designers and instructors brought in from outside the development effort will provide a catalyst in two mutually supporting directions: 1) Designers will assist in delivering the developed material by up-dating the Instructor Guide as unanticipated aspects of the material come to light in the classroom. 2) Instructors not bound to the material by virtue of authorship will bring an objectivity to that material and, given an effective reporting procedure, they can contribute revisions that enhance the “teachability” of the curriculum.

Appendix C contains a flowchart illustrating the six-step procedure outlined above and alternatives that may occur within that procedure.¹

APPENDIX A

JOB ANALYSIS

Maintenance Technician (EAX)

1. Report to the Contractor Switching Services Supervisor (EAX) during Contractor M&O and thereafter to the TCI Maintenance Foreman (EAX).

¹Interested professionals may acquire sample lessons by writing to: Language Training Program, c/o GTE, 140 First Avenue, Waltham, Massachusetts, 02154.
2. Responsibilities are:
   a) Respond to audible and/or visual alarms.
   b) Read and interpret diagnostic program and trouble report TTY messages, detailed network circuitry, frame layout, cabling, wiring and job documentation.
   c) Trace calls through the network; format TTY messages to request diagnostic programs and system reconfigurations; remove and replace both common control and network printed wiring cards and be able to manually restore the system to a call processing configuration when the system is unable to automatically do so.
   d) Recognize, test, isolate and correct faults in the network, the space divided common control equipment and the markers.
   e) Recognize, isolate and correct faults in the electronic common control which are identified by the repair manual and limited to the corrective maintenance procedures of identified card replacement.
   f) Read and interpret data base changes provided by the subscriber department or traffic facilities administration group.
   g) Recognize, isolate and correct errors in the system data base associated with subscriber line and inter-office trunk assignments.
   h) Perform routine preventive maintenance, inspections and/or test on No. 1 EAX Equipment including power.
   i) Perform routine system dumps to provide the system with off-line recovery capability.
   j) Prepare trouble tickets.

APPENDIX B

TERMINAL OBJECTIVE 4: LESSON 34
Rhetorical Function(s): Process Description, Definition
Rhetorical Technique(s): Cause and Effect
Primary Structure: Comparative Forms
Secondary Structure: when Clauses

VOCABULARY

thermometer  mercury  heat
tube        hollow  space
warm

The Thermometer

'The thermometer is a glass tube with mercury inside. 'Because the tube is hollow, the mercury can move. 'It goes up when the room gets warm and it goes down when the room gets cold.

'Why does mercury move up or down? 'Like all elements, mercury is made up of molecules. They are always moving. 'Heat makes them move faster and farther apart. ('The higher the temperature the faster they move. ) 'So the mercury takes up more space and it moves up the tube. 'When the molecules get cold, they move slowly. ('The lower the temperature, the more slowly they move. ) 'They come closer together and the mercury goes down the tube.
APPENDIX C
PROCEDURE FOR DEVELOPING AN ESP CURRICULUM

1. ANALYZE
   Technical Corpus
   Language Needs
   Vocab / Gramm / rhet

2. SOURCE
   Authentic Material

Is Material Available?

3. WRITE / EDIT

4. EXERCISE
   Pre-Stage Post Stage 1 / 2 / Stg. 3

5. EDIT THE PRODUCT

6. PILOT THE PRODUCT

Does the Material Meet the Needs?

SEQUENCE
This new edition of Modern American English is a complete course in English as a second/foreign language for adults. In addition to the texts, the series also includes workbooks, teacher's manuals, and recordings that provide practice and review of all the material covered in the texts.

Modern American English primarily emphasizes verbal communication, but it also concentrates heavily on reading and writing, and thus provides all of the elements necessary for the achievement of a well-balanced mastery of both spoken and written English.
Review Article


Let me begin with my conclusion: the Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English is the most complete and useful dictionary now on the market for ESL students; furthermore, it is the kind of dictionary that professional ESL teachers ought to have on their private shelves, both for easy reference and pleasant browsing.

Any review of this dictionary (hereafter referred to as the Longman) must include some reference to the only other ESL dictionary worthy of comparison: the Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary of Current English (hereafter referred to as the Oxford). Both publishers have a long and distinguished experience in producing a variety of English dictionaries for non-native speakers. The Oxford, with A. S. Hornby as its editor, was first published in 1948, with a second edition in 1963, and a third in 1974. The Oxford had no competitor as a college or desk dictionary for advanced ESL students until the publication of the Longman in 1978.

Curiously, no American publisher has yet produced a good dictionary for non-native speakers of English. New American Library published a paper-back in 1970, New Horizon Dictionary of the English Language (New York, A Signet Book) but it defines only 5,000 words—a special vocabulary “developed by the United States Information Agency . . . which wanted a dictionary in simple English for use in its overseas program among foreign readers of English as a second language.” Despite this explanation the dictionary claims only that it is “geared to the special needs of young readers,” and these special needs in no way correspond to the academic needs of foreign students in U.S. colleges. The vast majority of these students use one of the so-called standard college or desk dictionaries.1 As good as these dictionaries are, they unfortunately are not as useful as either the Oxford or Longman, which are comparatively unknown on U.S. college campuses, probably due to their being British. But there is no reason not to prefer the imports since both dictionaries now include American pronunciation, spelling, and usage. And in every test case except Persons, Places, and Cultural References (Yorkey 1969: 269), the Longman is equal to any of the American college dictionaries.

1 For a detailed, point-by-point comparison of these, see Yorkey (1969). Using a variety of criteria considered important for college-level ESL students, I recommended Funk & Wagnalls Standard College Dictionary and Random House Dictionary of the English Language as the best, the American College Dictionary and New World Dictionary of the American Language as good but less useful for academic needs, and Webster’s New Collegiate Dictionary as least satisfactory. Since that survey was completed, the American Heritage Dictionary has been published and it is reviewed in Yorkey (1974).
The editorial team for the Longman, edited by Paul Procter, includes Randolph Quirk, A. C. Jimson, Geoffrey Leech, Roger Kingdom, David Crystal, R. A. Close, and L. G. Alexander. The dictionary defines about 55,000 entries; each one includes pronunciation, hyphenation, a definition of each form or use, illustrative sentences for each meaning, and usage labels whenever appropriate, all this similar to the Oxford. A significant difference, however, is in the defining vocabulary that the Longman uses.

1. Controlled Vocabulary

Although the Oxford claims “practical definitions in simple English,” nowhere is it stated how the practicality or simplicity has been determined. In its general introduction, the Longman explains the controlled vocabulary of approximately 2,000 words which were selected by a thorough study of a number of frequency and pedagogic lists of English, particular reference having been made to A General Service List of English Words by Michael West. Furthermore, a rigorous set of principles was established to ensure that only the most “central” meanings of these 2,000 words, and only easily understood derivatives, were used.

The complete alphabetical list of the 2000 words is printed in an appendix.

One may rightly ask whether definitions written within a restricted vocabulary can be adequate for college use. In a test of ten words, randomly selected from textbooks in history, sociology, and natural science, only monistic (as in “monistic psychological explanations”) is not defined in the Longman. Perturbation (as in “Brooks Comet passed between the satellites of Jupiter without causing the slightest perturbation in the orbits”) is defined as “tech., an irregular movement of a body (PLANET) that goes around the sun, caused by the special pulling (GRAVITATIONAL) force of such bodies.” The capitalized words indicate they are outside the defining vocabulary but are, of course, defined in their own entry. Other test words included coterie, keynote, epoch, intangible, plankton, suzerainty, legitimate, and reify.

For comparison, here is the definition of existentialism in the Longman (at the left) and in the Oxford (at the right).

exis-ten-tial-ism /egz' ten tali zam/ n 1 the —dern belief and teaching of Kierkegaard, Sartre, Heidegger, etc., that man is alone in a meaningless world, that he is completely free to choose his actions, and that his actions determine his nature rather than the other way round 2 any of several systems of thought like this, either religious or nonreligious —ex-tant adj.

exis-tent-i-al-ism /egz' ten tali zam/ n doctrine (deriving from Kierkegaard /'kerkəɡd/ (1813—55), the Danish philosopher, and popularized by Sartre /sərt/ (born 1905), the French writer and philosopher) that man is a unique and isolated individual in an indifferent or hostile universe, responsible for his own actions and free to choose his destiny.

The following words in the Oxford definition are not in the Longman controlled vocabulary: doctrine, derive, unique, isolate, indifferent, hostile, and destiny. (Note also the unfortunate ESL-type typo: *to chose.*) The question is whether the Longman definition is easier for an ESL student to understand, another question, whether the philosophy of existentialism is seriously distorted by oversimplification, cannot be easily answered even by reference to Webster III:
existentialism: an introspective humanism or theory of man that holds that human existence is not exhaustively describable or understandable in either scientific or idealistic terms and relies upon a phenomenological approach that emphasizes analysis of critical borderline situations in man’s life and esp. of such intensely subjective phenomena as anxiety, suffering, and feelings of guilt in order to show the need for making decisive choices through a utilization of man’s freedom in an uncertain, contingent, and apparently purposeless world.

Although both the Longman and the Oxford define only about one-third the number of words of standard collegiate desk dictionaries, they seem quite adequate for the needs of ESL students in a university, where technical words and special terms are usually defined in the subject matter textbook.

2. Phrasal Verbs

The meanings of two-word verbs are extraordinarily complex and confusing to foreign students. Although there may be some lexicographical logic for listing them under the main entry of the verb (e.g., get), it is probably more clear and convenient to list them separately. In the Longman, each of the following is a separate entry, complete with part of speech, a coded reference to syntax, and an illustrative phrase or sentence: get about/across/ahead/along/around/at/able/away/away/away with/back/behind/down/down to/home/in/into/off/off with/on/on for/onto/out/off/over/round/round to/through/together/-up/up/up to. In Oxford these are all printed in bold face within the main entry, but often within a mass of solid type (get, for example, runs for three solid columns) so that it is difficult and discouraging for students to find the particular phrasal verb they want. For the total number of meanings of verbal phrase with get (Yorkey 1969: 264) the Longman has 29 phrases with a total of 80 different meanings, each with an illustrative phrase or sentence. The Oxford has 24, with a total of 55 different meanings.

3. Syntactic Codes

One of the features that distinguishes these ESL dictionaries from the American desk dictionaries is the use of some kind of code that gives more grammatical information than, for example, whether a verb is transitive or intransitive. In both the Longman and the Oxford, each noun entry indicates whether the word is C (countable) or U (uncountable). Each verb entry includes a coded reference to syntactic use: for example, the fact that explain patterns differently from tell, so that students can avoid *explain me the answer; or that tell patterns differently from say, so that students can avoid *she said to me the truth. The Longman introduction describes the codes within square brackets [ ]; this refers the user to full tables where sentences and phrases are given showing other English words which behave in the same way. The codes consist of a capital letter (which usually stands for an easily remembered term, such as L for linking verb) followed by a number, and one of the great advantages of the system is that the numbers always mean the same thing whatever letter they follow (thus 3 always means to + infinitive). The
result is a system which is easily remembered and which requires no knowledge of grammatical theory to be fully understood, but which nevertheless provides a thorough analysis that is fully acceptable to modern linguists and grammarians, (p. viii).

Again, for the sake of comparison—of form as well as substance—the Longman entry for explain is at the left, the Oxford at the right.

explain /ɪkˈsplæn/ v 1 [Tl, 5a, 6a, b: (to); I0] to give the meaning (of something); make (something) clear, by speaking or writing; I don't understand this, but Paul will explain. [The lawyer explained the new law (to us);] John explained how to use the telephone. [Explain what this word means 2 [Tl, 6a] to give or be the reason for; to account for: Can you explain your stupid behaviour?! That explains why he's not here.] 3 explain oneself to make one's meaning clear: I don't understand what you're talking about. Would you explain yourself a little? b to give reasons for one's behaviour: Late again, Smith? I hope you can explain yourself — we n explain away v adv [Tl] to account, or give an excuse, for (something wrong) in order to avoid blame: Try to explain away the false signature. [Explaination /ˌekspləˈneɪʃən/ n (C:U: of, for) 1 (an act of) explaining: He's giving an explanation of how the machine works.] 2 something that explains: The only explanation of/for his behaviour is that he's mad. [What did he say in explanation of his lateness?] ex-plan-a-to-ry /ˌɪkˈsplænətri/ adj of a statement, a piece of writing, etc. that explains; a few explanatory words — see also SELF-EXPLANATORY

If a foreign student is going to make effective, efficient use of the code [Tl, 5a, 6a, 6b: (to); I0] he must remember (and understand!) the following grammatical information that is presented in the introduction:

- **T** = verbs, many of which are TRANSITIVES, that are followed by a noun or nounlike expression in position III as a DIRECT OBJECT which does not represent (REFER TO) the subject, unless REFLEXIVE. (p. xxxi) (This is followed by seven lines of sample sentences.)
- **1** = means that a verb is followed by a nounlike expression in position III [LI]; [Tl] or 2 nounlike expressions in position III and IV [DI ]; [XI]. (This is followed by five lines of sample sentences; p. xxxii)
- **5** = means that a word is followed by that + a CLAUSE. . . (p. xxxiv)
- **a** = means that the word that can be left out between a word and a following CLAUSE. (p. xxxiv)

In the interest of saving space, there is no reason to continue with the detailed example of the explanation in the introduction. Although the numerous sentence examples help to clarify the code, it does not seem fair—especially for ESL students—to claim that the system is easily remembered and that it requires no knowledge of grammatical theory. Teachers are encouraged to study the ten pages of explanation and the single composite table on the end pages at the back of the dictionary. (Transformationalists will be happy to see that F3 is *John is eager to please.*)

It should be pointed out that the Longman coding system was developed
by an academic panel, headed by Randolph Quirk. The treatment of verbs is based on that used in *A Grammar of Contemporary English* (1972) by Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech, and Svartvik. The same coding system has been used in *A Communicative Grammar of English* (1975) by Leech and Svartvik.

In the Oxford, the coded references are based on Hornby’s *A Guide to Patterns and Usage in English* (1975). There are 25 basic sentence patterns, with 22 sub-patterns, making a total of 52 numbered and lettered codes that students either have to memorize or refer to in the table and examples at the beginning of the dictionary. For *explain* the Oxford code is [VP 6A, 9, 8, 10, 14]. For the kind of mistakes that many foreign students tend to make, the crucial code here is VP14: “subject + *vt* + noun/pronoun (DO) + preposition + noun/pronoun (phrase). . . In this pattern the verb is followed by a direct, object and a preposition and its object. This pattern is not convertible to [VP12], as are [VP13A] and [VP13B]. ‘Give somebody something’ [VP13A] may be converted to ‘Give something to somebody’ [VP12A]. ‘Explain something to somebody’ cannot be converted to ‘Explain somebody something’ . . .”

Judging from their general disregard of the usual kinds of information to be found in a dictionary, I am convinced that few ESL students would feel either motivated or pressured enough to take the time to read through so much special information or to memorize so many letters and numbers simply to determine if they have correctly used *explain* in a composition. Indeed, unless they have had specific classroom instruction in how to use this dictionary, most would not bother to read (perhaps not even notice) the crytic code at the beginning of the entry. However, even though few ESL students might have the patience or the perseverance to use it, the grammatical information is valuable for teachers of ESL. The syntactic codes in this dictionary, plus the usage notes (to be described below), constitute a handy reference grammar. The information can be used as a source of explanation or examples for the grammatical function of numerous word forms and word orders which teachers intuitively use and understand but which need the precision and distinctions which can clarify their explanation to students.

4. **Usage Notes**

Some historical background may put into perspective the Longman inclusion of usage notes for many entries. Lexicographers insist that their responsibility is to describe, rather than prescribe, language usage. This insistence does not accord with popular expectations and when Webster’s *Third New International Dictionary* was published in 1961, it was roundly attacked by the press. This lexicographical brouhaha was ably detailed, with extracts from numerous editorials and articles, in James Sledd and Wilma Ebbit, *Dictionaries and That Dictionary* (1962). After unsuccessfully trying to buy control of Merriam-Webster, so that Webster III could be removed from circulation and a new edition ultimately published, in 1969 the American Heritage Publishing Company brought out its own dictionary, the *American Heritage Dictionary*. The editors’ purpose was clearly stated in the introduction:
At a time when the language, already a historical melting pot, is under constant challenge—from the scientist, the bureaucrat, the broadcaster, the innovator of every stripe, even the voyager in space—[the editors] undertook to prepare a new dictionary. It would faithfully record our language, the duty of any lexicographer, but it would not, like so many others in these permissive times, rest there. On the contrary, it would add the essential dimension of guidance, that sensible guidance toward grace and precision which intelligent people seek in a dictionary. They will find it here, in a dictionary that is in many respects a notable departure from previous British and American lexicographical practice. (p. vi)

In order to determine “that sensible guidance,” the editors asked a panel of 100 outstanding speakers and writers a wide range of questions about how the language is used today, especially with regard to dubious or controversial locutions. As a consequence, this Dictionary can claim to be more precisely descriptive, in terms of current usage levels, than any heretofore published—especially in offering the reader the lexical opinions of a large group of sophisticated fellow citizens. (p. vii)

The editors of the Longman dictionary have also included this kind of guidance, though they have used their own professional judgment rather than appeal to “sophisticated fellow citizens.” The inclusion of usage notes, such as the following, strikes me in this case as sensible and sensitive to the insecurity that ESL students frequently feel, one not necessarily diminished by a statement that either form (pronounced ‘aiðə’ or ‘iðə’, using the Longman transcription ) is acceptable. Often the usage notes explain a distinction and (from the students’ viewpoint) a practical warning. For example:

**Usage:** different. (1) different(ly) from is correct in both BrE and AmE. Some BrE speakers also say different to: He is different to me, and some AmE speakers say different than: He is different than I am; but teachers and examiners do not really like either of these . . .

**Usage:** just. Already, yet and just (when it is used with time) were formerly not used with the past tense. Expressions like the following are now common in infml AmE: I already saw him. The bell just rang. Did you eat yet? These are coming into BrE but some teachers and examiners do not like them.

Often the usage notes concern a common problem for foreign students, such as the distinction between make and do.

**Usage:** make. (1) Compare do and make. They are each used in many expressions about which there is no rule, such as make war, do a favour; but very often one makes something that was not there before: to make a cake/noise/a fire; and one does an action: to do the shopping/one’s exercises. “What are you making?” “A shirt.” “What are you doing?” “Playing football.” . . .

The American Heritage Dictionary would probably consider the guidance in some usage notes as being too permissive. Compare their opinion regarding finalize to the Longman note for -ize.
Finalize is closely associated with the language of bureaucracy, in the minds of many careful speakers and writers, and is consequently avoided by them. The example finalize plans for a class reunion is termed unacceptable by 90 per cent of the Usage Panel.

**USAGE:** -ize, BrE also -ise. New verbs are being formed from other words all the time, using -ize in the meaning "to put into the stated condition": HOSPITALIZE, FINALIZE. Many of them are disliked by old-fashioned people.

Often the usage note includes a great deal of information for a single entry. See, for example, the elaborate diagram illustrating the uses of must, the distinctions (under say) between say, tell, speak, and talk (see the usage note for between!), or the differences (under cook) between stew, boil, steam, simmer, fry, braise, grill, broil, bake, toast, and roast.

As generally useful as these usage notes are, several seem too complete and compact for much value. After a few lines of the following, I refused (declined?) to continue:

**USAGE:** refuse. One can refuse or decline to do something, but one must decline (opposite agree) in words: The horse refused (not *decline or *agreed) to jump the wall. One can refuse or decline, not reject, an invitation (opposite accept); refuse (not decline or reject) permission; refuse, reject, or decline an offer (opposite accept); reject (not refuse or decline) a plan or a proposal. . . .

One problem of the usage notes, a problem all dictionaries share, is that too often they will not be seen. Students do not expect a dictionary to give them any guidance in syntax, such as make vs. do, explain, enjoy, let, or gotten, or in the subtle distinctions in meaning of such simple words as house and home; lady and woman; folk and state, nation, race, tribe, and people; dress and wear; or officer, clerk, employee, official, and civil servant. The presence of this kind of information about words that present special difficulties should be pointed out to students. And professional teachers will find useful answers to many pedagogical questions in the usage notes.

**5. Contemporary English**

The Longman claims to describe contemporary English, and the Oxford claims to describe current English. For a series of test words from a recent issue of Time (January 22, 1979), both dictionaries include definitions of the following words: the slumping dollar, the silver-tongued spiel, they translate savvy from the bazaars back home to the streets of Manhattan, this spin-off could go into a tailspin. Both define the following words but the Longman has a separate entry for each whereas the Oxford defines the term under the headword: within earshot, the play-off game, telltale flaws. The Oxford uses a capital letter for the spartan single room, and neither dictionary includes fast-buck operators.
Perhaps because it was published more recently, the Longman includes more entries of current campus usage than the Oxford. Furthermore, the illustrative sentences are distinctly colloquial. All of the following, in the Longman but not in the Oxford, are labeled slang:

**crash:** to spend the night in a particular place. Can *I crash on your floor tonight?*

**pad:** the room, house, etc. where one lives. My pad is on the other side of town.

**rip off:** (1) to rob (someone); charge (someone) too much. *They really ripped us off at the hotel.* (2) esp. AmE to steal: Someone ripped off my bicycle.

**right on** (used as an encouragement to a speaker): When he promised them free beer all round, the crowd shouted “Right on!”

**heavy:** esp. AmE troublesome and threatening: It’s a heavy scene, man, let’s leave.

**split:** to leave quickly: I’m getting tired of this place; let’s split.

6. British vs. American English

The Longman is very thorough in its treatment of American English. The Oxford seems to have made editorial additions of spellings (humour = humor, for example, or traveled = travelled) and familiar differences in meaning (kerb = pavement, flyover = overpass, knock up = awaken), but it has not made much effort to reflect American English usage as completely or accurately as the Longman. See, for example, the American meanings in the Longman entries for Band-Aid, fruit salad, salt shaker, Thanksgiving, or the Fourth of July—none of which are in the Oxford. The British and American difference in meaning of to table (made famous when Churchill and Roosevelt misunderstood each other’s request “to table a proposal”) is not included in the Oxford.

Both dictionaries include an illustration of an automobile with the parts labeled. The Oxford indicates the bonnet (US = hood) but does not give the US terms for windscreen or boot. Included are two words unfamiliar to me: trafficator (= turn signal) and mileometer (= odometer, defined in neither dictionary, nor is mileometer in Webster III). The Longman gives the AmE for bonnet (hood), boot (trunk), and petrol tank (gas tank) but no American words for windsreen or number plate. The illustration confuses AmE fender (BrE wing) with BrE bumper. Furthermore, the entry for bumper gives an AmE synonym, buffer. On the whole, however, the Longman handling of American English seems more satisfactory than the Oxford.

7. Registers and Labels

The Longman explains that “most of the words in this dictionary would be used, and understood, both in speaking and writing anywhere in the world. When the use of a word or phrase is limited in some way, this is shown by a short descriptive statement (LABEL).” These labels include nationalities (BrE,
AmE, for example, or CanE (Canadian English, or Ind&PakE (Indian and Pakistani English)), and such uses as obsolete, rare, literary, poetic, biblical, and technical. Distinctions are also made between formal, not formal, informal, slang, and nonstandard usage. Warnings, especially useful for foreign students, are also included for many expressions, such as derogatory, humorous, pompous, appreciative, or taboo. The Oxford has an excellent explanation of stylistic values and registers (pp. x-xi ) with informative examples, but its entries are not as frequently labeled; and the category of taboo words is not nearly so complete as that in the Longman.

8. Foreign Words, Cultural References, and Idioms

Foreign students need guidance in such matters as idiomatic usage (he’s a wet blanket, she’s a highbrow), literary references (he’s a real Robin Hood, she’s a Mrs. Malaprop) or foreign phrases (quid pro quo, savoir faire). Native speakers may not know the origin or the exact cultural reference of such terms but they have absorbed their meanings through time and experience. ESL students, lacking both, need immediate help when they come across references of this kind.

For ten test foreign words or phrases, both dictionaries define cul-de-sac, laissez-faire, ipso facto, mutatis mutandis, non sequitur, RSVP, and vis-a-vis. The Oxford does not include per se or Weltanschauung, and QED is defined in the appendix of abbreviations rather than in a main entry.

For ten test items of cultural references, both dictionaries define Achilles’ heel, (sword of) Damocles, El Dorado, Hobson’s Choice, (Hollywood) Oscar, Utopia, Uncle Sam, and John Bull. The Oxford does not include Uncle Tom and John Doe.

For ten test idioms, both dictionaries define cold shoulder, in the dog-house, a ham (actor), a pain (in the neck), and wall-flower. The Oxford does not define five o’clock shadow, old wives’ tale, (not worth) peanuts, shaggy dog story, and sunny-side-up.

9. Illustrations

The Longman includes about 1100 line drawings, grouped under categories such as amphibians, castle, domestic birds, household equipment, human body, scientific instruments, with cross-references to the pictures in the appropriate entry. The Oxford has also grouped illustrations in this way but has included photographs and individual line drawings. I feel the Longman has a slight edge on clarity while the Oxford has more variety.

10. Appendices

The Longman includes 20 pages of appendix material. Very useful are the defining vocabulary, a four-page list of irregular verb forms, and a spelling table “to find in the dictionary a word that you have heard but not seen.” A table of ordinal and cardinal numbers includes numerical expressions, such as nineish
and nine or thereabouts. An animal table includes interesting, but relatively useless, information (for example: seal = bull (male), cow (female), pup (young), colony (group noun) and bark (noise). More relevant is a Table of Family Relationships, including a family tree elaborate enough to indicate, plus definitions below it, such complicated relationships as great-aunt, second cousin, first cousin once removed, stepson, and half-sister. There is a table of weights and measures, of military ranks, and of nationalities and money (for example: Belgium (country), Belgian (adjective), Flemish, Dutch, French (languages), Belgian Franc (money).

The Oxford appendices (32 pages) also include irregular verbs, weights and measures, and military ranks. Abbreviations and affixes, both of which appear as main entries in the Longman, are listed; the affixes are particularly complete and include numerous examples. The information on numerical expressions is useful and more complete than the Longman. Occasionally useful to students may be the list of forenames which includes “pet names” and nicknames, Also listed are the works of Shakespeare and the books of the Bible.

11. Conclusion

All things considered, the Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English is the most complete and useful dictionary for ESL students now available. Though the Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English is excellent and equal to the Longman in many ways, I prefer the Longman because of its controlled defining vocabulary, its contextualized and many interesting illustrative sentences, its practical guidance in the usage notes, its emphasis on spoken as well as written English, and its wide coverage of American English usage.

Foreign students who are going to hear English as a language of instruction for several years—whatever their academic field of study may be—ought to have an English language reference as complete and convenient as this dictionary. I have never understood why so many students are content to use tiny, outdated, bilingual dictionaries, or no dictionary at all. An engineer would change an inadequate calculator, a doctor would get a sharper scapel. Why then are ESL students so unprofessional and so unable to recognize the importance of a good dictionary? Why are ESL teachers apparently so reluctant to insist that their students invest in a good English dictionary? It may be (is it heresy to suggest?) that many teachers themselves do not have the dictionary habit, that they have not taken the time to browse through a dictionary to discover many fascinating facts and judgments about their field. For both ESL student and teacher this Longman dictionary is a professional resource as enjoyable to read as it is informative.

Richard Yorkey
TESOL Centre, Concordia University
Montreal
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Those who can, do, and we all know the rest. But TESOL, as a field, must have some of the highest quality teacher training programs there are, and here is another fine book to prove it. Betty Wallace Robinett (BWR) really can and she has “done” a book that would grace any teacher training program.

I have always argued that different students learn differently, and I am recently coming to not only realize (I did that long ago) but also accept the fact that different teachers teach differently. It is inarguable, I suppose, that all the recent methodological madness speaks to some kind of Zeitgeist need of teachers. Different strokes for different folks, as the theoretical underpinning goes. But I do not accept, despite all this bandwagon bannerwaving (Close 1977), the neglect of language, formal language as the very substance of what we teach. Neither does BWR, and it is pure pleasure to read a book so sensible, so informed, so experienced (if you can say that) and so blessedly free of modish bannerwaving. And well written, which makes it especially suitable for non-native readers.

TESOL: SAT (I can think of another book with which that title might be confused) is divided into two parts. The first section, the substance part, “includes a general description of the essential features of the grammatical system, the sound system, and the vocabulary system” (p. xi). The second section, the technique part, “deals more generally with pedagogical matters” (p. xii). Each chapter concludes with very useful exercises. There is also an extensive bibliography, a list of commercially available tests, and an index, all of them very helpful.

Of the three chapters in the first section, the chapter on grammar is the weakest, which is understandable; who could cover English grammar in one chapter? Rather, BWR concentrates on those basic points of grammar a teacher needs to know in order to handle explanations and supplementary materials. Her approach is eclectic, with concepts from both structural and transformational grammar. I don’t particularly see the virtue of labeling He had been writing well (p. 24) as past tense, but that is my bias. The chapter is a good beginning on the vagaries of English, with many old friends (e.g. structural content words) clearly presented. There is a useful list of reference grammars for further study (to which I would add Crowell 1964).

“The Sound System” chapter is splendid. It is also the longest, and I am
glad of it. Our experience has been that, while teachers can hack it with little knowledge of grammar and a good reference text, they come to a complete breakdown when teaching pronunciation. The approach is, sensibly, that of Pike's phonemics. “The Vocabulary System” is also familiar to structural linguists, containing as it does a discussion of the concepts which are basic to an intelligent teaching of vocabulary, such as the distinction between lexical, grammatical, and experiential meaning and productive receptive vocabulary.

The second section begins with a short discussion of language and culture, unexpectedly placed but a good link between substance and technique. Chapter 5, also short, discusses “Trends and Issues in Language Teaching” which of course I like since her view that teachers need to be eclectic is one I also hold. There is a nice quote from Jesperson, who in 1904 discussed “counseling response” although he didn’t use such jargon. Plus ça change! There is also a much needed quotation from Wilkins on the notional syllabi: “it is taken here to be almost axiomatic that the acquisition of the grammatical system of language remains a most important element in language learning” (1976:66).

I especially like the dovetailing of Chapters 6 and 7; Chapter 6 discusses what the student needs to learn and 7, how to help the student do it. BWR actually uses the word teaching (“Teaching the Communication Skills”) which some, no doubt, will consider very old-fashioned, but which I cheer. Of course teachers counsel, of course teachers facilitate, of course students learn, but to pretend that teachers don’t also teach, or worse, that they shouldn’t, I find false as well as harmful, and there is no such nonsense here. BWR is extremely well read, and I appreciate just as much what she leaves out in Chapter 6, e.g. morpheme acquisition, as what she discusses. I am emphatically not saying the morpheme acquisition studies are not interesting; they are, and presumably BWR thinks so too. Rather, their discussion is not really appropriate here, and I admire BWR for seeing that, and for not feeling pressured to include all of our recent knowledge. Some knowledge is more relevant than other knowledge, and BWR chooses the relevant admirably.

Chapter 7 is a collection of techniques, often as exemplified in existing texts, and it should prove useful to any classroom teacher, of whatever pedagogical conviction. It covers the traditional skills of listening, speaking, reading, and writing, and closes with a discussion of classroom management and an analysis of an actual lesson, both of them helpful. It is the longest chapter of its section, permeated with the intelligent common sense and experience which is characteristic of BWR’s work. The last chapter is on testing, brief but covering all the basic concepts.

Where would one use such a text as TESOL: SAT? I think in any program which can only afford one course on TESOL for the structures of English and the techniques for teaching them. Our university has a course for non-majors on linguistics and foreign language teaching for which it will be perfect (our majors do three courses for the material covered by BWR). The linguistic orientation of Part I makes it easily adaptable to other languages (also true
of the techniques). It would also lend itself well to brief summer programs, teacher in-service programs, and the like. And, of course, teachers would profit from reading it on their own.

So, in case I haven’t made it clear, this is a very good book, and I like it.

REFERENCES

Christina Bratt Paulston
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This book’s simple title belies the tremendous complexity of the subject matter it contains. There is no straightforward, easy way to organize a book of readings dealing with a complex area of research nor is there a way to cover everything. It also seems to be true, ironically, that the younger the field the more difficult it is to capture its essence. Evelyn Hatch, in trying to identify the key research papers in a field as young as second language acquisition, set herself a difficult and challenging task; she has tried not only to compile but also to contextualize them. The strengths and weaknesses of her book cannot be viewed apart from this context.

The book is a collection of twenty-six empirical research studies, four co-authored or written by Hatch herself, and all separately, though briefly, introduced by her. Hatch tells us that purely theoretical papers were specifically excluded from the volume on the grounds that, though interesting, they leave us with claims about the process of second language acquisition which are mere speculation (p. 10). Thus, all papers in this collection contain empirical data to support their claims, and classic articles on the theory of error analysis, for example, have been excluded. Second, all the articles in this book discuss “second language acquisition in natural environments—that is, language acquisition outside the classroom” (p. 17). In Krashen’s terms (1976), the book deals with informal language “acquisition,” not formal language “learning,” which is tied up with classroom instruction. This rules out the literature on bilingual education, although bilingualism, especially child bilingualism, is a major theme. Third, Hatch states that, although there has been an intentional bias given to “work done in this country since 1970, an attempt has been made to include representative work from Europe and Canada and to use case studies involving as many different languages as possible” (pp. 17-18). Still, there must have been other criteria applied in the selection of papers, although Hatch does not enumerate them. For instance, since major articles on affective factors appear
only as abstracts, there seems to have been an effort to de-emphasize empirical research on attitudes and motivation. Also, one might assume that Hatch chose articles presenting not just empirical data but also emphasizing the specific linguistic structures acquired (rather than the general competence ultimately attained). This, in conjunction with the stated exclusion of classroom-centered research, might explain, for example, why Wallace Lambert’s work is not included in the selected papers or in the abstracts.

Of the twenty-six articles in the volume, those previously published range from 1954 (Leopold, Chapter 1) to 1976 (Schumann, Chapter 17). Over half the selections are not reprints; still others have appeared as working papers with limited distribution only. Much is then new although quite a few papers have already had wide exposure (e.g., Dulay and Burt; Bailey, Madden, and Krashen; Ervin-Tripp).

If the convenience of having a one-volume collection of many hard-to-obtain articles is not enough to make you buy the book, the information contained in Table 1 and 2 (pp. 3-9) of the Introduction should certainly be persuasive. In these contiguous charts, Evelyn Hatch has divided publications of empirically-based second language acquisition data into observational and experimental studies, then arranged them in ascending order according to the subjects’ ages. Also included are the languages studied, the investigators, the year, and the subjects’ names (if known) or the number of subjects. This listing is the most comprehensive survey of the data-based literature known to the reviewer, and it is an essential reference for anyone proposing to do research in this area.

Also valuable and unusual is the final section of the book: a compendium of abstracts. Many of the works summarized here are too long to include in the anthology, (e.g., dissertations and M.A. theses) so the solution adopted allows Hatch to acknowledge more researchers, and, as she points out, to reflect more accurately the accomplishments of the field (p. 11). In the end, however, the value of the abstract section may lie more in the legwork it saves the researcher than in the picture of the field it presents to the general reader.

A major point of interest in this volume is the attention given to comparing the learner and the non-learner—a subject first mentioned by Hatch in the Introduction (pp. 12-13) and treated at greater length in Shapira’s article “The Non-Learning of English: Case Study of an Adult” and Schumann’s paper “Second Language Acquisition: The Pidginization Hypotheses.” What a refreshing surprise to find a candid discussion of non-learning! The literature in our field has been glutted with sticky-sweet euphemisms designed to help students and teachers avoid the problem. We cringe from calling ourselves teachers. We don’t teach—we facilitate. We are ashamed to speak of students; they are learners. Yet everyday we are confronted with people who supposedly come to learn but make no progress. As linguists and teachers, it is our job to deal with human beings and errors, not to rename them. Shapira’s article on the issue of affect as a factor hindering progress stimulates
our imagination to explain non-learning rather than encouraging us to shove it aside. Furthermore it tantalizes us by suggesting that there may be fundamental differences in the learning strategies of children and adults: children generating rules from the speech they hear, but adults possibly acquiring formulae and not even applying analogy to generalize their use (p. 255).

While acknowledging the obvious differences between child and adult acquisition of a second language, Hatch attempts to dispel myths about some of the presumed differences. In her Introduction (pp. 11-14) and by means of her balanced selection of papers she shows us that children do not acquire second languages without effort. Like adults, they experience frustration and often go through a stage of rejecting one language or another. Burling’s description of how his son Stephen immediately “lost” the use of Garo while returning to the U.S. from India seems to be a case of language rejection due to numerous frustrating experiences (p. 71). Clearly Itoh’s two year old subject, Takahiro, rejected English (Chapter 5). Hatch also cites ample evidence that children, like adults, have a meta-awareness of language (pp. 14-17). The point of her discussion is that child and adult acquisition do, indeed, have a great deal in common, despite popular belief to the contrary.

The major interest (and value) of any anthology is in the selection of papers, and it is in this respect that we see Evelyn Hatch’s vast knowledge of the field. The papers in the volume range from the familiar morpheme acquisition studies (e.g., Dulay and Burt; Bailey, Madden and Krashen; Larsen-Freeman, all previously published elsewhere) to the newer and lesser known studies of discourse (e.g., Peck, Hatch). The paper by Sabrina Peck, however, does seem to represent more the wave of the future, not just because the unit of analysis is greater than the sentence, but because it analyzes conversational interaction. The data are more accurate reflections of real language use than the artificially elicited data we typically find in morpheme studies, and the attempt to look at the conversation as a whole shows the progress we are making in the field.

Many other papers in the volume reflect astute choices made by the editor. Of particular interest are those that predate the current fad for the study of infant bilingualism. We cannot help but share Hatch’s veneration for Werner Leopold, whose four published volumes (1939, 1947, 1949a, 1949b) on the language development of his daughter, Hildegard, are the basis for his 1954 paper reprinted in this volume (Chapter 1). Also quite important is the body of data collected by Burlington in 1955. More impressive than the specific details of the actual forms his son acquired is the attempt Burling makes to formulate issues as early as 1959. For example, he challenges Leopold’s assumption that acquisition of syntax precedes morphology (pp. 72-73). More significantly, Burling (p. 74) emphasizes the separateness of the two linguistic systems in his son’s use of Garo and English, contrasting this to Leopold’s description of Hildegard’s struggle to separate an initially mixed language she acquired, due to bilingual input.
Other highlights of the book are the articles which tie the data to theoretical claims. The most intriguing of these is Schumann’s “Second Language Acquisition: The Pidginization Hypothesis.” In this article, Alberto’s lack of learning is explained by the pidginization process, which, according to Schumann, persists due to social and psychological distance. And Ravem’s article, “Two Norwegian Children’s Acquisition of English Syntax,” discusses the predictions of the contrastive analysis hypothesis versus the L1 = L2 hypothesis, and, instead of polemics provides data to show that L1 acquisition sequence, not interference, explains the forms used by his children.

Although the primary value of a book of readings lies in the selection of papers, two other key factors determine its practicality for various purposes: organization and editorial comments. This volume’s organization does not make it easily adaptable to a course syllabus. First of all, the major classification for twenty-four of the twenty-six papers is according to method of investigation: case studies versus experimental studies. This methodological classification, in Tables 1 and 2 of the Introduction, though helpful to the researcher, is not the major point of interest to most readers who want to scan a Table of Contents for topics, not research methods. Organization by method emphasizes procedure rather than content. Professors writing a course syllabus usually want a book which highlights the issues. They are primarily interested in topics (e.g. pidginization, avoidance, morpheme acquisition order) or factors which affect acquisition (e.g., age, social distance, cognitive process, input). Most researchers want to see readings organized according to issues, too, since their research questions are usually directed at specific issues.

In fairness to the editor, we must say that the organization of the book is influenced by the immaturity of the field; it would be very difficult to organize the book according to issues and topics. Many articles don’t fit neatly into any one category, and many issues are not well defined. Still, the problems inherited by the editor are compounded in this particular volume by the fact that we are made to jump back and forth between method and topic as the basis for organization. Part III (Discourse Analysis) is based on a linguistic unit, whereas Parts I and II are based solely on method of investigation. While a linguistic unit is the title of Part III, in Part II it is the basis of a subdivision (morpheme acquisition order). In Part I, the linguistic unit is not mentioned. Further confusing the organization is the fact that Part II (Experimental Studies) is subdivided into three categories: one on the basis of method (Multiple Measures), one on a factor affecting acquisition (Age Comparisons), and one on a linguistic factor (Natural Sequence Order of Morphemes). Part I (Case Studies) actually has a very logical order of presentation, though the Table of Contents tends to obscure this. The hidden basis for organization is age of subjects in ascending order. This is obscured rather than highlighted by the titles of the subsections relating to simultaneous versus sequential order of acquisition. In the third subcategory, adolescents and adults are then lumped together as “older learners,” although a later article (Ramirez and
Politzer, Chapter 20, p. 332) contrasts these two groups. Also, the Butterworth and Hatch article, “A Spanish-Speaking Adolescent’s Acquisition of English Syntax” is erroneously listed as “our first look at adult second-language learning” (p. 231). Finally, the Abstracts section (Part IV) is on the same plane with the papers themselves (Parts I through III) when, in reality, it should be just an appendix.

Hatch’s prefacing remarks vary in quality from article to article. In some introductions she tends more toward summary than historical contextualization while in others she touches on issues, but what is needed is a greater attempt to tie together all of the twenty-six papers on the basis of the issues.

The editorial comments also present some practical problems. They are geared to a well-versed reader with an excellent memory. Mention of “Uznadze’s set theory” (p. 33), “Kessler’s assumption” (p. 54), “the Harvard group” (p. 118), and “Jean Berko’s experiment” (p. 118) appear without reference to specific articles or dates, let alone definitions, which leaves the uninitiated reader stymied. It is quite legitimate to gear a book of readings to a sophisticated audience by assuming, for example, mastery of technical vocabulary, but it is really inconvenient for any reader to find that the list of References at the end of the book (there are no separate bibliographies) omits numerous articles cited in the editorial comments and papers. Furthermore, the studies cited in the editor’s comments do not consistently tell the reader the publication date, even if the References section contains more than one article by that author. And, as often as not, the reference to an article does not specify whether the article is included in the abstracts.

Despite minor problems, this book fixes Evelyn Hatch’s already prominent place in the burgeoning field of second language acquisition. This anthology is the first and so far the only one composed of strictly data-based papers. Hatch has done a tremendous service to the field by editing this volume, and those who have already read it are not surprised that it is selling at a rate far beyond expectation. It is a must for all serious researchers in TESOL.
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The central theme of this volume is the spread of English in non-English mother-tongue countries. This theme is discussed from two perspectives: first, the unprecedentedly rich documentation of how English has taken root around the world, outliving the colonial era during which it was first introduced; second, the spread of English as a sociological phenomenon, the study of which has crucial bearing on such important theoretical issues in the sociology of language as language maintenance and language attitudes. The 14 chapters comprising this volume (quite a few of them having Fishman as the sole or joint author) fall into three main groups: global surveys of the role of English in a variety of societal domains (chs. 1 and 2), detailed studies of various sociolinguistic aspects of English in Israel (chs. 4-10), and theory-oriented discussions of language maintenance, attitudes, etc., (chs. 3, 11, 13, 14). There is also a chapter on language attitudes in Rhodesia (ch. 12).

The first chapter, by Conrad and Fishman, extensively documents the spread of English around the world. The claim that English is today the world language is substantiated by 1) the number of countries in which English is either the sole or an associate official language; 2) the number of students studying English in primary and secondary schools; 3) the number of foreign students at the tertiary level in English-speaking countries; and 4) the number of books and newspapers published in English. The documentation is thorough, the presentation clear, and the interpretation insightful and objective. The authors show pragmatic insight by their decision to include not only countries where English is the designated official language but also those where it is the de facto official language. Yet, one wonders if criterion 3) is the best measure of the role of English in higher education. English is widespread in the so-called Third World Countries, and, in most of these countries, English is often the main if not the sole medium of higher education. Yet the percentage of Third World students who go abroad for higher studies is negligible. Thus, although criterion 3) speaks eloquently for the spread of English, an even stronger measure would be the number of students enrolled at the tertiary level in English-medium classes. Also, a minor correction must be pointed out: on page 6, the authors state that the growth of indigenous literatures in English is associated with a "linguistic self-consciousness" on the part of communities of "predominantly English-speaking persons" which include third and fourth-generation first-language speakers of English. They cite South Africa, Rhodesia, and India as examples. Whether or not this claim is true of the first two countries, it is not true of India. Indian English literature is not associated with the so-called "Anglo-Indians," although there may be a few "Anglo-Indians" who have contributed to it; the majority of Indian English literary works are written by English-knowing bilinguals who speak some Indian language as their mother-tongue and use English as a second
language. In this connection, another slightly misleading statement must be corrected—those who write in English in India do not necessarily have “international readership” as primary motivation (p. 50) but rather inter-regional, intra-national readership.

Another important issue is the motivation for the use of English around the world. Teachers of English as a second language have traditionally assumed that the major motivation is what many have termed “affective” acculturation in the English-speaking world. One seriously doubts the validity of such an assumption, especially in the emerging countries of Asia and Africa. This chapter shows that out of the 71 million students learning English around the world, as many as 46 million come from Asia and Africa (excluding USSR, Korea and China). Isn’t it high time that such market-survey statistics influenced ESL policy?

The second chapter, “English Around the World” by Fishman, Cooper, and Rosenbaum, attempts to find correlations between the status of English and a variety of socio-economic and other factors in 102 non-English mother-tongue countries. This study differs from earlier studies not only in its non-impressionistic procedure and extensive data-base, but also in the authors’ insightful decision to break down the vague concept “status of English” into a diverse set of criteria and stating correlations in terms of these criteria. They find that the most important socio-economic factors correlating with the use of English are, after former Anglophone colonial status, religious compositions (absence of universal religions), linguistic diversity, and material benefits (exports to English-speaking countries). Urbanization, economic and educational development, and political affiliation were found to contribute little, independently of the other predictors.

In the next chapter, Fishman examines the phenomenon of the spread of English in the context of language maintenance and language shift. He correctly notes that the spread of English in the third world has not resulted in the same kind of massive mother-tongue displacement so characteristic of immigrant settings in North American and Australia. Part of the answer is no doubt the “diffusion-based” spread of English in the third world. The other part of the answer must surely lie in the deliberate language policy of the British colonialists who in fact had to be coaxed to introduce English into the educational systems of third world countries like India. Moreover, the sheer numbers and the existence of rich and venerable literary traditions must at some point figure in the explanation. Fishman goes to the heart of the matter when he remarks that the staying power of English “may derive from ethnic neutrality” i.e., the fact that English is not necessarily associated with a particular (British or American) set of ethnic values or ideology.

The next set of papers are case studies of the role of English in Israel. Chapter 4, “English in Israel: A Sociolinguistic Study” by Nadel and Fishman presents a history of the introduction of English into Israel, its use in education and the mass-media, etc., and serves as an introduction to the chapters
that follow. These chapters examine such varied topics as the maintenance of English in “new” neighborhoods, the use of English on a busy street in Jerusalem, students’ and housewives’ perception of the effectiveness of English vis-a-vis Hebrew as tools of persuasion, the economic incentives for learning English, the influence of English on formal terminology, foreign loan-words in Hebrew newspapers, and attitudes toward English. Each of these chapters seeks to answer a small set of specific questions by means of a well-defined empirical study, using a variety of techniques ingeniously adapted to elicit relevant data. With the exception of those chapters on the influence of English and foreign loan-words, which make rather slender points on borrowing, the other papers in this set provide rich and varied documentation of the multifarious aspects of the spread of English in Israel. Similar case studies for other countries would greatly enhance our understanding of the parameters of language spread.

After a chapter on language attitudes in Rhodesia by Hoffman (which, despite its intrinsic interest as one of the few studies of language attitude in Africa, stands out as the only non-Israeli case study in the book), the volume ends with two brief notes by Fishman which bring together the diverse societal factors and their interplay which are responsible for the spread of English around the world.

The Spread of English marks a milestone in the study of languages of wider communication by the extensiveness of its documentation, the balanced and perspicacious interpretation of facts as well as its in-depth studies of attitudes and motivations involved in the study and use of English in a non-English mother-tongue community.

Kamal K. Sridhar
University of Illinois


Errors and Expectations is a thorough inventory of the types of student errors in basic writing classes. The major areas of difficulty are reflected in the chapter headings: Handwriting and Punctuation, Syntax, Common Errors (i.e. problems in the inflection of regular verbs and nouns, subject-verb agreement and the use of articles), Spelling, Vocabulary, and Beyond the Sentence (i.e. problems in presenting and elaborating on a central idea). A number of examples for each type of problem have been drawn from 4,000 placement essays written by incoming freshman at City College of the City University of New York. For each problem, Shaughnessy discusses possible causes for the difficulty and suggests specific pedagogical approaches to their solution. Although the book focuses on the errors and expectations of basic writing stu-
...dents, it is nonetheless, for several reasons, quite relevant to the specific writing problems of ESL students.

First, many of the errors delineated by Shaughnessy are prevalent in the essays of ESL students. Shaughnessy, for example, notes the regularity of subject-verb agreement problems in the papers of basic writing students and contends that such errors arise from “a writer’s effort to conform to a system he is not clear about” (page 116). In order to deal with the problem, Shaughnessy argues that students need to learn what the words agreement and number mean in grammatical talk and be able to recognize subjects and isolate the nucleus of a subject phrase. ESL students, of course, need the same background in order to deal with their own errors in subject-verb agreement.

Throughout the book, Shaughnessy emphasizes the importance of looking beyond the error itself to its possible causes. Although there may be a large overlap between the types of errors made by ESL and basic writing students, the reasons for these errors may be quite different. Some of the reasons that Shaughnessy suggests for the error of native speakers are: interference from oral language, a lack of familiarity with formal written English, and the student’s own lack of confidence in mastering the system. She maintains that native-born students differ from second-language students in significant ways:

- they have usually experienced little or no success with written English in school, which is often not so of foreign-born students in relation to their native languages;
- they have not identified the real reasons for their lack of success in writing, having usually perceived themselves (and having been perceived by their teachers as well) as native speakers of English who for some reason use “bad” English; and finally, perhaps most importantly, they have been functioning in English for years, understanding the English of people in their communities and being understood by them in the full range of situations that give rise to speech. (page 92)

In this way the book provides a context for teachers to explore the different reasons behind the errors that appear in the essays of basic writing students and ESL students.

Finally, the book is important to ESL writing teachers because it recognizes the need to maintain a balance between a concern for errors and a concern for the students’ ideas. The need to be concerned with errors, as Shaughnessy points out, “has to do with the writer’s relationship to his audience, with what might be called the economics of energy in the writing situation. Although speakers and listeners, writers and readers, are in one sense engaged in a cooperative effort to understand one another, they are also in conflict over the amount of effort each will expend on the other” (page 11). Although, in order to preserve the writer-audience rapport, attention has to be given reducing errors, an overemphasis on them can reduce the student’s desire to communicate. Shaughnessy argues that “errors count but not as much as English teachers think” and that often teachers have a “tendency to view the work of their students microscopically, with an eye for forms but with
little interest in what was being said” (page 120). Shaughnessy’s plea for a balance between a concern for error and meaning is clearly relevant to the ESL writing situation. ESL teachers must also avoid hunting solely for mechanical errors or focusing exclusively on meaning amidst the many errors. In so far as both basic writing students and ESL students share the problem of trying to communicate without a full grasp of the rules of formal written English, the book is important in emphasizing to the teacher the need for a balance between correcting errors and attempting to grasp the intended meaning.

*Errors and Expectations* reflects a respect for basic writing students and their problems in mastering the rules of formal written English. Shaughnessy’s concern for both the growth of the student and the need for accuracy in language use is certainly not limited to the remedial English situation; it is therefore quite relevant to ESL.

**Sandra McKay**
San Francisco State University

**MODERN ENGLISH. Second Edition. Two Volumes and Instructors’ Manuals.**

When Rutherford’s first edition of *Modern English* appeared some ten years ago, many adventurous ESL teachers rushed to welcome it into their classrooms and invited it to stay. But those of us less adventuresome, perhaps the silent majority, shied away from using the new grammar text. This polarized reception was thought to be caused by the text’s professed linguistic orientation in generative-transformational grammar, a then new, controversial, and mystifying advance in linguistic research. Audio-lingual devotees, among others, questioned the pedagogical value of a linguistic theory which professed to have next to nothing to say about either how language is learned nor about how insights gained into the nature of language might be applied in the classroom. Well, one of the ways in which some of us have changed over the years is that we no longer demand absolute answers to complex questions. For some time now, an eclectic approach has been popular in dealing with questions of language learning/teaching. The eclectic approach allows us to use what is helpful from all sources, regardless of type or era (no earlier theory or methodology was all bad), and to keep the door open for future developments. And so it is with Rutherford, too, who names eclecticism as his linguistic orientation in this, the second edition of *Modern English*. Reflected throughout this edition are the most beneficial elements of the first, incorporated into a broader view of what is useful for effective learning/teaching.

This edition is an excellent grammar text. I like its comprehensive treatment and its careful preparation, but I like especially the materials in the text that enable me, as teacher-facilitater, to help my students develop into crea-
tive, intuitive learners of English. In my view, it merits a careful examination by all ESL teachers: both devotees and doubters of the first edition and newer ESL teachers who share our constant interest in looking for a good or better text.

The book is divided into two volumes, each intended for one semester of study. However, the two volumes form a single text: the basic format of the materials and the aim of developing communication skills is the same for both. The purpose of Volume One is to develop in learners the fundamental abilities needed to communicate in the spoken and written language; the purpose of Volume Two is to enable these learners to extend their skills to English of greater complexity and sophistication. To achieve these purposes, Rutherford provides instruction and practice in grammar, speaking, sound and spelling, word formation, reading, writing, and punctuation.

Volume One contains fifteen units, numbered 1-15, and Volume Two contains nine units, numbered 16-24; the consecutive numbering emphasizes the continuity of the two texts. Preceding Unit 16, the first unit in Volume Two, there is a helpful preparatory unit of writing exercises which links together the materials of the two volumes. The preparatory unit provides a review of the major grammar areas and various kinds of practice conventions which are included in Volume One. For students who have worked through Volume One, it provides a useful review; for students who are starting out with Volume Two, it provides both a review and an introduction. The writing exercises in the review/introductory unit have reference numbers to indicate the parts of Volume One where the relevant grammar points are discussed. Both volumes of the text contain a number of useful appendices; six in Volume One and ten in Volume Two. The appendices treat such topics as verb tenses, two-word verbs, vocabulary, qualifiers, indirect objects, comparative expressions, word-ending variants, and different types of complements.

Each unit is divided into five sections: A ) Dialog, B ) Dialog Improvisation, C ) Reading, D ) Reading Improvisation, and E ) Cloze-Dictation. Grammar discussions are part of Sections B, D, and E, and the helpful exercises in “Sound Patterns” are part of Section A. The practice exercises of each unit are located within the relevant sections and numbered consecutively throughout the unit. All writing exercises of each unit are grouped together after Section E and lettered alphabetically. Lettered entries with page numbers which correspond and refer to relevant writing exercises within the grouping at the end of each unit are interspersed throughout the sections of each unit. This system which places the writing exercises at the end of each unit, with references within the sections, necessitates shifting back and forth in the text as each section of the unit is completed. The system seems inconvenient and a bit confusing at first, but when mastered works well since everything is numbered and lettered precisely. Having appropriate writing exercises to accompany the section currently being studied is worth the small effort involved. A Tape Program of the dialogs, cloze-dictations, and oral exercises accompanies this new edition.

Teachers using *Modern English* should certainly also use the instructor’s
manuals which accompany Volume One and Volume Two. In these manuals all of the different types of exercises included in the units of the five sections of both volumes are discussed in detail. There are separate discussion sections on how the materials of the text lend themselves to small group work in class and on task-oriented testing. Another section lists nine types of manipulative drills with examples of each and gives helpful suggestions for teachers who might wish to write their own drills to augment those in the text. Rutherford also discusses certain assumptions about language learning which are implicit in Modern English: 1) Language is learned more efficiently if the grammar of the target language is studied. Therefore, the teaching of grammar is an important part of Modern English; 2) Exposure to ungrammaticality in language is helpful rather than harmful for language learners—hence, students are asked to distinguish what is acceptable from what is not acceptable in the grammar of English; 3) It is useful to teach the systematic relationships which exist within a language rather than its constituent elements; therefore, various kinds of intralanguage relationships are put to pedagogical use in many ways in the text (Instructor's Manuals, p. 6.)

The Instructor's Manuals end with a review of the units in each volume. There, selected exercises are dealt with in reference to keys, omitted portions in text exercises, teaching suggestions, and other relevant information. In addition, the Instructor's Manual for Volume One ends with an appendix of communication games called strip stories. These exercises of scrambled sentences are accompanied by full instructions for using the activity in the classroom. Except for Unit One, there is a strip story for each unit in Volume One.

According to Rutherford, the most fundamental change between the second and first editions is that the text "now devotes as much attention to language use as to language form, and it assigns primary importance to the function of language as a vehicle for communication and expression" (Vol. One p. vii). One effect of this new emphasis on communication and expression is a decrease in the number of purely manipulative or mechanical exercises in the text. Some other effects: the predominance of contextual exercises, the frequent use of social situations or reference to explain grammar points, and the refreshing use in the materials of games, cartoons, riddles, pictures, personal and business letters, notes on culture, tables, maps and diagrams which add variety, humor, and informality to the text. Certain regular exercises in the units, such as "Synonymous Sentences," "Included Meaning," "Word Range," the improvisation, and certainly the appropriateness exercises should help to make students create, intuitive learners of English. In my view, if it is used imaginatively, Modern English as a whole has this effect on students. I find little to criticize in Rutherford's Modern English; however, students beginning Volume One of the text should have had more than the "very little prior exposure to English" that the author views as sufficient.

Helen L. Carney
Bergen Community College
Kernel Lessons Intermediate, published in England in 1971, has acquired an American cousin named, appropriately enough, American Kernel Lessons: Intermediate. The original three authors—Robert O’Neill, Roy Kingsbury and Tony Yeadon—have been joined by Edwin T. Cornelius, Jr., who presumably readied the text for the American market.

From comparing the two texts it seems few changes were made in the trans-Atlantic move. The tables of contents are virtually the same, with some minor terminology differences in the two volumes. Each book consists of 25 units, with layout unchanged. The first part presents the grammatical structure under study in a series of pictures and anecdotes, while the second, called “Formation and Manipulation,” shows how the structure is formed and gives practice in using it. The third part is an episodic detective story called “The Man Who Escaped,” and the fourth provides the student with “Further Practice.” The last two parts, the “Summary” and “Exercises for Homework,” appear on the last page of each unit.

Geographic references are changed, however, also a few grammatical items, the names of some of the characters and, in some instances, their vocations. Julia Frost, for example, the secretary who can never get anywhere on time in the British version, becomes Jane Nelson in the American edition, and the conversation in part ‘d’ of Unit 21 indicates that she eventually mends her tardy ways in the New World. Tom Atkins becomes Joe Freeman and changes his profession from language teacher to bookkeeper. Fred Collins does not change his name, but his vice changes from drinking to gambling.

Fred is not the only one to go on the wagon in coming to America, Without apparent exception, all references to drinking and alcoholic beverages—and there are many in the British version—have been removed in the American edition. References to smoking and cigarettes seem to have been removed as well. For example, when Frank Martin has health problems in Unit 17, he is forced to give up “smoking and drinking beer” by his British doctor, but in the American version it is “eating fried foods, desserts and anything sweet” that is prohibited.

A rather minor change in the American edition can be seen in the characters’ dress, now a good deal more conservative. A comparison of the two Carol Stuarts shown in the first part of Unit 7 and of the young blondes shown in the first part of Unit 18 makes this obvious.

The introduction to the book makes no references to these changes, but one can guess that they were probably made as a concession to learners whose religious beliefs could have possibly caused them to be offended by the mention of intoxicants and pictures of scantily-dressed women in the British edition.

A rather obvious change in the American edition is in the addition of
artwork to the episodes of “The Man Who Escaped.” The story line itself is basically the same, although the hero—Edward Coke in England, Gordon Fletcher here—borrows the old lady’s truck in Unit 7 of the American edition rather than stealing the policeman’s bicycle. He also later effects his escape in the police car without having to attack his pursuers, as he does in the British edition.

In general, then, the American edition is the same book with the locale and language Americanized and a few changes made to eliminate the possibility of offending students from certain religious backgrounds. Curiously, however, while the British version is careful to point out that Coke slept on the sofa in Kate’s apartment in Unit 18, Fletcher’s place of repose is left to the reader’s imagination in the American edition.

Now, having established that the American and British editions are basically the same book, one may well ask, “Is it a good book?” The answer: “Yes, as far as it goes.” This judgment is based on two years’ experience using the British version in Iran and on general observation of the text.

*Kernel Lessons* certainly fulfills Stevick’s (1971) criteria of strength, lightness and transparency. The characters, situations and language are appropriate for adults and young adults, and even Iranian adolescents respond well to them.

Stevick (1971) cites four components for a language lesson and three of these are included in *Kernel Lessons*. Sufficient samples of language in use are supplied as well as occasions for use and exploration of structures. Lexical exploration is not included in the text, though the teacher can easily supply it when discussing the episodes.

What is there, then, to criticize in this text? Why did students who began using it with enthusiasm seem to lose interest by the ninth or tenth unit? Part of the answer might be found in Curran’s (1976) observation that “… real learning takes place somewhere on a continuum between newness and boredom” (p. 7). While the format of *Kernel Lessons* involves students in asking questions and manipulating language forms in an interesting way, there is no variation in the format and its predictability unfortunately leads eventually to a certain amount of boredom. The characters, too, become predictable, although students seem to enjoy reading about Fred and Julia’s latest plights even when they know more or less what will happen. “The Man Who Escaped” is the most successful part of each unit, probably because students are really interested in finding out what is going to happen next.

Stevick (1976) identifies two principles that underlie foreign language learning, and the failure of *Kernel Lessons* to observe at least the first of these seems to provide the rest of the answer to why it is not an unqualified success as a textbook. This principle states that, “Language is one kind of purposeful behavior between people” (p. 120). Although *Kernel Lessons*, through its various exercises, provides students with many opportunities to use the language, rarely is it used to enable them, to learn to interact with one another. While it is true that they ask questions in part ‘a’ of each unit, both the form
and the substance of these questions are guided and the questions are asked simply to gain practice in forming questions, not because the students will really care about the answers.

In failing to involve students personally in the language, *Kernel Lessons* neglects the assumptions of humanistic education as well which emphasize the importance of the affective domain in effective learning. For the most part, only in the “Transfer Exercise” at the end of each unit are students asked to write or tell about themselves.

I might doubt the significance of these omissions had I not had the experience of witnessing student interest fade as we proceeded further and further into *Kernel Lessons*. This is not to say that it is an ineffective book. On the contrary, what it does, it does very well. But the teacher who wishes to use it successfully had better plan to create supplementary materials to provide some variation in lesson format and to give students an opportunity to use language in a communicative and creative way.
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American food, jazz, marriage and divorce, wine, money, sports, pollution, American Indians, business, and ecology—fifteen reading passages on these American topics “have been especially written or adapted” for this book “intended for older adolescents and adult students . . . at or above the intermediate level,” and for use “overseas as well as in America. The aim . . . is the development . . . of an active, not passive, command of English.” (All quotes are from the preface.) The book provides enough material for a 15-week course meeting three to five hours a week—45 to 75 hours of work.

Mr. Lugton lays out a model weekly lesson plan organized around three broad divisions—preview, practice, and review. Teachers are encouraged to preview each reading selection with their students by discussing the preface and the photographs, maps, and other visual aids associated with the text. The practice phase consists of seven of the nine drills and other exercises that
follow each reading passage: 1) questions for oral response, 2) vocabulary, 3) synonyms and antonyms, 4) prepositions and other structure words, 5) word-form practice, 6) idioms and special expressions, and 7) reading comprehension. The final phase—the review phase—gives the students a chance to put what they have learned into practice through skits and role play, with topics for writing and discussion. Finally there is a dictation. The author suggests ways that each of these three phases can be conducted on three levels of difficulty.

There is an appendix, “How to use a dictionary,” with facsimile pages of a dictionary, and some exercises to teach the students how to exploit the information found in a dictionary.

At the close of the introduction the author urges “follow-through activities”—extensive reading of all kinds novels, short stories, plays to complement the intensive reading of the book.

If the aim of a course is solely to do intensive reading, American Topics can serve. However, the book would be more valuable if the passages were more varied. They do not move appreciably from easier to more difficult, so that at the end of the book the student is still working at much the same level as he was at the beginning. Furthermore, all the information in the passages seems to be at the same level of importance, not intended to be read at varying speeds with varying amounts of attention paid to the content. In fact, no help is given the student to increase his reading speed. The author cites the importance of extensive reading outside the classroom, but he does nothing to prepare the student for this kind of reading. That a student can successfully work through a passage intensively will not automatically assure that he can read other kinds of material for other purposes, using very different skills, perhaps skimming or scanning.

Although the passages have been especially written or adapted, they present a curious mix of easy and difficult vocabulary, with some difficult words and idioms left undefined. In the first chapter “to please the palate” is left unexplained, but “picnic”—surely an international word—is put into the vocabulary development section and into the fill-the-blank exercises. The work on synonyms is useful, but not enough attention is paid to the context of each word, since, of course, synonyms are not always in free variation. Despite these limitations, vocabulary building is aided by the number and variety of drills and exercises the author provides, especially the word-form charts in which a word is taken through its participle, noun, verb, adjective, and adverb forms: admired, admiring, admiration; admire, admirable; admirably (page 103). Some important structure work is included, notably on the use of prepositions and articles.

The strength of the book in vocabulary building is not matched in the sections on reading comprehension. Each passage is followed by a great many questions for oral response, all direct reference questions, from twenty to fifty of them; Mr. Lugton seems to feel that he has to question every line of the
text. All the questions operate at the sentence level and can be answered with no understanding of the text beyond an understanding of the main grammatical constituents of the sentence. In his introductory examples of appropriate answers to comprehension questions, Mr. Lugton recommends “complete sentences” (without pro-form substitution)—“Who built a new nation?” Answer: “The immigrants built a new nation” (page xix). Such artificial responses are rarely if ever heard outside a language classroom. In his attempt to question everything Mr. Lugton produces some silly questions: “What lifted?” Answer: “Spirits lifted” (page 39). And on page 233: “What staggers the imagination?” (Reviewer: the question does!)

Nor does the situation improve in the multiple choice comprehension questions. Again each question can be answered directly from the text. In the very last chapter, on page 241, we have not moved beyond:

1. The oceans cover nearly
   a. half the world.
   b. two-thirds of the world.
   c. three-quarters of the world.

Sometimes the questions are badly designed so that a correct answer makes a badly formed sentence. On page 14:

5. Spanish speakers are mainly found
   a. on the Eastern seaboard.
   b. in the midwest.
   c. next to Mexico.
   d. all across America.

The correct answer, d, produces “Spanish speakers are mainly found all across America,” which is at least questionable, if not actually unacceptable. It would be very time-consuming and demand some expertise for a teacher to compensate for the inadequate questions in the book.

The claim made on the back cover of the book, that it is useful for developing all four skills at an equal pace, is not substantiated; there is not enough work in listening, speaking or writing—or enough time allowed for these skills in the author’s weekly lesson plan—for this to serve as the sole book for an intermediate course. The suggestions for carrying on the activities of the book on three levels of difficulty seem to deal with such superficial techniques as having the students ask the questions rather than the teacher.

However, the American flavor of the book does make it distinctive, The book is unusually attractive looking: the typeface is beautiful, the use of white space is pleasing, the photographs are varied and interesting.

Rose Adamek
The University of Michigan
Research Notes

Research Article

READING COMPREHENSION OF NON-NATIVE STUDENTS IN ENGLISH COMPOSITION AT THE FRESHMAN LEVEL

Dyne H Macha, Department of English, Texas A & M University

The purpose of this study is to measure the reading comprehension of non-native freshmen (NNF), comparing their performance with that of native freshmen (NF). As first-year university undergraduates, NNF face demanding textbook and journal reading assignments; since they are expected to compete in most courses with native students, how do they fare as readers in comparison with NF?

Most earlier studies showed NNF or ESL populations experiencing problems in reading, primarily rate and discourse ones (Oller 1972, Lee 1972, Chihara et al. 1977, Macha 1977, Cohen et al. 1978). Yet a few reports suggested the contrary, noting similarities rather than differences between native and non-native readers of English. For example, a study at UCLA Oller and Conrad (1971) found advanced ESL learners scoring surprisingly close and, in some instance, outscoring college freshmen on a cloze test. More recently, Perkins and Pharis (1978) have argued that ESL readers compensate for their lack of English ability with other well developed abilities, (e.g., cognitive, intellectual, conceptual, psychological). It was hoped that administering a variety of reading tests to groups of native and NNF would shed light on some questions raised in previous research, illuminating the position of NNF in relation to NF and allowing intelligent practical decisions to be made concerning placement, instruction, assignments, and materials used with NNF.

Procedure

Five reading comprehension instruments were administered to segregated groups of native and non-native students enrolled in sections of regular and international Freshman English at Texas A & M University. Two traditional, one subjective, and two integrative measures were employed; altogether there were 316 student responses. Thirty-eight NF and 33 NNF took the Davis Reading Test Form 2A Series 2, a standardized test presenting 80 multiple-choice questions over 13 passages taken from textbooks, scientific reports, and stories. Twenty NF and 35 NNF took the “Diederich Reading Test,” a more challenging traditional instrument presenting three literary passages followed by 20 multiple-choice questions focusing on point of view and main idea. The timed cloze test, which had been given earlier by Oller and Conrad (1971) under untimed conditions at UCLA, was administered within a 20-minute limit to 22 NF and 37 NNF at Texas A & M. Thirty-six NF and 45 NNF took the sequenced and scrambled cloze test, administered earlier by Chihara et al. in a study at the University of New Mexico. Finally, 17 NF and 33 NNF took the subjective measure, which was based on the Diederich Reading Test since the results on the latter instrument showed both native and NNF experiencing difficulty with this test. On the subjective measure students were asked to present a negative report by marking potential problems on their copy of the Diederich Reading Test; circling any words that might have hindered their understanding, underlining any parts of a sentence or any whole
sentence that was unclear to them, and bracketing discourse elements, that is, groups of sentences, that gave them trouble. In addition, subjects were asked to enumerate which of four possible categories of reading difficulties they found most problematic on this test, beginning with the most troublesome. The possibilities included vocabulary, grammar, discourse, and speed.

Results

As Tables 1 and 2 indicate, the results showed discrimination between native and NNF on all but one of the five tests. An analysis of variance at the .01 level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Possible Score</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Davis (level)</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32.55</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NNF</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22.85</td>
<td>8.52</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(speed)</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>62.74</td>
<td>8.27</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>45-78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NNF</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27.70</td>
<td>14.15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8-74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Diederich”</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>12.25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NNF</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>41.86</td>
<td>10.92</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timed Cloze</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>47.82</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>38-58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NNF</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31.03</td>
<td>10.80</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4-52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sequenced Cloze</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>69.67</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>55-81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NNF</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>58.02</td>
<td>10.70</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40-79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scrambled Cloze</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>59.50</td>
<td>10.46</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>23-79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NNF</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>51.07</td>
<td>11.02</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29-71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 2
Responses on Subjective Measure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Problematic Words</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NNF</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Problematic Sentences</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NNF</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Problematic Discourse Elements</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NNF</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PART II: PERCENTAGE RESPONSES FOR GREATEST READING PROBLEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Grammar</th>
<th>Discourse</th>
<th>Speed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NF</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNF</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
test, the Diederich Reading Test, failed to discriminate significantly between native and NNF, an inability on the part of both groups to handle such difficult discourse. Next, the timed cloze test clearly discriminated between native and NNF whereas Oller and Conrad’s untimed administration of this instrument at UCLA had not. Scores for NNF on this instrument were considerably lower than scores for NF and nearly half the NNF indicated they needed more time to complete this exercise. On the sequenced and scrambled cloze exercise, again NNF scored significantly lower than their native counterparts, though they fared better than the advanced non-native students tested by Chihara, et al. And, on the subjective measure, NNF expressed more problems with comprehension of words, sentences, and discourse than did NF, considering vocabulary their greatest problem, as did ESL students in an intensive program at the University of Michigan in an earlier study by Yorio (1971). What these findings seem to suggest is that though NNF have graduated from institute-level reading they continue to face a vocabulary problem in their undergraduate reading situation. The NNF at Texas A & M also gave discourse a rather problematic rating, though not as high a rating as native subjects, and unlike native freshmen NNF considered speed to be troublesome. Thus, on the basis of the various reading instruments administered at Texas A & M, it was concluded that relative to NF populations tested, NNF generally produced lower scores that may point to problems with reading rate (Davis Reading Test, timed cloze test), discourse (sequenced and scrambled cloze exercise), and vocabulary (based on the subjective measure) when reading English messages.

Implications

Some practical implications for teaching emerge from the findings. First, the scores address placement, suggesting that NNF are not ready to compete with their native counterparts in language skill study and that it would be in the interest of the non-native students to place them in segregated sections of Freshman English. Second, the experiment suggests a comprehensive instructional reading program for NNF that bridges the gap between advanced institute reading and native reading in Freshman English, including instruction in three skill areas—speed, vocabulary and comprehension.
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This study was undertaken to determine if the same acquisition order occurs for Japanese secondary school students learning English as a second language as the ordering observed by Dulay and Burt (1973, 1974a & b). In all, 777 subjects from 33 classrooms were sampled and stratified by three variables: (1) grade level (8th and 9th graders), (2) English textbook used (Total English and Prince English) and (3) location of school (urban and rural). The subjects tested (ages 13 to 15) study English mostly through the “Grammar-Translation” method taught exclusively by Japanese teachers of English. They have only four English class periods a week and more than half of the class period is spent in Japanese rather than English. The students' aim is only to pass the course or pass entrance examinations to higher institutions of learning.

The data collected for this study were written responses to test items. The test consisted of three pictures accompanied by several questions each pertaining to the picture. There were twenty test questions altogether which included three to four expected contexts for each of the nine morphemes investigated here. The subjects were allowed 45 minutes to answer.

The data for obligatory occasions were analyzed by three different scoring methods varying from strict to lenient. Only analyzable responses were scored and unanalyzable responses were eliminated from the study. The three scoring methods were nearly perfectly correlated. Moreover, there were no remarkable differences between grades, textbooks or locations of schools, although there were some differences both among subgroups and individuals covered in this study. The order of morphemes for all subjects was significantly correlated with orders obtained by Dulay and Burt, and also most other L2 studies including Bailey, Madden and Krashen (1974), the speaking and imitating tasks of Larsen-Freeman (1975a & b) and Rosansky (1976), but not the one given by Hakuta (1974a & b). The order also correlated with some sequences observed in L1 studies: Method I of de Villiers and de Villiers (1973) and Porter (1977). The present result supports the hypothesis that strong similarities exist in the L2 acquisition process for all kinds of learners: children, adolescents and adults, even if the amount of exposure, learning situation and data collection procedures are different.

This study was also designed to obtain a morpheme acquisition hierarchy and compare it to the one shown by Dulay and Burt (1974b). By increasing the percentage of disconfirmatory response patterns from 5 to 11, a similar acquisition hierarchy to the one discovered by Dulay and Burt and to the “natural order” proposed by Krashen (1977b) was obtained.

(From a Ph.D. dissertation, The University of New Mexico, 1979)
THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SELF-ESTEEM AND THE ORAL PRODUCTION OF A SECOND LANGUAGE

Adelaide Wilson Heyde, English Language Institute, The University of Michigan

The purpose of this study was a) to focus on the relationship between self-esteem and the oral production of a second language, b) to examine measures of self-esteem, and c) through the examination of a) and b) to explore more thoroughly what a person's use of his second language reveals about his self-esteem.

Three levels of self-esteem were examined: global self-esteem (evaluations of overall worthiness which the subject made of himself), specific self-esteem (evaluations the subject made of himself in situations where he was using French), and task self-esteem (evaluations of the worthiness subjects made of their performance on an extemporaneous speech). Tests of speaking ability included an oral reading of a dialogue cued for specific sounds and an extemporaneous speech. The speeches were scored by the teachers and three judges (native speakers of French).

Statistical results revealed that non-language aspects of self-esteem (e.g., behavior and identity) may have had an indirect effect on speaking scores. There was evidence that perhaps subjects did not see their educational and intellectual self-esteem as related to their use of the second language. Global ratings of the speech appeared to reflect more accurately a subject's ability to use language than the discrete point rating of the dialogue. Correlations between the dialogue scores and aspects of specific self-esteem suggested that accurate pronunciation may be closely related to one's affiliation to one's peer or ethnic group.

The linguistic analysis of selected speeches revealed that high self-esteem subjects were more accurate in their use of grammar and pronunciation and were more fluent than low self-esteem subjects. An analysis of the strategies used in oral production showed that low self-esteem subjects used inaccurate, short prefabricated patterns, avoidance, and interlingual transfer. Analysis of the speeches of high self-esteem subjects revealed intralingual transfer, high-risk personality, and accurate, lengthy prefabricated patterns. Both linguistic and statistical evidence indicated that teachers had an influence on the students' self-esteem and speaking scores.

The exploration of measures of self-esteem revealed: a) the need to augment standardized measures of self-esteem (such as the Tennessee Self Concept Scale) with measures specific to the study, b) the importance of including the sub-scores of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale in the study, c) the need to limit task self-esteem questions to global ratings of errors and to global comparison ratings, and d) the need to weight scales in computing total self-esteem.

Four areas of further research were suggested: 1) the relationship between aspects of non-language self-esteem and both language and task self-esteem, 2) the relationship between learning self-esteem and both language and task self-esteem, 3) self-esteem and cultural allegiance, 4) the teacher's influence on the subject's self-esteem and speaking score.

(From a Ph.D. dissertation in linguistics, The University of Michigan, 1979)
The Forum


Over the last fifteen years the audio-lingual approach (ALA) has been subjected to intensive criticism, much of it justified and some of it misguided. Its theoretical basis in behaviorist psychology has been challenged as linguists and psycholinguists turned away from habit formation theory to a cognitive view of language. Many of the ALA principles of language teaching were challenged as practical experience deemed them inappropriate. This is not surprising, for Lado (1964) writes: “The principles [speech before writing basic sentences, patterns as habits, etc.] are subject to change or elimination as new scientific facts are added to our knowledge” (p. 50). Although I hold no great love for ALA in general, many of its techniques are still useful today, even in the new psychological framework. One of the dangers of emotionally charged criticism is that when an approach is rejected, its good features are thrown out with its bad. One such casualty is the pattern practice drill.

Lamendella presents neurolinguistic evidence which purports to show that pattern practice is useless in language learning. However, his argument holds only for a straw-man version of pattern practice. First, it is not at all clear that the speech copying circuit operates without involving grammatical processing, even in neurologically impaired patients. Second, there is a lack of understanding on his part of the role of pattern practice in a language lesson.

Lamendella postulates the existence of a speech copying circuit involving the dominant hemisphere sensory (Wernicke’s) area, the motor (Broca’s) area, and the arcuate faciculus which connects them. Conduction aphasia is said to result from the disconnection of Broca’s area from Wernicke’s area through a lesion in the arcuate faciculus (Geschwind 1965). But there is a problem with this view since conduction aphasia results from a lesion “…to one point in the arcuate faciculus, the supramarginal gyrus, whereas were this truly a conduction defect lesions anywhere in the pathway should produce a similar picture” (Brown 1972: 83).

In postulating the speech copying circuit, Lamendella seems to accept the view that the arcuate faciculus performs a mere conduction function. This view does not explain the presence of paraphasia in both repetition and spontaneous speech, impaired writing and naming, and the presence of an analogous pathway in apes. The arcuate faciculus and the cortical areas along its path must be involved more actively in speech production:

If processing along the path of the arcuate faciculus is admitted, the arcuate zone would boil down to the classical speech area. The disturbance in repetition would then represent only a disturbance of expressive speech tested under the conditions
of repetition. It is necessary, therefore to look for alternatives to the associationalist view of the arcuate faciculus. The most probable of these are that it acts as an "internal feedback" control on a posterior speech generating system, that it modulates activity between two systems organized in parallel, or possibly, going back to Wernicke's original idea, that it exerts a synchronizing or priming effect on the anterior articulatory apparatus (Brown 1972: 83).

In discussing the transcortical aphasias, Lamendella presents evidence which clearly demonstrates that such patients, whose speech areas are presumably isolated, still have the ability to make sentence completions, lexical modifications, corrections, etc., which would indicate that the speech copying circuit does more than merely copy the input as a tape recorder does. Moreover, there is evidence that normal individuals do not faithfully play back the input either —for example, in shadowing, the shadower tends to correct grammatical and phonological errors, and typists unconsciously correct misspelled words and misspell correctly spelled words in a manuscript, which they customarily misspell. Thus it appears that when the speech copying circuit is engaged, grammatical processing does take place. The key word here is grammatical.

In much of the recent literature on language learning and teaching, there has evolved a tendency to confuse grammar and communication—two distinct entities. In addition, it is often forgotten that pattern practice and other drills are supposed to be only one component of a language lesson. The purpose of drills is to provide the learner with sets of examples of specific L2 structures in order to facilitate learner generalizations about the grammar. The next step, which Lamendella and other critics fail to mention, is to afford the learner the opportunity to use the newly learned grammatical structures in meaningful and communicative situations. Obviously, over-reliance on pattern practice, repetition, or any other single technique will lead to boredom, fatigue, and consequently, little learning. "A successful application of the audio-lingual method requires inventiveness and resourcefulness on the part of the teacher, who must be continually alert for opportunities to vary the presentation of material and to force the students into interesting situations where they will feel a spontaneous desire to express themselves through what they have learned" (Rivers 1968:46).

Suppose all drills were replaced with communicative activities. Would this lead to quicker and better language learning? Probably not. Witness the millions of immigrants who live in an English-speaking environment for most of their lives, learn to communicate quite well with English speakers, but never reach the level of grammatical accuracy that foreign students usually do after two or three semesters in an intensive ESL program, Krashen (1975) found that for adults formal instruction was a better predictor of proficiency in English than time spent in an English-speaking country. Communicative situations may provide sufficient input for successful language learning by children, but adults are not so lucky—they need more, much more. They need rule isolation and error correction (Krashen and Seliger 1975), both of which are
inherent to various types of language drills, including pattern practice. They also need the opportunity to practice what they have learned in communicative situations.

It should always be remembered that the purpose of language is to facilitate communication and that it is one of several forms of communication available to us. When a language is learned in a communicative setting, the emphasis is on the perlocutionary act, not grammar. Learners tend to rely on the other communicative options because their language options are highly limited or nonexistent. Without formal instruction they cannot go far; their interlanguage becomes fossilized once they are sufficient for their immediate communicative needs. If, on the other hand learners are subjected to nothing more than drills, they may internalize grammatical rules, but they will be unable to utilize them in communicative situations. Communication alone results in a fossilized interlanguage, whereas drills result in a well-developed “monitor.” Neither situation is acceptable.

Successful language learning and teaching demands a combination of grammatical drills and communication. The failure of learners to “automatically access Target Language grammatical knowledge in communicative interactions” stems from unimaginative or inadequate teaching, not some intrinsic neurofunctional defect in pattern practice drills. Of course the learner will not use his L2 grammatical knowledge in communication if he is not taught to do so.
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Lamendella replies:

Lamendella (1979) proposed a functional explanation for the failure of pattern-practice drills to accomplish the goals set for them. Klosek (this volume) rejects both the proposed explanation and the assumption that these drills have already been shown to be of negligible value in the foreign language classroom. Here, I will attempt to reaffirm the validity of this underlying assumption.

Within the applied linguistics of the structuralists, a language was believed to be made up of “patterns” which learners had to acquire as “habits.” Habits were defined within a Stimulus-Response learning paradigm. The conditioning of correct Target Language (TL) habits in learners was thought to require massive reinforcement and overlearning. On this theoretical basis, there was developed the pattern-practice drill (PPD). This specialized type of grammar exercise essentially involves the student’s mechanical repetition of a cued sentence and the substitution into this sentence of forms supplied by the teacher. Reinforcement of correct TL grammatical patterns was to be achieved by many repetitions of example sentences with different fillers. In this way, the student was believed to attain progressive mastery of TL grammatical habits. Once learning was consolidated by pattern drills, these habits would then be automatically elicited under the appropriate conditions in future TL communicative interactions.

Along with many other aspects of the Aural-Oral Approach and the Audio-Lingual Method, PPDs came under strong criticism during the later 1960’s. Attacks on the S-R behaviorist paradigm by Chomsky (1959) and others had already removed the theoretical justification for PPDs and similar mechanical grammar drills. Neither the behaviorist view of reinforcement nor a simple notion of habit could any longer be seen as accounting for the cognitive activities involved in either first or second language acquisition.

Furthermore, transformational grammarians pointed out that PPDs often require the student to manipulate surface strings without regard to the integrity of underlying syntactic relations (cf. Rutherford, 1968). Lexical items such as easy and eager were to be substituted as equivalent fillers into such frames as “John is — to please” even though the resulting sentences can be demonstrated to derive from quite different syntactic deep structures. Thus, a student would not at all be practicing the same grammatical pattern when producing these two sentences during a PPD.

Decisions on the sorts of exercises which should be used in the classroom

1 In particular, the body of this paper will not address the issues Klosek raises concerning the pathological basis of Conduction Aphasia or the role of the arcuate fasciculus in speech processing. His discussion does not affect the arguments presented in Lamendella (1979) and, in my opinion, has served more to cloud the issues than to illuminate them. For example, Klosek’s comments on Conduction Aphasia deal with competing claims about the pathological basis of this disorder, rather than its functional character. Even if the interpretation of Brown (1972) were correct, it would have no bearing on the arguments presented in Lamendella (1979). Similarly, the comments on the arcuate fasciculus are irrelevant to my arguments and conclusions.
must ultimately be made according to what does and what does not work. In this sense, theoretical justification of classroom practices are beside the point. It is appropriate, therefore, that the damning criticisms of mechanical PPDs came from the pedagogical establishment itself with the growing realization that PPDs simply do not work! Students who easily and endlessly manipulate a TL structure during drills can be observed to fail dismally in applying this same structure in real-world communicative situations. PPDs do not seem to noticeably inhibit negative language transfer outside the drill setting. PPDs, in themselves, seem to contribute little if anything toward helping the learner acquire usable knowledge of TL linguistic structures. In short, PPDs do not accomplish the very goals which provided the only reason for their initial use in foreign language instruction. Unless some new reasons for retaining them can be provided, it seems an obvious conclusion that their use should be discontinued.

Klosek asserts that PPDs still have a valuable place within the first of two basic components of language learning and language teaching: “grammatical drilling” and “communication.” However, in defending PPDs, Klosek never identifies the “good features” which off set their many obvious bad features. Most of what he does discuss is directed toward “grammatical drilling” in general, rather than PPDs per se. Although he agrees that the original theoretical rationale for PPDs has been found lacking, no new justification for their continued use is provided beyond his conclusion that successful second language learning and teaching demand a combination of “grammatical drilling” and “communication.” Klosek attributes the widespread failure of learners to apply abstract knowledge of TL grammar in communicative interactions to “unimaginative and inadequate” teaching, rather than to some intrinsic defect in PPDs. In his view, after the learner acquires grammatical knowledge through drilling, the imaginative and adequate teacher can provide an opportunity to use the newly learned structures in “meaningful and communicative situations.” In what I can only regard as a quite optimistic assessment, he appears to be claiming that the inventive teacher should experience no difficulty in effecting the automatization of TL structures first learned in classroom drilling.

Be that as it may, the fact that Klosek feels that imaginative teaching is needed “after” drilling suggests an implicit recognition that PPDs in themselves do not accomplish the generalization of grammatical learning to communicative interactions. However, such drills were developed precisely for this purpose. It was precisely the multiple repetitions involved in PPDs that were supposed to provide the reinforcement necessary for a TL grammatical pattern to become

2 I find it difficult to credit much of what Klosek has to say about the relative value of real-world communication and formal instruction in promoting useful learning. For example, Klosek claims that the adult learner cannot go far without “formal instruction” and simplistically asserts that fossilization will occur once the learner’s interlanguage is sufficient for immediate communication needs; he implies that the learner given formal instruction will not fossilize (cf. Selinker & Lamendella 1978). He also claims that, after 2-3 semesters of intensive ESL, a learner will achieve a higher level of grammatical accuracy than would an immigrant during a lifetime; the immigrant will only learn to communicate well with English speakers!
a new speech habit. Once learned, the pattern should (in principle) be triggered automatically under the appropriate stimulus conditions. These beliefs have been shown to be unfounded. The mere echoing of TL utterances does not in itself guarantee any learning whatsoever, much less the generalization of learning to the world outside the classroom.

However PPDs initially became part of language instruction they have remained there neither because they have been proven effective nor because they are justified by some plausible theory of language acquisition or language pedagogy. As much as anything else, it is probably inertia which has been responsible for their continued place in language textbooks. This is not to say that they are without redeeming characteristics. When done right, they are fun. As Klosek notes, they do provide example sentences for particular TL structures. They provide the classroom teacher (and textbook writer) with something structured and concrete to do in class. They provide a context in which errors of pronunciation and grammar can be corrected. PPDs lend themselves to quick and easy multiple choice testing of language proficiency (a mixed blessing at best). They may have positive psychological effects on both teacher and student, since the student’s fluent echoing of TL utterances during drills gives the impression of speaking the language.

Nevertheless, many other types of grammar exercise have these same advantages and it is beyond argument that a great many things are wrong with PPDs. Not the least of their inherent negative defects is the mechanical, rigidly controlled nature of the student’s involvement. Framed in other words, one of the points stressed in Lamendella (1979) was that students do not have to “be there” in order to perform well during a PPD. Possessing a minimal knowledge of word classes and low-level cooccurrence restrictions, students can carry out PPDs perfectly without understanding a single sentence. Even given that some subset of students may pay attention to the grammatical structures presented in PPD, only under the most radical behaviorist assumptions could this state of affairs be looked on as beneficial to the language acquisition process.

Many new types of classroom exercises have been developed that go beyond mechanical repetition of isolated example sentences. These exercises are not rigidly controlled, and allow the student some choice of response (cf. the “meaningful drills” of Paulston 1970; also Rutherford 1977). Additionally, it has proven helpful to provide a topical or situational context for the utterances produced by learners during classroom drills (cf. Slager 1973), rather than having the learner mindlessly mimic a random list of disconnected sentences lumped together simply because they illustrate a grammatical structure. To the degree possible, it is clearly advantageous to provide the learner with classroom activities having as much real-world significance as possible. As Klosek notes, in order for a student to learn how to communicate in the TL, it is helpful for the student to practice communicating in the TL. Klosek apparently does not believe that it is possible to teach grammar simultaneously with the ability
Another inherent negative feature of PPDs (and, in general, a characteristic of the Aural-Oral Approach and the Audio-Lingual Method) has been the emphasis on grammatical structure as the organizing principle for classroom activities, instead of the ability to successfully communicate meaning in the TL. Klosek has proposed that we continue to try and first teach grammatical structure abstracted from communicative use of language, and only then provide the student an opportunity to practice using this knowledge. He assumes that PPDs do facilitate the initial learning of TL grammar, but he fails to present reasons why this particular exercise type accomplishes that goal better than other sorts of drills, or in fact any evidence that PPDs facilitate useful grammatical learning to any significant degree.

In the classic Aural-Oral Approach, PPDs were claimed to consolidate the student’s inductive generalizations about TL grammatical structure. Klosek claims that PPDs do facilitate the student’s generalizations and, although I do not believe that this happens for enough students to matter, let us assume for the moment that (in some unspecified fashion) the initial learning of TL grammar is indeed facilitated by PPDs. Does this, ipso facto, mean that PPDs have served some useful purpose? The answer to this question depends on the degree to which the TL knowledge gained is useful to the learner; i.e., the manner and extent to which that information is available when it is needed in communicating with native speakers of the TL.

Lamendella (1979) argued that in fact there are two major types of non-primary language acquisition: Foreign Language Learning and Secondary Language Acquisition. Space limitations preclude my repeating those arguments here, but it seems certain that the more typical result of formal instruction in the classroom organized around grammatical drilling has been Foreign Language Learning. In this form of nonprimary language competence, the learner’s access to TL grammatical knowledge is normally limited to conscious monitor conditions, and incorporates a strong involvement of the Native Language via a translation buffer; the basis for such learning appears to be formal cognitive operations (for discussion, see Lamendella 1977). The significance of all this for our purposes here is that, to the extent that PPDs might actually facilitate grammatical learning, the resulting type of knowledge is likely to do the student little good as compared to the pragmatically useful knowledge involved in Secondary Language Acquisition.

Drawing on neurolinguistic evidence and a functional view of neural information processing, Lamendella (1979) posited a Speech Copying Circuit as the probable basis for repetition, imitation, and certain forms of substitution and completion in human speech behavior. It was suggested that during PPDs the majority of students functionally disassociate higher level language systems from the speech systems as an efficient means of performing a repetitious speech task not related to communication; that is, most students seem to allow the Speech Copying Circuit to mechanically control their repetition and substitu-
tion behavior during PPDs. Under such conditions, the potential of PPDs to facilitate TL grammatical learning depends on the potential of the Speech Copying Circuit to support initial acquisition of grammar.

As discussed at length in Lamendella (1979), evidence from aphasia does indicate that speech systems at the level of the Speech Copying Circuit possess some sort of low-level grammatical capabilities; i.e., even when the higher level systems are disrupted due to a brain lesion and the patient is reduced to the unconscious echoing of speech input, certain low-level grammatical operations may be retained (e.g., "She washed itself" compulsively echoed as "She washed herself"). Klosek concluded that such grammatical processing means that speech systems at this level can learn grammar and that therefore, PPDs do facilitate grammatical learning. In presenting his conclusions, he simply ignores several pages of discussion in Lamendella (1979) leading to the conclusion that in fact, the residual grammatical capabilities in such aphasic patients are the result of a process during which initial learning was carried out by higher level language systems and subsequently delegated to systems at the level of the Speech Copying Circuit as automated subroutines.

The extra step involved in first teaching abstract grammar and only then trying to get the student to use this knowledge in communicating is unnecessary and, according to both my teaching experience and my theoretical understanding, more harmful than helpful. The energies of the imaginative and adequate teacher would be better directed toward equipping the learner with an implicit knowledge of grammatical structure of a usable type, through getting the learner to communicate messages successfully in the TL from the beginning, and as much as possible, PPDs represent a worse than useless digression from the more productive type of learning involved in Secondary Language Acquisition.

Enough is known about the negative aspects of PPDs both pragmatically and theoretically, that the burden of proof lies with anyone who would argue in support of their continued place in the language lesson. Perhaps Klosek’s faith in grammatical drilling is based on personal success as a teacher, but he neglects to specify how PPDs might have contributed to this success. Unless there exists evidence I am unaware of indicating that whatever their faults, PPDs in and of themselves contribute something useful to either the initial acquisition of grammar or the later application by the learning of grammatical knowledge in real-world communication, I will continue to believe that they have not earned even a marginal place in second language pedagogy. It may or may not be the case that other forms of mechanical drills serve some legitimate purpose, but pattern-practice drills have proven to be of negligible value.
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TESOL Quarterly has made an important forward stride with the publication of the excellent article by Professor Herbert J. Walberg and his associates on the correlations between learning and age/experience. In the past, this subject has been obfuscated by hunches, vague reasoning, and impressionistic manipulation of the numerous variables. Walberg’s keen and rigorous research advances the subject significantly and crystallizes it in scientific molds.

My own observations over a quarter of a century, mainly with college and graduate students, would lead me to conclusions that are consistent with those of the Walberg article. I would raise the question whether, with students at these higher levels, there would again be a period of acceleration of language acquisition once the learners had passed a certain threshold and could begin to read books in English, participate more fruitfully in social activities, and extract more linguistic substance from experience with the media. I hope that Professor Walberg will advance his research to this frontier. And I hope that his valuable suggestions for further research will be pursued by our colleagues in the profession.

To those who are planning the next national convention of TESOL, I would like to recommend Professor Walberg as a principal speaker at a plenary session.

Paul Smith
Cambridge, Mass.


Dr. Paulston’s paper on biculturalism was a welcome subject, and although it was admittedly speculative in nature, I predict that it will be con-
Dr. Paulston’s basic thesis is that “a bicultural individual . . . has in fact only one set of cultural competence and further that this competence is partially eclectic and shows nowhere the same conformity between individuals as does linguistic competence” (p. 372). Central to her discussion on biculturalism is the way in which she has chosen to define culture. She aligns herself with anthropologist Keesing by advocating that we conceive of culture as external, as what those around us know, believe, and mean. In this manner, not every individual would share the exact same theory of experience; nonetheless, similarities among group members would be evident.

Nowhere in her article does she mention or cite theories of acculturation or cultures in contact. And a majority of her largely anecdotal examples refer to individuals, most likely Pitt ESL students. She does, however, cite a 1958 study about a young Nisei who experienced cultural maladjustment, and Philip’s study about American Indians who were failing in school because they apparently were lacking mainstream American communicative competence. (Philip’s study, by the way, was not included in her bibliography.) But, there was not even a whisper about Chicano or Puertorriqueño biculturalism. Contributions to the study of biculturalism made by Ethnic Studies programs throughout the United States weren’t mentioned either. This alone makes me believe that Dr. Paulston is referring to a special type of biculturalism: the kind that obtains in individuals who as adults come to the United States to study and live for a substantial period of time, and who upon arrival in our country have received a majority of their formal education in a non-English mother tongue.

Let’s look at some of her remarks. She maintains the following: “It is possible to become bilingual without becoming bicultural, while the reverse is not true.” If we reverse the statement and make it untrue, it becomes a sweeping statement: It is impossible to become bicultural without becoming bilingual. Now this I find hard to swallow, especially since I personally know many bicultural Chicanos, Jews, and Puerto-Ricans living in California who are monolingual native English speakers. My acquaintances are not surface-level bicultural individuals, they have deep-level historical ties with both cultures. Further, her statement that “many, naively to my mind, claim that to become bilingual is to become bicultural” (p. 373) seems to be naive also, since I don’t believe that many people concerned with this question think in terms of absolutes. That is, that one becomes bilingual at point X and is from then on, and contemporaneously becomes bicultural at some parallel point Y and is from then on. This is just too simplistic. Rather bilingualism and biculturalism are likely to be considered in terms of degrees and systems of social interaction, such that one may become more or less bilingual than bicultural or more or less bicultural than bilingual within certain domains of
behavior which may or may not be well-defined by the individual or group.

On “becoming bicultural” Dr. Paulston uses Kleinjans’ (1975) descriptive
model of second-culture acquisition. After reading this section I am even more
convinced that she is speaking about adult biculturalism as opposed to biculturalism as one’s native cultural competence. She mentions 3 categories and
their subtypes as what an individual learns during C2 acquisition: Cognition,
Affection, and Action. Strangely, however, she only develops the first two; we
are left in total darkness about Action. It is in this section too that we learn
what she means by “partially eclectic.” I think she means that “the individual
picks and chooses. Some aspects of culture are beyond modification” (p. 376).
Swedish frankness, we learn, is apparently beyond modification, a “behavior
one cannot switch off and on” (Ibid.). Her frankness is something about her
that she “cannot change” (Ibid.). This sounds a bit like the saying “The Irish
are hot-tempered;” indeed, she later states that we may say “How typically
Mexican” (p. 397), but never “How typically Mexican American” (my exam-
ple), thereby repudiating this inherently bicultural culture indigenous to the
United States.

In her section on “Implications for Education,” Dr. Paulston again makes
a debatable statement. I was unaware that she was an educator in addition
to being an ESL authority, but consider the following: “what they (ethnic
children) need if they are to succeed in school, is to learn the cultural ways
of mainstream America” (p. 378). That’s it, teach them the ways of the White
Man and they’re bound to succeed. This attitude has probably been more
responsible for the failure in our education of some of our ethnic minorities
than it has in their success. Moreover, as Kjolseth pointed out nearly a decade
ago, this assimilative attitude favors both language and cultural loss ( Kjolseth
1970 ).

Lastly, still within the realm of educational implications, we read that “the
children must have access to Anglo teachers, if they are to learn the rules of
mainstream culture” (p. 379). I assert that Dr. Paulston could have been much
wiser in her selection of “type of teacher” to teach our children mainstream
culture. Anglo, of course, excludes all Jews, Asians, Poles, Czechs, Latinos, and
Blacks. All of which are mainstream American culture. Mainstream American
is not Anglo. It is composed of sundry cultures, each of which contributes
uniquely and richly to all of our daily lives.
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Christian Jan Faltis
Centro Cultural Colombia-Americano
Christina Bratt Paulston replies:

I am not certain why I have so angered Mr. Faltis, especially as he keeps taking umbrage at ideas and notions he has himself construed, and incorrectly so, from my article. Rather than engage in a windmill battle of refutation, I will let the reader judge the many misinterpretations. Instead let me deal with some issues I find interesting. First, I want to clarify one point. I did not intend to deal only with adult immigrant biculturalism, and I specifically say “there are different types of bicultural individuals” (p. 370). In fact, the majority of the bicultural informants I acknowledged in that paragraph were Chicanos and Puerto Ricans.

My lack of explicit mention of Chicano biculturalism seems to have been one source of Mr. Faltis’ annoyance. It was quite deliberate on my part since the issue is conceptually very complicated, as indeed Mr. Faltis demonstrates in his confused statement “this inherently bicultural culture indigenous to the United States.” In the first place, Mexican American culture is not bicultural but tricultural in origin: Spanish, American and Indian. It struck me afresh during a recent sabbatical leave in Spain how enormously enriched Latin American culture is just because of its Indian substrata and to ignore its contribution may be convenient but false. Second, the only culture indigenous to the area which we today know as the United States was Amerindian; in considering issues of Mexican American culture, one cannot ignore the importance of Spanish colonization and American annexation in forging the nature of the relationship between the ethnic groups in contact. I said as much: “It is clear that the origin of the contact situation is one reason for the fact that being bicultural means different things to different people” (p. 373). Indeed, Mr. Faltis’ very reaction is symptomatic of the kind of strained relationship one frequently finds in such contact situations but which is rarely encountered today in the descendants of European immigrants who willingly submitted to the other culture.

The basic problem, however, is “a bicultural culture.” Can an entire culture be bicultural? At the level of surface behavior, surely this is possible, but at deeper levels of values and beliefs this is very far from certain. I rather doubt it. Maybe what we have in the Southwest is a cultural continuum, analogous to a creole continuum. I don’t know. But it should be very clear that it was this murky issue that made me skirt discussing Chicano culture rather than any “repudiating” of it. And as a matter of fact I think you can say “How typically Mexican American” (I do wish Mr. Faltis wouldn’t make up his own examples for what I did not say). But note that the expression “Mexican American” is synonymous with Chicano and therefore the example is easily misleading; I still would not say “How typically Chicano-North American bicultural behavior.” If any reader has any thoughts on this matter, I would much appreciate hearing them.

This issue is closely related to another interesting point that Mr. Faltis brings up, namely that it is possible to be monolingual and bicultural. I had said something to the effect that one could not become bicultural without be-
coming bilingual, and clearly here I had in mind adult acquisition. But the
issue is troublesome. It is possible that ethnic groups in the process of assimila-
tion will shift languages prior to changing culture, and just as bilingualism is
the mechanism for language shift, so a generation or two of biculturalism may
be the mechanism for assimilation. It is an interesting thought, but I hasten
to add, in order not to cause Mr. Faltis further grief, that I understand that
was not how he intended his point.

I am perfectly aware that my comments on implications for education are
not only debatable but highly controversial. Mr. Faltis' comments would be
amusing were the issue not so deadly serious. Nobody who works in bilingual
education claims that minority children taught the "ways of the White Man"
are bound to succeed. We know better. What concerns us is the fact that they
are bound to fail if the schools cannot better meet their needs. And I really
don't know anyone who denies that minority children need exposure to the
dominant culture; that is after all what desegregation and busing are all about.
That is not the controversial part, and Mr. Faltis' comments are nonsense we
don't need at this time when bilingual education in the United States is in
jeopardy.

The controversial part is the "access to Anglo teachers" insistence. I won't
argue that point again. I concede that the term Anglo is dreadful jargon but
it is used as a technical term in the literature on bilingual education, and it
just never occurred to me that it would be misunderstood. Mr. Faltis is quite
wrong. Jews and Poles and Czechs and Blacks are all Anglo as far as HEW and
bilingual education programs are concerned. Even immigrant Swedes are Anglo,
and that is how the HEW computer has me pegged, over my protestations. In
this context, Anglo simply means mainstream. Maybe Mr. Faltis was thinking
of WASP and became confused.

And in conclusion let me say that I expected more flack than I have
received over that article. Rather, I have been gratified over the support I
have been given, especially by my Latino colleagues in bilingual education. I
say this, not for ego enhancement, but because it is indicative of recent think-
ing within bilingual education. And having said that, I suppose I will now
get a bunch of letters denouncing the article "for the record." Oy ve.

Comments on Doris Feldman's "Special Reading System for Second Language
Learners" (TESOL Quarterly, December 1978).

Teaching reading is now being recognized as an important part of ESL
instruction. Referring to beginning reading instruction, Feldman (1978) offers
practical advice to ESL teachers. There are serious weaknesses in Feldman's
article, however; 1) its presentation of the existing reading and ESL theories
is dated; 2) its description of the implementation of the Reading System (RS)
is inadequate; and 3) its research results to support the RS are unsubstantiated.

First, Feldman complains about the lack of literature on the beginning
reading instruction for ESL learners and mentions Thonis (1970) as the only available (though inadequate in Feldman’s opinion) book on the topic. Feldman ignores several recent works—Ching (1977), Henderson (1972), Saville-Troike (1976), and Thonis (1976)—which provide excellent treatises on recommended reading approaches, methods, and techniques to use with ESL children. Further, Finocchiaro (1969) is cited as an example of “most writings which suggest that reading instruction be delayed until the spoken language has been developed” (p. 416). The question of the appropriate time to introduce reading instruction is, indeed, a controversial issue in the ESL field. Current thinking has it that the teaching of reading should not wait until students become proficient in speaking English (Saville-Troike 1973, 1976; Connor 1978).

Second, the RS is basically a linguistic reading method similar to ones written for native English-speaking children (e.g., the Merrill Linguistic Readers). It is highly controlled, relies on teaching letter-sound correspondences, uses controlled vocabulary, and does not utilize pictures. In my opinion, the RS differs from the traditional linguistic reading programs only on the following points: 1) It seems individualized and utilizes small-group instruction (this is typical of ESL instruction in general); 2) It does not teach the names of letters in the beginning of the program; 3) It allows for a few differences in student performance due to the ESL learner’s non-English language background (e.g., students are expected to have difficulties in mastering certain blends which are non-existent in their native tongue).

Feldman’s description of the implementation of the program does not address the following questions which ESL practitioners need to consider to be able to benefit from the RS in their own teaching:

1. Except for the use of short sentences (which, in Feldman’s view, resemble children’s natural speech), how does the RS reflect a psycholinguistic emphasis (referred to on page 416)?
2. What is the students’ language proficiency level when they start in the RS? How is the language proficiency level assessed?
3. Are the four phases of the RS taught in the order in which the article presents them? How well does the child have to perform before advancing to the next level?
4. How does the RS relate to the rest of the ESL instruction the students receive? How large are the instructional groups in the RS? Can students from different grade levels be taught together?
5. Feldman writes that the children receive reading instruction in their classrooms. Is there coordination between the RS and the regular classroom instruction?

Third, Feldman claims that the RS was successful and writes that “students can read now” and that “behavior and academic problems” have disappeared after enrollment in the RS. Ideally, to scientifically verify the success of the
program, Feldman should have included data about the students relative to those in a control group. Failing that, data should have been provided about the students’ performance relative to the passing of time. The article contains no information about the students’ reading skills at the time they entered the RS even though conclusions about the students’ reading skills after the RS are drawn, based on standardized test scores.

More importantly, these scores presented do not show the gains made by the students that Feldman claims. First, the data in Table 1 do not indicate that students who stayed longer in the RS read better (as determined by the standardized reading test designed for native English-speakers) than students with shorter exposure to the RS. I have revised her Table 1 so that the scores can be studied by groups of students according to the time in the RS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years in RS</th>
<th>No. of Students</th>
<th>Grade (R)</th>
<th>Vocabulary GE</th>
<th>Comprehensive GE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-2/3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3/4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/2-2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-21/2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/2-3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table indicates that the GE scores of the students, indeed, tend to rise as the years in the system increase (the two groups with the longest stay in the RS have too few observations for drawing conclusions). It is worth noting, however, that the average grade level of the students goes up together with the time in the RS. It is reasonable to expect that students in higher grades read better than their counterparts in lower grades. (Connor (1978) found the grade level to be one of the most predictive factors of ESL learners’ reading performance.) ESL children are known to learn English in their regular classes without special ESL instruction. One would normally suspect learning disabilities if ESL students after three years do not read as well as those ESL students who have been in the same school for a considerably shorter time.

Feldman’s Table 1 also contains the numbers of Merrill books read, despite Feldman’s contention, large numbers of books read are not necessarily an indication of superior reading skills. The numbers may rather reflect the fact that students with a shorter exposure to the RS have not yet reached the phase where the Merrill books are introduced.

A second measurement in the article, the tallying of the second and third graders in the study, adds nothing to the interpretation of the results. The reader is equally puzzled about the purpose of Table 2. Feldman herself questions the usefulness of the grade-equivalents reported in the table: “Though the scores seem to indicate that these ESL students have acquired sufficient written language skill to compete with their peers, this is hardly the case” (p. 423).
In conclusion, the data provided in the article do not indicate that the reading system for second language learners has had a significantly positive effect on the ESL learner’s reading skills. To show the effectiveness of the RS, the article should have included information about certain individual factors which might have affected the students’ performance, such as age, length of residence in the U.S., language background, reading skills in the first language, etc. Without information about these individual variables and the students’ reading levels prior to the RS, one can assume that mere exposure to English, both formal and informal, may have contributed to the students’ present reading skills.

1Preliminary research results from Connor and Connor (1979) indicate that several of these variables significantly affect reading performance levels.
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Doris Feldman replies:

It is good to know that Dr. Connor shares my interest in reading instruction for second language learners. However, it appears that she has misinterpreted the basic message of my article on this subject. It was written as a descriptive report of a working instructional system. The reading system described in the article had been developed for its own sake and for the sake of the learners, and not primarily as the instrument of any particular research design (See 415-16).

In comparing Connor’s comments with the text of the article, certain inconsistencies stand out. For example, she suggests that several recent works could have been consulted before the formulation of the Reading System for
Second Language Learners (RSSL). Except in the case of Henderson (1972), all of the suggested resources were published after RSSL had already been implemented—Ching (1977), Thonis (1976), Saville-Troike (1973 and 1976). In June of 1973 the RSSL was a working instructional system. (Henderson’s work had not been utilized since it did not differentiate between reading instruction for bilingual and monolingual students.)

Connor also states that “Current thinking has it that the teaching of reading should not wait until students become proficient in speaking English,” yet her own references seem to share another view. Ching states: “Before bilingual children can learn to read English, they must be able to understand and speak it effectively” (Ching 1977:4). Thonis refers to Spanish speakers: “If Spanish speaking pupils are to be successful, they must be provided with extended auditory opportunities in English so that they can become thoroughly at home in the sound system prior to an introduction to its visual appearance” (Thonis 1976:41). Further documentation can be found in support of teaching the spoken language first, in the work of Smith and Johnson, “. . . a Spanish—or Chinese—or Winnibago-speaking child who is to learn to read English should learn to speak and understand the language first” (Smith and Johnson 1976:275); and also as stated by Fry, “After mastering to at least some extent, spoken English, then, and only then, should the child be given reading and writing instruction in English” (Fry 1977:304).

Connor compares the RSSL with “traditional linguistic reading programs.” Yet she supplies as many reasons why the RSSL is different as she does why it is the same. It is difficult to categorize any reading system as a linguistic system or approach. Spache states that “One linguist may attack the whole word or sight method; another concentrates on criticizing popular methods of phonic instruction; while a third finds fault with both of these . . . yet all methods are called the linguistic approach” (Spache 1969:150). The RSSL is not a linguistic approach in the sense just described above but it does reflect a linguistic bias in that it is built upon the assumption that the learners govern their own language behavior, be it the spoken or the written language.

Five groups of questions were posed by Connor as important to the implementation of the reading program. Answers are given in order of her questions, below:

1. The answer to the first question can be found in the preceding paragraph, though it is not clear how a statement relating psycholinguistics to reading can benefit implementation. This is already stated in the description of the RSSL (418-20) in less theoretical terms.

2. To answer the second part of the question first: Assessment is an area that is apart from a system description and would have to be determined by the particular program project. Language proficiency was not a factor in determining participation in RSSL. The range of language competence, at the spoken level, went from no English to sufficient
English for general communication purposes. None of the children were able to read in any language.

3. The four phases of RSSL are ordered as they appear and the students progress from one phase to another when they have fully met the objectives as stated.

4. All ESL instruction is built around the RSSL, since the time given to each student is limited. As mentioned in the article, groups are usually limited to five or six students, though there may be as many as ten or twelve in the classroom at one time. One group could conceivably represent four different grade levels.

5. At the beginning there is little coordination between classroom instruction and ESL instruction in reading. Later on some coordination does take place, such as reading in the content areas.

The two tables that are represented in the article were compiled from all of the scores that were made by the children in RSSL within the time period examined. In order to facilitate the presentation of the data mean scores had to be used. This resulted in a less accurate picture of the growth shown by the students in the program, but at the same time it did help to indicate that all of the children had learned to read and that some of them had learned extremely well. This is all that was intended by their inclusion in the article.

Connor’s revision of Table 1 is inaccurate, as are her conclusions. A comparison of Connor’s Table 1 with the original will show that only 14 students in the first time group took the Level II Vocabulary Test, and only 12 took the Level II Comprehension Test. Yet, Connor has lumped together scores from Level I and II, changing the Grade mean to accommodate her revisions. The same has been done throughout the Table. (It can be noted that a comparison of the more individual raw scores tells a truer story.)

Connor’s statement that “It is worth noting, however, that the average grade level of the students goes up together with the time in the RS” is a puzzling one. Isn’t it usual that child advances in grade level with each progressing year he spends in school? Connor also states that “It is reasonable to expect that students in higher grades read better than their counterparts in lower grades.” That this is not necessarily true is shown by the raw scores made by those students in the upper grades who had only been in the reading program for a short time. The student listed fourth down in the first section of Table 1 had not been able to read at all before he entered the program. He had been in the fifth grade at the time. A year later he progressed substantially but hardly enough to feel comfortable in the sixth grade. Table 1 shows three students being beyond third grade and not being able to read before participation in the RSSL.

Though limited to such conclusions as can be drawn from an ex post facto study using instruments of measurement that were selected by school ad-
ministrators for purposes of evaluation that were different from the purposes reported here, the study has shown that the Reading System for Second Language Learners is a viable means of instruction.
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Meetings of Interest to TESOL Members


February 28-March 2, 1980. Third Los Angeles Second Language Research Forum. UCLA, Los Angeles, CA. Preregistration (by Dec. 15) is $5 for students, $10 for others. Abstracts (200 word max., 4 copies without name) plus one 3x5 card with author’s name, affiliation, and title of paper are due by Oct. 1, 1979, to Michael Long, Program Chair, at address below. For further information: Jeannine Gerbeault, L.A.S.L.R.F., English as a Second Language, UCLA, Los Angeles, CA 90024.


TESL Reporter Twelve-Year Index

Stretching back to the beginnings of the TESL movement, the TESL Reporter has reflected in its pages the full range of developments in the field. Its primary focus, however, has remained with practical matters directly helpful to the teacher in the classroom. Publication of the twelve-year index now makes available articles and reviews which have hitherto lain in back issues beyond easy reach. TESL Reporter subscribers will receive the index as their summer issue. Others who wish a copy may write to Alice C. Pack, Editor, Brigham Young University—Hawaii Campus, Laie, HI 96762.

All past issues of TR are now available through the ERIC data base.
NAFSA Call for Papers and Workshops

The Association of Teachers of English as a Second Language (ATESL) is inviting abstracts from individuals wishing to present papers or conduct workshops at the 1980 NAFSA Conference in St. Louis, Missouri, May 20-24, 1980.

Presentations may relate to any aspect of English as a Second Language at the college, university, adult or secondary school level. Papers (30 minutes with discussion) typically report on work you have completed or are doing of a theoretical or practical nature. Workshops (2 or 3 hours) should focus on practical details of ESL teaching and include demonstrations and group participation.

Before December 1, 1979 send four copies of a 200-word, typewritten abstract, one copy with your name ON and three with your name OFF to:

Paul Angelis
ATESL Chairman
Room P-235
Educational Testing Service
Princeton, New Jersey 08541

Include a letter with your complete name, title, affiliation, and telephone number. Those who have been accepted will be informed by January 31, 1980.

Fulbright-Hays Opportunities Abroad

Short-term Fulbright-Hays visiting lectureships are available to established American professionals and members of college and university faculties. The awards, six weeks to four months duration between February and September 1980, will enable the scholars to lecture in the country of assignment, with possible visits to adjacent countries. Applicants must be U.S. citizens and have postdoctoral college and university teaching experience. Grant terms include roundtrip economy class air travel for the grantee and a stipend of $60 a day plus a cost of living allowance, the total not to exceed $90 a day. For application forms and further information, write to CIES, Dept. CN, Eleven Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036 (telephone 202 833-4978).


AMERICAN REPUBLICS ( AC, AD ) Eight postdoctoral research awards, each for six months in any of the following countries: Brazil, Mexico, Spanish-speaking countries of Central and South America (except Argentina and Uruguay which offer research grants under
their own programs). Dominican Republic, Guyana, Haiti, Jamaica, Surinam, Trinidad-Tobago. Preference may be given to scholars whose projects include collaboration with colleagues in host country and who are willing to give occasional lectures in field of specialization. Applications due by June 1, 1979.

ARGENTINA (AD) LINGUISTICS & ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE Graduate seminar and undergraduate courses in general and applied linguistics, sociolinguistics, methodology, translation. Ph.D., rank of assistant professor or higher, and considerable teaching experience required. Spanish helpful but not required. Buenos Aires higher teacher training colleges and Catholic U; short seminars and lectures at other institutions. Four months from mid-March to mid-July 1980. Applications due by June 1, 1979.


BURMA (MH) Number of awards not determined. Scholars interested in Burma are invited to submit a current resume and request future information. Fields of interest in the past included ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE.

BURUNDI (LR) Two awards, Oct 1980-July 1981. Preference for applicants who have taught in developing countries and are available for two years. U Burundi, Bujumbura.

TEFL Teach English language courses at all levels to undergraduates and serve as administrator of English program and adviser to head of Language Department. Fluent French, Ph.D. in applied linguistics required.

TEFL Teach undergraduates and prepare coursework materials. Fluent French, M.A. in TEFL or foreign language teaching required.


DENMARK (WB) Alternate fields of interest, for travel-only support, include: INDO-EUROPEAN COMPARATIVE LINGUISTICS, PHONETICS, U Copenhagen; THEORETICAL LINGUISTICS, Odense U. Preference for scholars with assurance of maintenance support from other sources. Within Sept 1980-June 1981.


GREECE (CG) AMERICAN LITERATURE AND CIVILIZATION Three awards. Full or associate professors to teach fourth-year courses, others to teach introductory literature and/or English as a foreign language. Thessaloniki and Athens U. Sept 1980-June 1981.


HUNGARY (GBL) One-month lecturerships may be offered in fields including LINGUISTICS. Between Nov-Dec 1980 or Feb-May 1981.

IRELAND (WB) The U College in Dublin is offering a lecturing/research award in fields including LINGUISTICS. Graduate and undergraduate courses to be given and host institution. Oct 1980-June 1981.

ISRAEL (CG) Up to 7 awards in several preferred fields including TEFL/LINGUISTICS. Applied linguist experienced in testing and evaluation of second language teaching to guide construction of tests for measurement of English language acquisition, aid in improvement of materials, teach graduate seminar in testing and research design and other courses of own choice. Tel Aviv U. Sept 1980-June 1981.

ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE

ENGLISH LANGUAGE and LITERATURE Wide range of courses including composition, literature surveys, and advanced courses.

KOREA (MH) Teaching; research in collaboration with Korean scholars. Applications accepted in fields including LINGUISTICS. Senior or younger scholar. Within Aug 1980-July 1981. Five awards for bilingual instructors to teach English and one of the following: Russian, Japanese, Spanish, Chinese or Arabic. Candidates need not be experienced in simultaneous interpretation, but must be fluent in two languages. Hankuk U Foreign Studies, Seoul. Nine months starting Aug 1979 or March 1980.


NETHERLANDS (GS) AMERICAN AND DUTCH STUDIES Civilization, culture, society and government through history, literature, linguistics, art, art history, drama. Affiliation to be arranged; 4-5 months within Sept 1980-June 1981.

PAKISTAN (LZG) Fields of interest include TEFL or REMEDIAL ENGLISH at U Karachi. Scholars in other specializations are invited to apply. Two graduate courses per semester, specific courses to be determined by lecturer and host institution. Sept 1980-June 1981.

PERU (AC) PRESERVATION OF CULTURAL HERITAGE Scholar with teaching/collaborative research project in field that contributes to understanding Peru’s cultural heritage, including anthropology, archaeology, linguistics, museology. Good to fluent Spanish. Affiliation to depend on mutual interest. Five months beginning April or Aug 1980. Applications due by June 1, 1979.


ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE Two awards for younger scholars for Technical U, Wroclaw and Higher School of Pedagogy, Bydgoszcz. Teaching of English to students at all levels. For Wroclaw, background in scientific English desirable.

LINGUISTICS Six awards in either theoretical linguistics (specialization in phonetics, syntax, or semantics) or applied linguistics (TEFL methodology, psycholinguistics, or sociolinguistics). U Warsaw, Poznan, Lodz, Lublin, Sosnowiec.

ROMANIA (GBL) Ten lecturing awards in fields including those listed below; up to seven research awards in any field. Sept 1980-June 1981. Awards in other fields may become available. Scholars interested in Romania are invited to inquire, indicating specialization and background.

LINGUISTICS Any area, including: phonology, syntax, semantics; psycholinguistics; sociolinguistics. Background in Romance languages helpful but not mandatory. Universities in Bucharest and Cluj.

TEACHING OF ENGLISH Four/five awards; teach English at all levels. U Constanta, Galati, Pitești, Sibiu, and possibly Timisoara.


SOMALIA (LR) ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE Courses to faculty, staff and special students; advice on curriculum development of Faculty of Modern Language expected to get underway in about a year. M.A. or Ph.D. required. Scholar with teaching experience in a developing country preferred. National U Somalia, Mogadishu.

SWEDEN (WB) SWEDISH STUDIES Up to 3 travel-only awards for lecturing and research in the study of cultural, economic, political and social aspects of Swedish society. Sept 1980-June 1981.


U.S.S.R. (WJ) Below are listed interests expressed by Soviet institutions, which are willing to consider any specialist within the discipline. Scholars interested in teaching in the U.S.S.R. are invited to inquire about opportunities, indicating specialization and background. Research awards not available.


TEACHING OF ENGLISH Nine junior awards to teach English. U Nis, Novi Sad, Pristina, Sarajevo, Skopje, Banja Luka, U Osijek Pedagogical Faculty U Titograd Tech Faculty.

YUGOSLAV STUDIES RESEARCH Three or more research awards in any field of Yugoslav studies including LINGUISTICS. Scholars interested in lecturing in Yugoslavia are also invited to inquire indicating background and specialization. Three months or longer.

Publications Received


FL Nebraska. Spring, 1979. Nebraska Foreign Language Association, affiliated with the Nebraska State Education Association.


PUBLICATIONS AVAILABLE FROM THE TESOL CENTRAL OFFICE

Reference Guides . . .


Other TESOL Publications . . .

On TESOL 78: EFL Policies, Programs, Practices. Charles Blatchford and Jacquelyn Schachter, eds. Selected papers from the Twelfth Annual TESOL Convention in Mexico City. TESOL, 1978. 264 pp. Paper. $7.00 to TESOL members, $8.00 to nonmembers.


Classroom Practices in Adult ESL. Donna Illyin and Thomas Tragarth, eds. TESOL, 1978. 209 pp. $4.00 to TESOL members, $4.50 to nonmembers.


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. $1.75 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.

Program of the Eleventh Annual TESOL Convention, April 26–May 1, 1977, Miami Beach. Contains 112 abstracts of papers presented at the convention. 226 pp. Paper. $2.00 to TESOL members, $2.50 to nonmembers.

Program of the Twelfth Annual TESOL Convention, April 4–9, 1978, Mexico City. Contains 241 abstracts. 259 pp. Paper. $2.00 to TESOL members, $2.50 to nonmembers.

From Other Publishers . . .


Back Issues of the TESOL QUARTERLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Issue Numbers</th>
<th>Price per Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Vol. 1</td>
<td>#4</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Vol. 2</td>
<td>#1,2,3,4</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Vol. 3</td>
<td>#1,2,4</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Vol. 4</td>
<td>#2,4</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Vol. 5</td>
<td>#1,3,4</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Vol. 6</td>
<td>#1,3,4</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Vol. 7</td>
<td>#1,2,3,4</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Vol. 8</td>
<td>#1,2,3,4</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Vol. 9</td>
<td>#1,2,3,4</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Vol.10</td>
<td>#1,2,3,4</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Vol.11</td>
<td>#1,2,4</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Vol.12</td>
<td>#1,2,3,4</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$93.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TESOL Newsletter: The complete set of Volume 12 (5 issues for 1978) available for $2.00 prepaid.

There is no charge for single copies of the following:

1. TESOL Statement on statewide programs of competency testing
3. Guidelines for the certification and preparation of teachers of ESOL in the United States
4. Guidelines for selecting English language training programs
5. Guidelines: English language proficiency
NOTHING LIKE IT!!

Ever wanted a handy guide to our ESL texts? One that lists ESL material by level (from beginning to advanced) — including TOEFL equivalents — and by content (vocabulary, structure, composition, etc.)?

IT'S READY AND WAITING FOR YOU!!

NEWBURY HOUSE'S GUIDE TO ESL MATERIALS includes all Newbury House ESL texts, readers, and tests, and grades them according to the Newbury House Linguistic Grading Scheme, with TOEFL equivalents!

Simply complete the form below and mail it to us. We'll immediately send you a copy of our new 1979-80 Newbury House Catalog containing the Guide to ESL Materials. If you already have our new 1979-80 catalog, you'll find the Guide on pages 2 and 3. Write and tell us what you think of it.

NOTHING LIKE IT!!

Please rush one copy of Newbury House's Catalog with the Guide to ESL Materials to:

Name______________________________
Address_____________________________
City_______________________________
State________________ Zip___________

80-2-TQ

Are you on our mailing list? Yes☐ No☐

NEWBURY HOUSE PUBLISHERS, Inc.
Rowley, Massachusetts 01969

Avoid cutting these pages, please. Photocopy the label(s), and mail to:
Newbury House Publishers, Inc., Rowley, Massachusetts 01969
What's new?

NEWBURY HOUSE READERS FOR EXTENSIVE AND INTENSIVE STUDY

An illustrated series which provides vocabulary, reading, and grammar practice on six progressive stages of difficulty. EXTENSIVE READERS emphasize reading for pleasure (while acquiring language skills). INTENSIVE READERS emphasize building upon existing reading skills.

EXTENSIVE READERS

Stage 1: □ The Nightmare, by Leslie Dunkling. $1.80.
Stage 2: □ Darkness by the River, by Lewis Jones. $1.95. □ New York!, by Warner Hutchinson. $1.95. □ The Tiger with the Bright Blue Eyes and Other Stories, by Lewis Jones. $1.95
Stage 3: □ Portraits of Americans, by Lewis Jones. $1.95. □ Call of the Wild, adapted by Mitsu Yamamoto. $1.95.
□ Murder in the Language Lab, by M. L. Allen. $1.95. □ Superstars of Sports, by William Folprecht and Diane Lefer. $1.95.
Stage 4: □ Great Ideas, by Martha B. Ardif and Eileen Seaward. $2.80.

INTENSIVE READERS

Stage 3: □ Bridges to Fear, by Mitsu Yamamoto. $2.50. □ Soap and Water, by Linda Bosson. $2.95.
Stage 4: □ The Danger Light, by Brian Harrison. $4.95.
Stage 6: □ Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness, by Mary Ann Kearny and James Baker. $4.95.

LANGUAGE SCIENCE
LANGUAGE TEACHING
LANGUAGE LEARNING

NEWBURY HOUSE PUBLISHERS, Inc.
Rowley, Massachusetts 01969
Jazz Chants for Children

CAROLYN GRAHAM, American Language Institute, New York University. This collection of chants, poems, and songs uses children's affinity for rhyming games and rhythm to teach them the structures and intonation of conversational American English. With the aid of delightfully illustrated picture activities, Jazz Chants for Children teaches prereading skills as well. The program uses situations familiar to children—such as asking permission of adults and dealing with peers—in order to encourage emotional expression and effectively present American children's culture. All the chants, songs, and poems are recorded on a one-hour cassette. A Teacher's Edition provides detailed presentation notes as well as the reduced student pages.

Oxford Picture Dictionary of American English

Three Editions: Monolingual English • English/Spanish • English/French Index

E.C. PARNEWELL, Spanish Linguistic Consultants: MIGDALIA ROMERO DE ORTIZ, EFRAIN BARRERA, EDUARDO ORDONÈZ, and RICARDO OTHEGUY. "One of the finest picture dictionaries of American English I have seen in recent years. It is done with a professional integrity not often seen. Oxford University Press must be congratulated for its fine effort and commitment in continuing to provide leadership in bilingual education." — Gilbert Sanchez, New York University Program in Bilingual Education

In the West and Northwest, contact Ms. Connie Attanasio at 830 Warren Avenue, Venice, Cal. 90291. (213) 396-8724.
Oxford University Press 200 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10016