TESOL QUARTERLY

Table of Contents

To print, select PDF page
nos. in parentheses

TESOL QUARTERLY

A Journal for Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages

Editor

BETTY WALLACE ROBINETT
Ball State University
Muncie, Indiana

Editorial Advisory Board

Challenge to the Profession *

Harold B. Allen

Most of us have traveled a good deal, I suspect, many in foreign countries. We have known in some measure what is called cultural shock and have struggled with the hardship of the sounds and forms of another language. If so, you can more easily imagine with me now the almost unbelievable saga of Charles Wayo as related in the February issue of *Ebony.*

Five years ago Charles Wayo, then only fourteen and known by his tribal name of Kofi Akakpo in the Hausa village of Ghana where he lived, found in a trash pile a torn and dirty copy of *Ebony.* Unable to read it, he still found in its pictures a land where black people live like the white people he had seen—in good houses, with good clothing, and with automobiles and material things he had never even dreamed of. A fierce ambition arose in him—to go to that land and get such an education that he could return to his own people and help them to live in the same way.

In the little school where he worked as janitor, he saw English words and sentences on the blackboards. To the little English that he had acquired in school, he now added more. He memorized what he found on the boards

before cleaning them. In *Ebony* he found a letter from an American service man. Now that he had learned enough so that he felt he could write a letter, he wrote to this man, Captain Charles W. Simmons, stationed in Ankara, Turkey.

When he wrote the letter about himself and his ambition to Captain Simmons, he signed himself Charles Wayo, taking the captain's own given name and adding his native word for "intelligent person."

Captain Simmons' interest was aroused by this unexpected communication, and a correspondence followed. But this was not enough for Charles. He knew that now, more than ever before, he had to get to America, and he figured that somehow he would have to find the captain first. He studied a map of Africa and decided that, although he had no money for transportation, he could reach Ankara on his two legs—and this amazing child simply determined that he would walk to Turkey. Barefoot, with no food but two loaves of bread and one pound of onions, with no clothing except shirt and shorts, and with a map from a filling station in Aura, he started out on January 1, 1964. The first day he made forty-five miles, and the next day nearly as much. He began a journal of his travel. He found people from other tribes whose language he could not speak but who gave him food and water. At length he crossed the border into Nigeria, and found refuge for a while with a Nigerian family that wanted him to remain with them. But

he had to go on. By now it seemed that his best route was not eastward to the Sudan and through Egypt but northward to Algeria and along the Mediterranean. So this lad actually set out to cross the Sahara desert alone and on foot. His feet were scratched and torn from rocks; his body suffered from infection; several times he was seriously ill. You yourself will have to read that narrative to learn the details of his well-nigh miraculous journey: the escapes from death by snakes and thirst and starvation; the help extended by a Muslim family in a mid-Sahara oasis; the truck tide offered by French soldiers who dropped him off when he refused homosexual relations; and the ultimate arrival in Algiers. Months had passed by now, and he was prepared for many new experiences. But when he managed to go to Spain by hiding among some barrels on a ferry from Tangier in Morocco, he was shocked when for the first time he saw poor Europeans, and he was angered when a Spanish beggar asked him for money—angered because he felt that the white people in Ghana had been living a lie in giving the impression that they were superior. He saw now that in the world both blacks and whites were both rich and poor; and his desire to do something for his people grew even stronger. Walking and hitch-hiking, without a passport and without money, secreted in a farmer's cart so that he could pass the border into Italy, he made his way across France and into Greece and Yugoslavia and—at last—Turkey. More than two and one half years after he had left his village, he reached the U.S. air base in Ankara. There his search ended; he found Captain Sim-

mons. "Why, you're Charles Wayo." And, as the wonder of this boy's pilgrimage suddenly overwhelmed him, he could only exclaim, "Well, I'll be damned. I'll just be damned." The wonder of it amazed others, too; and through the help of Captain Simmons and his friends, Charles is now a student at Father Flanagan's famous Boys' Town in Kansas preparing for an American college where he can get the training that will enable him to return to Ghana to help his people.

Now, Charles Wayo's usefulness to his people will result from his becoming familiar with the ideas and things and ways of another culture through its language—English. Though photographs first awoke the curiosity of this bright young man, it was not until he had some acquaintance with English that he was able to write to Captain Simmons. It will be through English that his life and that of his people, I hope, will be enriched.

Learning English is more than acquiring control of English phonemic patterns, more than learning the morphemic permutations and the syntactic complexity of our language. It is also something about the cultural complex that underlies and accompanies our language.

If we are meeting our high obligation as teachers of English to speakers of other languages, then, we are doing more than teaching the sounds and the words and the structures of English. We are teaching control of these specifics within the frame of reference of the humanistic tradition of the English-speaking peoples. This, indeed, is our obligation—to add to the student's familiarity with one language and one culture some familiarity

with another language and another culture. And though we may never evoke so dramatic an effect as English has already had upon the life of Charles Wayo, we can be certain that we will be making life richer and finer and happier for many of our students. For them, in their own generation, we can make it possible to grow and to advance in the dominant culture without the handicap and the heartache of the non-English immigrants who flooded into the United States for nearly a century of our country's rapid growth.

It is true, as Wallace Lambert has pointed out, that some foreign accents are sometimes acceptable in certain situations. I confess being delighted with the lilt in the speech of a Dutch stewardess on a KLM flight to Amsterdam. Greta Garbo, the Gabor sisters, and Maurice Chevalier are not the only motion picture stars to capitalize upon this kind of attraction. But they are exceptions. The life story of many a first-generation immigrant would include a description of the ridicule and rejection that greeted him because of his speech, his foreign accent. A whole category of American humor is based upon the foreign accents of Swedish and Yiddish and German and other immigrants considered at least laughable if not absurd and inferior. Inability to understand what was heard or to read what was available, inability to speak or to write easily in the new language— these were handicaps that often sharply restricted the social and the occupational opportunities of these new Americans. Frequently it was a major cause for their preferring to live with their own kind in tight little ur-

ban or rural communities.

We can certainly look with pride upon the ultimate effect of the great melting-pot, and the world can look with amazement at this nation that has absorbed millions of speakers of German and Italian and Greek and Polish and French and Swedish and Danish and Norwegian and Czech, whose descendants now speak American English as if they had an Anglo-Saxon ancestry. But the first and sometimes the second generations of these newcomers would not have suffered from this language handicap had they been able to profit by what is known today about teaching English as a second language.

We now have the responsibility of drawing upon that knowledge in order to prevent the frustrations imposed by the language handicap upon the present generation of non-English speaking residents. There is no sound reason today for their being subject to that handicap. We have the job of helping them to gain a second language that will make easier the opening of social and occupational doors and hence enrich their lives and the life of their communities.

At this moment I have not been thinking of teaching English to peoples in other lands, although that is certainly a large part of the job—a critical part of it. Nor at this moment have I been thinking of teaching English to the foreign students who for a few years are in our schools and colleges, although that, too, is part of our job. Rather at this moment I am thinking of those hundreds of thousands of people, some of them Americans with a much better claim to that designation than you and I have,

whose lives are frustrated and restricted because they do not control the dominant language of their country.

Yet, although each of us must work in his own particular place, we as a profession cannot ignore that tripartite nature of our responsibility. The teacher of elementary children in El Paso today may be working in a school in Nigeria tomorrow. The teacher of English to foreign students at the University of Ilinois may have just arrived after a two-year stint in Tanzania. It is essentially one job— that of teaching English, the language and its culture, to speakers of other languages, regardless of how old they are or where they live. It is a job that calls for teachers who can give more of themselves than other people usually do. It calls for something we call dedication and commitment.

Of course, not all persons teaching English as a second language have such a commitment. Plenty of Americans abroad are teaching English because it is a way to make a little money. Nearly two years ago, my daughter and son-in-law took positions teaching English in a private language school in Spain. Idealistic about their work, they entered upon it with vast enthusiasm. Disillusionment came swiftly when they discovered that the school was essentially a money-making operation and that neither the management nor the other teachers cared about whether they were actually teaching English. Certainly there are teachers in this country with equal lack of commitment. Yet, commitment is what I would first check in looking for the good teacher of English as a second language—such commitment as I have found in a

volunteer Junior League teacher in New York city, a teacher in a BIA school in Arizona, a teacher in a public school in New Mexico, and another in a university in Utah.

But commitment is not enough. Idealism and good will are not enough. I have seen committed teachers do egregiously wrong things in the classroom, and I have heard them make palpably unsound statements about the English language. No, the teaching of a second language is a professional skill requiring professional training and competence in linguistics and in methods and in materials. The teaching of English as a second language calls for special preparation in the field of English—in language and composition and literature. The TENES survey completed a year ago revealed how grossly inadequate is such preparation on the part of most of the teachers now engaged in teaching English to speakers of other languages, especially in the critical primary grades.

On a national scale the problems cannot be met by one person's saying to himself, "I'm going to get some professional training next summer." They are too large and complex for any such individual solution, dedicated though the individual may be.

Recognition of this fact led to the creation of TESOL one year ago. Useful as had been the *ad hoc* conferences planned by a committee representing the five interested organizations, no such conferences can really do all that needs to be done. The situation clearly demanded the development of an independent professional organization primarily concerned with the teaching of English to speakers of

other languages. It would have to be an organization for all teachers having that concern, and it would have to be an organization for action. TESOL is that organization.

This first year has been a good year. At its inception, TESOL was blessed with a small treasury inherited from the three *ad hoc* TESOL conferences. This made it possible to distribute one newsletter and to lay plans for its continuance, to publish the proceedings of the New York conference last spring, and to get our own professional journal under way. As editor the executive committee was fortunate to obtain Betty Wallace Robinett of Ball State University.

The initial nestegg also enabled the executive committee to search for a part-time executive secretary. Through the intermediation of our first vice-president, Robert Lado, we were able to enlist the services of James E. Alatis, just as he was leaving the U.S. Office of Education to become Associate Dean at Georgetown University. Since last September, he has been able to establish office procedures, develop a mailing list of more than 5,000 names, and lay a foundation for the growth of TESOL.

The most recent appointment of the executive committee is that of Alfred Aarons as editor of the newsletter. He brings to the position long experience as the able editor of the *Florida FL Newsletter* and deep concern with the teaching of English to non-English speakers. He and Mrs. Aarons acomplished a small miracle in getting his excellent first issue out in time for the Miami convention.

The two other major individual contributions to the year's work have been those of the first vice-president and the local chairman. As first vice-president, David Harris was constitutionally charged with the responsibility of planning the convention you are attending. Those who have attended can appreciate the excellence of the program, but unless you yourself have had the task of planning one and getting the speakers for the various assignments, you cannot fully appreciate the amount of preparation behind the program. Fate twice wished such a job on me, once for CCCC and once for NCTE; and you must believe me when I say that out of this experience, I can express the deepest appreciation for the fine work of Dave Harris and his cooperating committee. The local chairman of the 1967 TESOL Convention, Paul Ball, charged with what is probably the most thankless job of all, very capably set up the smoothly running machinery which made it possible for the program to function.

Two other events can be mentioned. One was that, with William Slager, chairman of the English association in NAFSA, I called upon Harold Howe, U.S. Commissioner of Education, to present the executive committee's resolution asking for a full time person in ESL to be attached to his own staff and not to a particular elementary, secondary, or college division. The other is that, with the financial support of the Center for Applied Linguistics, certain members of your executive committee and certain members of the NAFSA group met in Washington last fall to discuss areas of mutual concern and cooperation. The meeting was, I should say, successful beyond our expectations.

All this activity this year, and much

else that I will not now detail, is only a forecast of what TESOL will be doing, with your help, next year and in the years to come. A glimpse of that future I suggested in three talks this past year, one to the Arizona Bilingual Council after a day of visiting Indian reservations, one to the South Dakota Federation of Modern Language Teachers, and one last month to the Alaska Council of Teachers of English in Anchorage. In those talks I estimated the 1970 membership of TESOL as about 5,000. Here are some of the things we can look forward to if you help get 4,000 other teachers to join your professional association. Most of these points were described in greater detail in the March, 1967 issue of the *TESOL Quarterly.*

First, a membership that large will insure for the organization itself these provisions already begun or about to begin:

1. A central office, with a TESOL library that can serve as a repository of TESL textbooks and reports and other materials and hence will be a clearing-house for the profession.
2. A quarterly journal devoted exclusively to matters of interest to teachers of English to speakers of other languages.
3. A newsletter reporting all kinds of events relevant to the TESL field.
4. A national register of competent TESL personnel.
5. A publishing program offering pamphlets, special studies, and other materials regular publishers would be unlikely to prepare.
6. A speaking and consulting program.
7. A national convention each year.
8. A planned program of co-sponsored local and regional meetings, perhaps with the support of future affiliate organizations.
9. Official organizational cooperation

in any and all kinds of relevant meetings, studies, research, and other activity, especially with the five original organizations sponsoring the *ad hoc* conferences, as well as with the U.S. Office of Education.

Then, second, I see the influence of TESOL helping to bring about the following:

1. Appointment of a TESL specialist in the U.S. Office of Education.
2. Appointment of a TESL specialist as an English-as-a-second-language consultant in the department of education of every state where the TESL problem exists.
3. Appointment of at least one TESL specialist as a consultant in the board of education in every major city where the TESL problem exists.
4. Additional recognition by each relevant school administration in terms of the time and materials and other resources necessary because of the special needs of teaching English as a second language.
5. Establishment of guidelines for the preparation and perhaps ultimately the certification of teachers of English as a second language.
6. Increased research in the special pedagogy of foreign-language learning and teaching, especially with relevance to English.
7. Establishment of guidelines for the evaluation of TESL materials of all kinds, printed as well as audio-visual.

These action specifics by no means constitute the whole picture of the future, but they point to much of it. It is a future in which we who have TESL concerns will become increasingly proud of our profession as it becomes a profession to more and more persons now engaged in it. But it is a future that will not come about without your support. This is a membership organization. It will produce

positive action only if it has many members, for in its active members will lie its strength and its leadership. You have already revealed your commitment by coming here to this convention. I urge you now to demonstrate that commitment further by talking about TESOL to fellow teachers and administrators and enlisting them as TESOL members.

Only as increased professional competence is developed among all who teach English to our speakers of other languages, will those speakers be able to move more readily into the fullness of the English-speaking culture. Only as this organization grows in size and prestige can it support such competent teachers through working with administrative officials in city, state and federal agencies.

The future of TESOL—indeed, the future of the profession—is in your hands.

The Promises and Limitations
of the Newest Type of Grammatical Analysis [1]

Archibald A. Hill

I. MAINLY PROMISES

There can be no doubt that the nineteenth and twentieth centuries have been more exciting to students of linguistics than all those that came before, nor can there be much doubt that the two centuries, linguistically speaking, are much alike. The linguists of the nineteenth century felt that their discovery of the systematic quality of change in sound made a revolution in language study, and that when they talked of "the laws of sound change" they were making statements as important and as fruitful as many of those in the natural sciences of their day. It was less fortunate, perhaps, that their insistence on absence of exception in "laws of sound change" was set up as a dogma used by them as a mark of orthodoxy.

Our own century also has resulted in discoveries, and in dogmas, so that one could describe our era as like the one preceding, but with all bids doubled and redoubled. If we confine ourselves to American activity alone, there have been two major revolutions, and many others which approach the major. The first of these revolutions appeared in the 1930's in response to an epochmaking book, *Language,* by Leonard Bloomfield.[2] Bloomfield and his followers created the school now known as structuralism. Its major insight, I believe, was the realization of the importance of contrasts. Thus one of Bloomfield's most famous articles starts out with the statement that in language, some things are the same, and some are different.[3] The things which are different are the contrasts, set in a framework of things which are the same. Almost the whole of the Bloomfieldian position follows from this statement; as one goes on identifying "sames" and "different," one draws a map of the total structure of language. The Bloomfieldian maps were based on language behavior, and were thus severely positivist and anti-mentalist.

Structuralism had remarkable success, particularly in phonology. Thus for instance, I once had occasion to work with both a pre-structural phonetic transcription of Cherokee, and a structural description in terms of con-

Mr. Hill, professor of English and linguistics at the University of Texas and secretary of the Linguistic Society of America, is the author of *Introduction to Linguistic Structures* (Harcourt Brace, 1958) and *Oral Approach to English* (English Language Education Committee, Tokyo, 1965).

[2] *Language* (New York, 1933).

[3] "A Set of Postulates for the Science of Language," *Language,* II (1926), p. 154.

trasts.[4] I never succeeded in identifying any of the forms in the prestructural transcription with forms as written by the Cherokees themselves. The structural descriptions were readily identifiable. Structural phonology gave great simplification and great clarity, but brought with it, however, a complex and unfamiliar terminology. Classes of contrasting sounds, such as the vowels of *met* and *mat* were called phonemes, and non-contrasting sounds such as the slight nasalization brought about in *mat* by the initial consonant, and necessarily absent in *pat* where there is no nasal consonant, were spoken of as allophones. Unfortunately, use of these terms in an approved fashion came to be a mark of orthodoxy, and much ink was spilled in repelling heresies. Nor were the structuralists always ingratiating in argument. Bloomfield's thumbnail review of Ogden and Richards' work, *The Meaning of Meaning,* was devastating.[5] Ogden and Richards set up the semantic situation as a triangle, a hen, say, as the outside stimulus, giving rise to a mental concept, and this in turn to an audible word, each forming one angle of the triangle. Such a mentalist picture was anathema to the great positivist, and he demolished it neatly by pointing out that such a triangle gave no notion of how a man might talk about hens when none were immediately present. The positivist attitude also appeared in conversations. This was the era when if someone said that "lousy" was an ugly sound, there was always an irritating linguist around to ask "How do you know?" and after the usual answers had been given, to point out that the word was ugly only by association with an ugly insect, which by any other name would smell no more sweet.

Yet in spite of the successes of structuralism, there were signs of weakness. Thus structuralists agreed on the importance of contrasts, but never on what the contrasts were. The number of basic vowel phonemes was given sometimes as nine, sometimes as ten, sometimes as six. Sometimes the sum total of vowels and diphthongs was given as thirty-six, sometimes as only fourteen. Some contrasts were explained as differences in length, or as differences in quality, or as differences between simple sounds and combinations, And finally, no agreement was ever reached on whether pairs like *its wings* and *it swings* were or were not different, and if so what the difference was.

More important, perhaps, was the disagreement between the group that followed George Trager, and those who followed Kenneth Pike. Recognizing that in all languages there are but a limited number of phonemes which combine into a larger number of morphemes and words, and that the words combine into an infinite number of sentences, the Tragerians always began their descriptions with phonemes, and ended with sentences. The Pike school insisted that the student begin with the sentence, and work downward to the smaller units. The dispute is capable of being resolved, since the Tragerians are right that description can be more economically handled by giving the smaller units first, and the followers of Pike are right in that anal-

[4] Cf. my "A Note on Primitive Languages," *IJAL,* XVIII (1952), 172-77.

[5] "On Recent Work in General Linguistics," *Modern Philology,* XXV (1927-28), p. 214.

ysis must proceed from sentences, since these are the forms in which language is presented. This was roughly the state of linguistics in 1958, the year of the appearance of Noam Chomsky's manifesto, *Syntactic Structures.* [6] There had been intimations of a coming revolution before, particularly in a talk before the Linguistic Society of America by Zellig Harris, [7] but for most the appearance of Chomsky as a major linguist must have been as startlingly complete as the birth of Athena.

What is this newest linguistics, newer than that linguistics which our schools call the new linguistics? Perhaps its most general tenet is that every adult has a set of rules which he uses to combine simple, underlying and internal structures into an infinite number of sentences, unlimited in their number and complexity. The adult hearer, also, is provided with some sort of recognition process which enables him to recognize the structure of the sentences he hears. The process of combining structures into more complex structures is known as transformation, and has given one of the names by which the school is known. The process of understanding is thought to be closely similar to that of production, since the hearer is believed to start internal, silent speech as soon as he begins listening, and in doing so, to use the usual transformational processes. When a match between internal sentence and incoming sentence is achieved, understanding is reached. Let me say at once that I think these main tenets are indisputable, and that

_____

[6] *Janua Linguarum,* series minor, 4 (1957).
[7] "Transformation in Linguistic Structure," Dec. 29, 1955.

they have had a tremendous impact on linguistics. Both traditional grammar and structural linguistics found it necessary to work with presented sentences, thus reducing analysis to a kind of parsing. The reduction is what led Charles Hockett to speak of such analyses as "marble slab linguistics," since it required that a piece of utterance be caught and dissected like a cadaver. The taunt, though there is one which is an answer, is justified enough. At a blow, the new notion of hearer as speaker, made of language something dynamic, in which process is important, and in which sentences can be predicted. The linguist no longer needs to catch his sentence and spread it out on the slab.

A second tenet of transformational theory is that the goal of linguistics should not be to create a "discovery procedure" for laying bare the structure of all languages. When this statement is meant as a criticism of previous linguistic activity, however, it must be accepted with some reservation, since I am not at all sure that linguistics of the thirties and forties strove for an automatic and mechanical procedure, guaranteeing discovery. It would seem to me that most of us were interested at the most in a "search procedure" and that we would have regarded a super Donderbeck's machine for grinding out structure as proof of the triviality of our science. On this statement I may be wrong, and in any event the transformationalist warning is a wise one, since all sciences are essentially criteria for the judging of competing theories, rather than theories themselves. Linguistics should judge between competing grammars, so that as they are criticized, they be-

come continuously better. Moreover, transformational theory has provided the criterion needed. It is based on the belief that every native speaker has a set of rules which enable him to produce an infinite number of sentences and which also inhibit the production of pseudo-sentences which are not acceptable. Thus the native-speaker grammar is the set of rules for producing sentences and rejecting ungrammatical sentences. Linguist's grammars are the description of these rules. Both types of grammar cover or "generate" sentences and sentence types, though generate in this sentence does not mean that a grammar is a machine for making sentences. On this basis, then, a perfect grammar must generate all and only the grammatical sentences of the language for which it is written.

The results of this criterion are somewhat surprising. The best grammars turn out to be the great compilations of the traditional type, those of Jespersen, Poutsma, and Kruisinga. All were based on large corpora, and provide for a large number of sentences. Yet all these works remain basically "marble slab" grammars, and generate sentences outside their corpora only by accident. They are also not very consistent, since many decisions are left to the reader's judgment, giving room for variation. Also, since they are very long indeed, they can hardly be very simple. One reason why with all their faults these pre-Bloomfieldian grammars are better than the productions of structuralists is that structuralists largely confined themselves to discussing how to write grammars, illustrating their discussions with partial specimens. In this, transforma-tionalists are now repeating earlier history, since discussion of how to write grammars is now very lively indeed. The development of criteria of judgment is, however, a very great achievement and springs quite naturally from the dynamic approach to language. Native speaker's grammar as a set of rules can be said to predict all possible sentences from the time the rules are learned. The ancient criterion of completeness is thus made to mean grammatical completeness, and together with the other traditional criteria of consistency and simplicity made up revitalized tools.

In striving for consistency the transformationalists make effective use of formulaic statements of the conditions under which a rule applies, statements which are sufficiently rigorous so as to force the grammarian to apply the rule each time the conditions recur. The rules often take the form

$$AYB \longrightarrow AZB.$$

That is, when the environment consists of a preceding A and a following B, Y becomes Z. Formulae have several consequences. For the skillful user they give rigor and consistency. For the outsider they are repellent, and have at best only the doubtful value of a *pons asinorum.* They may also, if the user is unskillful, be elaborated only for their own sakes. All three results have certainly already occurred, though increase in precision has been the main one. It should not be thought, however, that use of formulaic statement is the property of transformationalists alone, since many schools of linguistics have employed it. The particular virtue of Chomskyan formulae is that they are employed as

a thought-out part and tool in a unified approach to language. They are a part of a unified approach also in that they are looked upon merely as more precise statements of the unexpressed knowledge the layman already has. The unexpressed knowledge is called by the transformationalists intuition, though this is not the only entity called by that term in their vocabulary. The term and the importance attached to it represent a violent break with Bloomfieldian tradition, since for Bloomfieldians to say that a position was intuitive meant that it was probably wrong. For Chomskyans it means that it is probably right, but in need of replacement by an explicit statement. The great grammars of the past are then good because they most nearly agree with the native speaker's intuition. Structural grammars can be called bad or counter-intuitive. One profitable result is that respect for the older tradition has been greatly increased, even for such distant works as the Port Royal Grammar which Chomsky has found parallel to many of his ideas.[8]

A final tenet of transformational grammarians, never quite explicitly stated, is that the basic items of which the language is made up are the morphemes (though they no longer use the word) which are the meaningful elements of communication. In accord with this view, sentences are described in inverted tree-diagrams, very like the familiar diagrams of our school days, and which more and more precisely specify the sentence elements. Typically a tree begins with

Sentence is to be rewritten as
Noun Phrase plus Verb Phrase
$$S \longrightarrow NP + VP$$

Noun Phrase is to be rewritten as
Determiner plus Noun
$$NP \longrightarrow D + N$$

Verb Phrase is to be rewritten as
Verb plus Noun
$$VP \longrightarrow Vb + N$$

until at last a "string" of morphemes is uniquely specified by abstract, written designations. Thereafter, this "terminal string" is converted by a set of rules into the audible sounds we produce while speaking. There are, I think, many ways in which this view of phonology as a sort of pronouncing dictionary,[9] can be useful. It fits very well with traditional English-teaching attitudes, since the abstractly noted string can be translated into writing quite as well as into speech, and will therefore appeal to teachers who have been repelled by structuralist insistence that before analyzing sentences it is necessary to learn both phonetics and phonemics. Yet as will be shown later, this attitude toward phonology is one of the sharply controversial issues today.

If I now try to summarize some of the reasons why transformational analysis deserves the name of a major linguistic revolution, I can begin by saying that its admirable unity and completeness shows a way in which grammars can (at least ideally) be written for the whole of a language. Previously we have always managed to get stuck in phonology, or if we

---

8 *Current Issues in Linguistic Theory. Janua Linguarum, series* minor, 38 (1964), p. 15.

9 Cf. L. M. Myers, "Two Approaches to Language," *PMLA,* LXXVII, No. 4, pt. 2, (September 1962), p. 8.

were lucky, half-way into morphology. It is now possible to make complete, precise, and admirably economical statements about syntax, something which before we had no more than fumbled at. For instance, we now see that it is possible to put a firm base under syntactic classes of words without reference to non-linguistic meaning, the bugaboo which had frightened us away from syntax. I can illustrate what I mean by a simple example. School grammars used to divide nouns into animate and inanimate classes according to what was designated, as with animate *soldier,* and inanimate *table.* Since structuralists objected to the circularity of making meaning both tool and end of analysis, structural grammars did not make use of the animate and inanimate distinction. Yet we now see that it is possible to set up operations which are applicable to one set of nouns, but not the other. No reference is made to meaning, and the only test is whether the operation produces a grammatical sentence or does not. There is a class of nouns which can act as either subject or object in sentences which contain verbs like *astonish, terrify, puzzle.*

The soldier puzzled the dog, OR the dog puzzled the soldier.
John astonished his wife, OR, his wife astonished John.

There is a second class of nouns which can stand only as the subjects, not the objects of these verbs. As a result, these sentences are not reversible.

The rock astonished the soldier.
The painting frightened my wife.

We have no real hesitation in rejecting such a form as * "The soldier astonished the rock," even though we might accept it in a fairy story. Yet we can construct the sentence "The chair astonished John" and reverse it to "John astonished the chair." I believe we would all agree that if "chair" in the first sentence is the same as in "John sat in the chair," then "chair" in the second sentence is a different "chair," probably that in "the chair called for order." With the two *chairs* we have settled a question of identity by syntactic habit and the test of acceptability, not by reference to meaning. Such present-day tests, as transformationalists are quick to point out, are, ironically enough, vindications of the Bloomfieldian position.

Further, such syntactic tests and operations will greatly benefit such areas of linguistics as lexicography, in that there will be a basis on which to write dictionary entries. How many should there be for *chair,* for instance? At least two, one animate, the other inanimate.[10] Complete syntactic study should make dictionary entries systematic as none are at present.

Language teaching has already profited from the appearance of transformational analysis. It is possible to present a great part of the structure of the target language as a series of processes by which a starting sentence is transformed. Such a view is certainly a vulgarization of the basic theory of sentence relations, but a useful and I believe, a harmless one. Suppose we start with

---

[10] Labels like *animate* and *inanimate* are, of course, linguistically based and so are not in exact accord with the divisions of the outside world. *Amoeba* is animate in reality, but since for me at least *"John astonished the amoeba" is impossible, *amoeba* is linguistically inanimate.

Standard Oil sells gasoline.

Without taking account of differences in tense and number, this can be varied to

Gasoline is sold by Standard Oil and Standard Oil doesn't sell gasoline or   Gasoline isn't sold by Standard Oil.

For anyone who bothers to count, the number of sentences that can be built up in this way is astonishing, and it is clear that operational and transformational drills can teach a lot of English in a short time.

Composition classes can profit, since transformational explanations and drills can certainly bean aid in acquisition of conscious control of sentence patterns. In literature classes, the effects have already been felt, and teachers are beginning to use such terms as "poetic deviance," "embedding," and "concatenation."

Perhaps the most wide-reaching result is statable by merely describing the goal of a fully developed transformational analysis. If the transformationalists' picture of the native-speaker grammar is accepted, then the most important characteristic of the human child is that he is born with the capability of constructing such a grammar for himself, with remarkable efficiency and with remarkable closeness to the other grammars of his community. To study the acquisition of native-speaker grammar is the long-range goal of transformational analysis, and it is certain that to achieve such an understanding would be no less than to achieve understanding of the nature of man himself.

II. MAINLY LIMITATIONS

The current prestige of transformational analysis is very great indeed, so great that criticism of any of its tenets or techniques is fraught with some peril. Yet the experience of structuralists a generation ago indicates that criticism is, as always, possible, and that it is a healthy thing for the science if it is fully discussed. Criticism of transformationalism can be directed either against details, or against some of the more basic assumptions of the group. The first sort can probably be left for normal processes of correction if the criticism is justified. The more important type of criticism might, at least conceivably, require change in essential parts of the theory.

As an example of a criticism of detail, I can cite one area in which a position sometimes held by transformationalists might profit by more systematic examination. This is the position that phrases containing pre-nominal adjectives have been "derived" from predicate sentences. That is, that "important duty" is "derived" from "duty is important." The statement, of course, is a structural description and no more, and does not mean that the derivation is in any sense a historical fact. A different position would be that pre-nominal adjective sequences are built up directly by filling a series of ordered slots. The latter position was my own as a structuralist, and is also similar to that of the Pike school of tagmemics. It would seem to me that neither position is fully established, and that one kind of evidence which could be brought to bear on it has not been gathered. This would be a complete survey of adjectives (gathered from some such corpus as a dictionary, but added to from the investigator's native-speaker grammar) to see how many

instances there are of both non-prenominal adjectives like *content* in *the men are content,* but not **the content men,* and on the other hand, how many instances there are like Werner Winter's *the late President,* which can not be derived from *the President is late.* Such a survey seems to me a desideratum, as much for transformationalists as for others.

There is other evidence which bears on this question of the construction of nominal phrases. In a paper before the Linguistic Society I described two versions of the sentence

> Take the first crossing which is paved and go North. [11]

If the sentence was given with the kind of terminals around *which is paved* that usually mark the ends of fully independent sentences, juries consistently interpreted the *wh-* clause as independent (or non-restrictive); other pronunciations were either ambiguous or clearly non-independent (that is, restrictive). Current transformational theory derives both sentence types from two independent sentences, but with different processes of combination. Such a conclusion is certainly possible, but seems to me to sacrifice the distinction offered by the phonological connection with an independent sentence for one type, but not for the other. Again, more investigation is needed, and until it is available, the possibility that "first paved crossing" is built up by slot-and-filler is not ruled out. If slot-filling is actually the process of accretion, then in the non-independent type of this sentence, *paved* has simply been moved to post-nominal position and was never an independent sentence.

A second, and more important, criticism concerns the violent disagreements over the nature of phonology. In the 1930's it was usual to say that there were two types of sound-classes recognized as parallel but different. One was phonemes, thought of as all the sounds of a language arranged in the most economical, consistent, and complete sets of contrasts which the analyst could find. Further, it was argued that all members of any class had to share some one unique physical characteristic.

The second type of sound class was called the morphophoneme, all those phonemes which occupied a given position in a morpheme, once that morpheme had been identified. A typical example is the last sound of *calf,* which alternates with a /v/ in the plural. The /f/ and /v/ can be said to be the two members of the morphophoneme which is the final of *calf.* The two sounds do not cease to be different phonemes, since they still distinguish morphemes like *duff* and *dove.* Moreover, since *wife, life, half* all show the same /f/: /v/ alternation, all these /f/: /v/ sets can be grouped into a single, generalized morphophoneme. A further difference between the morphophoneme and the phoneme is that a morphophonemic position may be left unfilled, as when the final /d/ of *cold* is lost in the pronunciation of "It's a cold day." Since the slot has been defined when the morpheme *cold* is identified, it is possible to say that one member of the final morphophoneme is a zero. A phoneme, on the other hand, is a physical event, and so must be either

---

11 "Post-Nominal Modifiers: Transformations and Phonology," *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia,* IX (1965), 37-49.

present or absent, and can not be both at the same time.

Dispute arises because the transformationalists have argued strongly that the step of classing sounds into phonemes, before they are again classed into morphophonemes as members of identified morphemes, is unnecessary and wasteful. That is, transformationalists move from the physical distinctive features of sounds directly to morphemes, and then use the morphemes not only to identify the audible properties of utterance, but to formulate rules for the translation of the meaningful parts of utterance into the audible result. No part of recent linguistic theory has been so fraught with misunderstanding, if for no other reason than that it is now impossible to know what is meant by such a term as phoneme, which means quite different things according to who is using it. The underlying dispute is real, not merely terminological, and ultimately turns on the nature of the clues to identification. In spite of the cogency of transformational argument, I do not believe the dispute has ended in complete victory, and it seems to me that there are some signs that it will continue to some ultimate clarification, at which point it will not matter whether there is victory for one side or the other, or adjustments for both.

A basic fact, and one important to the Chomskyan interest in the acquisition of native-speaker grammar, is that the child must listen to what is said around him, and guess at morphemes and sentences in terms of what he hears. There are three main possibilities for the identification of what the native speaker hears when he is in the listening-learning stage. One is the set of relevant contrasts, that is, the set of phonemes. Another is the set of Jakobsonian distinctive features, recorded by sound-spectrograph, arranged binarily, and set up as universal phonetic distinctions,[12] The third candidate is sounds grouped rather grossly and intuitively into phonetic classes in the manner of nineteenth century phoneticians. This last is obviously the weakest and need no longer be taken seriously.

Speaking for myself alone, I think it might be possible to resolve the whole dispute by solution of this uncertainty. Obviously, it makes little difference whether we think of distinctive features as the acoustic qualities represented by the spectrographic records, or the articulations which produced them and which correspond with them—though not perfectly, apparently. Also, if the role of contrast within a framework of some kind of distinctive features were clarified, perhaps dispute and disputants would be happily deflated.

A second important problem is the activity of the hearer when he is listening to the sentences of his already learned language. It is generally agreed that he starts an internal sentence when he starts to listen, and that when internal and external sentence match, understanding is achieved. I would insist, however, that the role of the hearer is not yet clear. Though we often match on very flimsy evidence, it is also true that for a short time after an utterance, its image persists, and we can re-listen to

_____

12 Jakobson, Fant, and Halle, *Preliminaries to Speech Analysis,* (Cambridge, 1951) .

it. The hearer can use this play-back for more exact matching. In this kind of matching activity, a phonemic difference can be defined as a minimal non-match. That is, if a speaker produces the sentence "pick up the coat," and the hearer's tentative match is "pick up the goat," he can re-listen and get the right form though he may, of course, also follow the different, conscious technique of trying all the possibilities without re-listening. Once again, the nature of the dispute is not fully clear. Do we hear in terms of a /k/:/g/ contrast relevant to English, though not to such a language as Chinese? Or do we hear a binary contrast in much the same way whether the original sentence was English or Chinese? Or possibly, do we hear morphophonemes because we identify first, and listen afterward? This last possibility is not quite absurd, since we may indeed guess at morphemes and only then listen in terms of matching.

Yet the language of much transformational writing seems to define morphemes as the primary "givens" of language, independent of any substance of which they are made up. Not infrequently, as a result, transformationalists are accused of basing their analysis on written forms, a charge which has often and rightly been denied. I have, equally, been misled into believing that the transformational morphemes (or formatives) were quite bodiless, again a charge which has rightly been denied. It would seem that what is true is that occasional loosenesses of language lead the unwary to this interpretation, and that the actual belief that morphemes are made up of Jakobsonian distinc-

tive features still needs clarification, in spite of the discussion it has already had. On this matter again, the real question is whether we hear contrasts or distinctive features.

At present, I should view the descriptions of the hearer's situation as essentially incomplete. The best formulation that I can give is that I think the input is phonemes, in much the classical sense. These are clues or triggers, which set off the hearer's process of guessing at the morphemes and chains of morphemes, for which he employs the full battery of probabilities, from most probable followers for previously identified morphemes, from grammatical structure of the language, from the non-linguistic context. The input of phonemes is then normalized, in terms of the reverse of morphophonemics rules as generally given, and always in terms of the assumed identity of the morphemes. Note that this statement is a necessary part of the position, and one which has not always been understood. An omitted phoneme can, of course, be supplied in more than one way, unless the morpheme has been previously identified. An example is a current television ad which speaks of "the makers of /kówl smòwk/." This could, in terms of English morphophonemics, be identified as either "coal smoke," or "cold smoke." I suspect that others, like me, misidentified this momentarily as the first, rather than the second. When, however, the hearer has made his normalization and his match, he becomes a speaker in replying. In this phase of communication, he then follows the morphophonemics rules as ordinarily given, translating the full and normalized

structure of internal speech into the "degenerate" sequences which once again constitute the phonemes with which the cycle started.

The last criticism of transformational theory concerns the description of the perfect grammar. Many transformationalists, though not Chomsky himself, make the statement that the perfect grammar would generate all and only the grammatical sentences of the language in question. Chomsky's position is (if I understand it rightly) that the perfect grammar would not only generate all and only the grammatical sentences, but would provide a description of any presented ungrammatical sentence which would show exactly how it departed from the grammatical. The point is perhaps not critically important, but in the Chomskyan view generation of "all and only" would then necessarily precede recognition of deviation. In any event, inclusion of deviant sentences by the grammarian would obviously upset his grammatical rules. There can be no disagreement with the statement that a grammar of the sort envisaged would indeed be perfect. Disagreement can only be concerned with whether or not such perfection is reachable.

It will be remembered that the cutting tool for rejecting ungrammatical sentences is the native speaker's unexpressed knowledge of what is or is not acceptable. The transformationalists' (or other linguists') use of "ungrammatical" is only one of several ways in which this term is used. One use will immediately occur to teachers of English—the term is used to condemn forms like *ain't.* Such a use

identifies "ungrammatical" with use of a low-prestige dialect, or dialect form. For purposes of analysis it can be dismissed as irrelevant. A second way of defining "ungrammatical" has been widely used by structural linguists, particularly in anthropological field work. This is that "ungrammatical" equals only what a native speaker would not say. The definition is useful in working with an informant whose language the linguist does not know, but it is objectionable to generative grammarians for good reasons, since quite obviously native speakers make mistakes. The third use of "ungrammatical" is the only one of importance here, namely that the ungrammatical is what does not correspond to the rules of the native-speaker grammar. Transformationalists usually say that the ungrammatical is what does not correspond to the intuition of correctness on the part of the native speaker. I should prefer the statement that the ungrammatical is what is discovered by the native speaker not to correspond to his rules when he uses the process of introspection. As I have said before, intuition is a trouble-making term. Understanding of ungrarnmaticality has been curiously hard to reach. Transformationalists (and others) often toss out sentences with no context as examples of ungrammaticality. Since no context is given, the sentences are often taken as an invitation to conjure up some context, no matter how improbable, which will justify the sentence as grammatical. Also, though the issue is now water under the bridge, some of the early transformationalist language permitted the interpretation

that things like difficulty of remembering, or of supplying a coherent intonation pattern, were experimental criteria for ungrammaticality. [13] As a cutting tool, a sentence must, I believe, be defined as ungrammatical without reference to a special context. In fact, when reliance is placed on a jury decision, the question has to be quite carefully framed, and must be in terms of operations, not isolated sentences. That is, a question should be something like "can the second word in the phrase 'pairs of shoes' be put in the empty slot in 'Look at the cross-eyed—.'?"

Transformationalists usually make a further statement, namely that there is a scale of grammaticality, a statement which is pretty obviously true. They also assume that a sentence which violates a generally applicable rule is more ungrammatical than one which violates only a narrowly applicable one. Again, I find no particular objection, except that some specific, narrow violations invoke a strong emotional response, which is not what the transformationalists are talking about. A purist might react more strongly to the use of *ain't* in place of *am not* than to Cummings' "he danced his did." But even when the notion of ungrammaticality is made thus relative, it is assumed that

---

13 My article, "Grammaticality," and Chomsky's reply, "Some Methodological Remarks on Generative Grammar," are both conveniently available in *Readings in Applied English Linguistics,* edited by Harold B. Allen, 2nd ed. (New York, 1964), pp. 163-92. In this exchange, neither of us fully understood the other, and it is certain that I demolished a position Chomsky did not hold. Yet my article may be granted a modest value in having raised some questions about grammaticality which have certainly troubled others as well as me.

it is possible to set the threshold at some designated point, so that the grammar will be perfect to that point.

It is my contention, however, that such a perfect grammar is—ideally at least—unreachable for any natural language. Grammatical sentences can be recognized only if they contain fully identified morphemes, and these are not allowed to change. Change is an inescapable quality of all natural languages, and all analysts have had to pretend that it did not exist, in order to analyze at all. We have all had to use the marble slab, of course. Yet generative description is rather specially vulnerable to this objection. Generative grammar is not concerned with the relatively slow changes which make all dictionaries out of date, but with the prediction of sentences by individual, living speakers, who continually shift identities of words and morphemes, and continually break rules. My sentence "look at the cross-eyed of" is grammatical enough if *of* is taken to be the name of an unknown animal. I believe, therefore, that transformational-generative grammar—like other scientific endeavors—can describe its subject matter only on an "as if" basis. The fluid nature of individual language-use makes of the "all and only" grammar an unreachable goal, like the now unlamented goal of reaching syntax solely on the basis of phonology. Lest this seem too severe, let me say that both goals can be aims which it is useful to strive for, though unattainable.

One final bit of confusion is the insistence that the perfect grammar can not omit "all" from "all and only" since to do so would mean that a

grammar which generated only one grammatical sentence would then be acceptable. But even if "all" is unreachable, it does not have to be abandoned. A way out is to draw the generative rules so that a rule is necessary before a sentence is permitted—ungrammatical sentences would be those left out. It would also be necessary to avoid the difficulties over the continuum of grammaticality by setting the threshold at one hundred per cent. Nothing would then be grammatical unless it were completely, even trivially so, and unless it were immediately recognized as grammatical when fully free of context. Under such circumstances, competing grammars could be judged by their positive generative power, though to do so, the possibility of recursion so necessary if a grammar is to produce an infinite number of sentences, would have to be left out of account. If it were not, then any grammar which allowed for "then another ant took a grain of wheat, and then another ant took another grain of wheat" would have to be regarded as satisfactory. I am, in short, suggesting still another "as if" limitation. I am suggesting that we treat the sentences of the language only as a very large, even unlimited number, not a truly infinite one.

Structural grammar gave us many insights in spite of the fact that it was in some ways false to language. It was thus open to the taunt that it was "marble slab" grammar. Transformational grammar is open to the counter taunt that it is "strait jacket" grammar, in that it must adopt in a special way a prohibition of change of identity. Yet the sting can be taken out of both taunts when linguists become fully conscious of their limitations, and realize that human conditions make absolute and final truth something for another world only.

Maximum Results from Minimum Training*

J. Donald Bowen

Preparing a paper on the subject of short-term training for teaching English as a second language is not an easy assignment. This is true for several reasons. One is that all of our experience in teacher education warns us that limited training tends to be superficial, to yield results that are below the standards we are willing to defend professionally. Few indeed are the brief training programs that can be endorsed without reservation on the grounds of adequacy.

Another reason to prompt skepticism is a general one: We just don't know enough about teaching or learning to compress a few neat answers to general questions into a seminar-type presentation. We have not defined all of our teaching problems in detail, and such as we have defined are not correlated with specific classroom methods or techniques in a way that permits us to confidently proclaim a definite class routine. Teaching is an art, a skill, and it is learned through an apprenticeship, not from a manual of instructions. And apprenticeships are notably difficult to compress.

There are other reasons why it is not easy to generalize about short-term

* This paper was presented at the TESOL Convention, April 1967.

Mr. Bowen, now professor of English at the University of California, Los Angeles, was formerly co-director of the Philippine Center for Language Study and is the editor of their monograph series which includes *Techniques and Procedures in Second Language Teaching* by Fe R. Dacany. He is himself author of several articles on Spanish, English, general linguistics, and language pedagogy.

training. Very much depends on whom the training is for. A seminar for experienced teachers with a general education background who want to learn the specifics of language teaching is very different from training a group of liberal arts graduates who have accepted a Peace Corps assignment abroad. And training for a group of teachers who will be teaching a language not their own would be very different in still another way— they might need an important concentration of language learning themselves, in some cases that very part of the language they will themselves teach in the next school year.

Still another variable that can have a profound effect on the training design is the situation in which the trainee will be teaching. Will he be working with children or adults? With beginning or advanced students? Will he have possibly difficult cultural adjustments to make, or will he be "Americanizing" immigrant students willingly seeking a new cultural identification? It is very difficult, perhaps impossible, to make any useful generalizations on training that will have an inherent validity, regardless of training of whom, for what, or where.

Longer-term training offers an opportunity to provide familiarity with a large body of experience, which can build a certain amount of versatility into the participants. Their training experience is ideally varied; it may consist of a philosophical understanding of educational theory and pro-

cesses; of an appreciation for the patterned arrangements of linguistic structures; of an awareness of the forms and effects of interference between linguistic systems in a language classroom; of a close acquaintance with a variety of language-teaching materials, perhaps with the experience of attempting to learn a new language; of an understanding of the interrelationship between a language and the culture it is a part of. On the basis of this kind of training, necessarily long-term, a participant can hope to develop a level of adaptability that will help him to accommodate to whatever local conditions are imposed by the situation he works in and, with experience, perhaps to participate creatively in working towards improved teaching patterns. It is quite obvious that this kind of professional development is hardly possible in a short-term training program.

What *can* be accomplished in a limited period of time? There are some who say the main value of short-term training is morale building, that teachers go back to their jobs with renewed self-confidence, though in spite of the training they return to their classrooms to teach in much the same way as previously. This may be an extreme view that overminimizes what can be accomplished. Perhaps it would be instructive to ask some of those who have had the experience of short-term training what benefits were gained and what shortcomings were apparent.

I have had recent contact with two kinds of short-term training: NDEA summer TESL institutes and Peace Corps training programs. The two could hardly be more different, and taken together they illustrate most of the problems of generalizing on the subject of short-term training. NDEA institutes are available mainly to established teachers who feel they need more information about second-language teaching in the United States, working with students who already are or will likely become U.S. citizens. Peace Corps trainees, on the other hand, are typically younger participants, usually fresh graduates from a liberal arts college, with neither training nor experience in teaching. And they will be working in areas of the world where it will be the teacher's, not the student's, responsibility to adapt to new cultural patterns.

These two groups have had training programs designed as much as possible with the differences of their situations in mind. A large majority of the NDEA institute participants have reacted favorably to the training they have received, either complimenting the program they were in or offering criticism that was constructive and well based. A number of objections have been made to practice teaching, to examinations, and to grades. All of these appear to be reflections of a need for ego preservation. Perhaps this is a result of an inherent contradiction: training offered to professionals who possibly should be presumed not to need it. Whatever the reason, there seem to be teachers who, through insecurity or shyness, do not want to be observed, evaluated, or compared in their professional performance.

The reactions of the Peace Corps Volunteers are quite different. They have recently been regular students and they have no professional status

to defend, so they don't often object to examinations or grades. They feel the lack of teaching experience and place a high value on any opportunity to practice on real students, often remembering these opportunities as the most useful part of their training.

The NDEA participants and the Peace Corps trainees both need to be convinced of the practical relevance of their training. No one likes to think he is wasting his time, and a credibility gap in a training program is especially damaging. The NDEA teacher shows this when she looks at a practice-teaching class and says, "This is very fine for these children, but my students are different in many ways." The Peace Corps trainee may just fail to believe that Nigerians or Malaysians or Bolivians can possibly have trouble with the use of the definite article in English, or with plural forms, or with prepositions; these patterns are too clear and consistent. It is possible that both the NDEA participants and the Peace Corps trainees are wrong, and that later on they may remember and make good use of what they were taught during training.

This opens a question: Should short-term training attempt to win the full confidence of the participants, or since time is limited, should the concentration be on presenting what experience has shown to be useful and valuable, storing up information which the trainee can call on when the need becomes apparent to him? My own opinion is that the training should try hard to win participant confidence, that more efficient learning takes place with the willing cooperation of the participants, whether on the level of teacher training or any other peda-

gogical application,

Why do trainees fail to accept the content of a program? Most of them feel that it is because the program is too general and theoretical, and this is no doubt a valid criticism. Peace Corps training has improved with experience—and with the feedback of earlier Volunteers who could speak in very specific terms about the details of their assignments. In some of the earlier efforts there were conspicuous shortcomings. In one the trainees were given practice in the structural analysis of exotic languages, such as Swahili for a Malaysia-bound group, which was about as useless as the jungle-survival training given the first Philippine contingent.

Former Peace Corps Volunteers complain of irrelevancies in their training, of too much theory, of generalities that were never made meaningful in a specific situation. There seems to have been very little of the adaptability that a fuller program would attempt to develop.

One answer to more relevant preparation would seem to be on-site training, in the situation where the trainees will work and teach. The Peace Corps has recognized the value of this concept and has split training between stateside institutions and in-country programs. But this is not the full answer, even assuming the two phases are well correlated in a single program. Just teaching in an environment is not sufficient preparation—or all formal training could be discontinued. An adequate staff and facilities may not be present and available in rural Ethiopia, even though there are schools and students in abundance.

What then is the best solution

available for a relevant and concrete training program? I should like to discuss this question in two separate frames of reference—first for what might be referred to as an NDEA situation, then to a Peace Corps situation. Other kinds of programs may selectively apply some of the ideas presented for these two, which represent widely different circumstances, though they have certain features in common, such as the fact they both are teaching their own language. A quite different program would have to be designed for teachers with a native language other than the one they are preparing to teach.

The typical NDEA institute program has four or five ingredients: introduction to linguistics or applied linguistics, methods of teaching a second language, observation and practice teaching, principles and methods of acculturation, and a shock language. This curriculum seems balanced and has proved to be generally satisfactory.

There are weaknesses, however, at least potential weaknesses. The linguistics can be too abstract and theoretical for the short time available, failing to show relevance to classroom procedures. The methods course can present a quick definition of situation, overview of philosophy, and catalog of techniques, from which choral repetition, backward buildups, and substitution drill seem to be the participants' most permanent acquisition. The observation and practice teaching, if available at all, are certain to be very limited, both in choice of level and in opportunity to participate. The practicing teacher finds it very difficult to identify with a group of students

she personally teaches only two or three times in a summer. The culture course may be an intellectual presentation of geography, history, and customs, or a listing of a group's traditional frustrations and fears, but it may only go skin deep as far as really transferring the effects of the deepest feelings of a Spanish American or Indian student in an American classroom. The shock language may be Spanish, which so many participants have a smattering of that it has little shock value, or it may be Chinese or Tagalog, languages hard enough to learn, but difficult to apply in convincingly realistic situations.

I don't mean by this long list of potential shortcomings to say that this is a description of the NDEA institutes in TESL for the past three summers. This would be unfair and untrue. But these are the dangers, and I suspect most TESL institutes, including two I have directed, have experienced at least some of these shortcomings.

What would be an ideal program for an NDEA TESL participant? I would apply the ingredients of the present programs in a somewhat different way, designed to impress them more vividly on the participant. He feels a need for new insights and new approaches. Often he can be helped most by a chance to look at his language and culture the way his students do. An ideal program would lift him out of his own situation to gain a new perspective on techniques and procedures, to move back for a view of the forest instead of the trees.

He needs to practice, not just to observe and discuss. But his practice must avoid embarrassment, especially

if too many colleagues are witnessing what he considers his mistakes and limitations.

I would suggest that the ideal NDEA type program would be experience in an overseas environment, which would combine English teaching with living in a new culture for an impressive application of second-language teaching.

An overseas institute would make it possible to provide practice-teaching assignments in abundance—a class for every participant, and at the age level each is accustomed to. This is a serious limitation of domestic institutes; at great expense and inconvenience the director assembles students for the practice class, only to be told by the participant that his sixth-grade students are very different from the grade one students in the demonstration class. And he is right. No wonder he feels uncomfortable and insecure; he has little chance to establish a normal teacher-student relationship. Overseas he can be assigned responsibilities in a sixth-grade class, and he can meet and teach these students daily, for six or eight weeks, not just take turns with thirty other participants to actually teach the class a total of two or three times.

But an overseas institute would have to provide supervision, consultation, and evaluation. This could be done in two ways: (1) Local teachers and supervisors, plus the institute staff, would help plan and then visit classes, and (2) a special program seminar would set aside time to consider curriculum and plans, and to discuss any problems participants encounter in their practice-teaching assignments. This would be the core of the institute curriculum: supervised practice teaching on a daily basis and a methods seminar, supported by a course in the local language and a course in the contrastive analysis of the American and the local cultural patterns. There would be lots of free discussion in and out of classes, with theoretical implications treated only when they can be related to a specific problem. The reality of the situation—the class the participant teaches, the language he studies, the culture he lives in and interacts with—these would provide the opportunity and motivation, and the staff would give guidance, direction, and pertinence to the institute. The participants would come out knowing much more about the application of techniques to teaching problems.

The cultural component of the program would be real and personal. The participants would be faced with the problems of adjustment that living and working abroad require. They would live in local homes, taking board and room with local families, probably of teachers of the schools to which they would be assigned. They would have to solve the problems of a new money system, different means of shopping and public transportation, a new linguistic environment. They couldn't come out of this experience without having a new respect for the seriousness of the problems their own students at home face in adapting to the demands of American life.

The advantages of this program would be the personal contact with language teaching and cultural adjustment, both highly relevant to successful ESL experience in the United States. During the institute there would be competent advice and ade-

quate guidance, available on a personal basis, to provide not just experience, but professional growth.

Let's turn now to a Peace Corps type program. The typical curriculum is much more complicated, with less experienced trainees and more varied goals to reach. The Peace Corps trainee has been considered a semi-official representative of his government, who must arrive at his assignment in good physical and mental health, who must be prepared to explain his way of life, and who must be able to make a useful professional contribution.

The training program has included several components: introductory or applied linguistics, methods of second-language teaching, often including observation and practice teaching with his peers, with ESL students, or in poverty pockets. It also includes intensive language training for a skill that will be absolutely essential in his assignment: communication. Also included are a course in culture and society, an indoctrination of American institutions and ideals, an exposure to the inherent contradictions of world communism, and physical education—the latter often as a tension breaker in a hard packed program. Finally such administrative details as shots, personnel records, orientation lectures, and selection interviews with the program psychologist must be included. It is an overintensive and very difficult program.

I won't try to make recommendations on any but the TESL phase of the program, though some former Volunteers would suggest trimming out such things as communism and American institutions, a criticism which may be directed not at content, but at a superficial presentation.

In the TESL segment an ideal program for Peace Corps Volunteers should be based on a specific set of materials designed for a particular teaching situation. The training would be aimed at familiarizing the trainees with the materials, the educational setting, and the students, with basic theory considered only if and when it is clearly relevant to the understanding and solution of specific problems.

Such a program for each group of Peace Corps trainees is obviously not feasible. Even if the astronomical sums of money were available to pay for it, the skilled personnel to produce the variety of programs needed would not be. A compromise is imperative, one that would preserve training directed toward individual situations without sacrificing the common denominator of shared experience which is inherent in the general theory of second-language teaching. I would suggest a bank of materials from which segments could be withdrawn and combined in different patterns to provide logical and coherent sequences of methodological experience. These would have to be produced in a form not presently available.

The materials for an integrated TESL-training course—linguistics, methods, and applications—would be based on an extensive set of video tapes or films, each tape or film an audio-visual presentation of from three to five minutes illustrating a single teaching point, course problem, presentation technique, or drill procedure. A selection of these tapes or films would be sequenced and coordinated with the syllabus or text the

trainee would be later teaching from. The total collection would have to include a wide representation of classrooms and situations, varied to show all the specific types of classes the trainees would eventually work in.

After an appropriate brief orientation, trainees would view these mini-lessons—or perhaps in this day they should be called mini-lessons—and immediately after, there would be a guided discussion on what had been witnessed, emphasizing aims and techniques, with theory otherwise entirely incidental, or even ignored. Trainee discussion would be encouraged for as long as interest could be maintained.

When the trainees understood the what and the how of a mini-lesson, they would go before a class of real students and present the same lesson. The feature of this training that would be emphasized is the specific correlation of illustration to practice.

This teaching experience would, if possible, be recorded on video tape, so that in a subsequent evaluation session the trainee could participate as a witness. A very useful incidental advantage of a video tape replay is that it facilitates verification of just what happened in the class, so the memory of those present can be checked in case of disagreement.

The next step would be a careful evaluation of the trainee's presentation of the lesson, emphasizing what was effectively done, but including suggestions for improvement. Trainees would participate in small groups in these critiques, and each group would be coordinated by a teacher or teacher educator with recognized successful teaching experience. Each group should have access to someone who is closely familiar with or who has experience in the school system the trainees will be assigned to, that is, a person who can speak with authority and assurance on the details of the future assignment.

The final step would be optional, included in the cycle if it was felt to be useful. This would be a generalization of the principles illustrated in the presentation and discussion. In this area of pedagogical theory, due caution should be exercised. The important function of the training is illustration of procedures; there is little time for adequate discussion of generalized or theoretical applications of the procedures shown.

The training cycle, then, consists of:

0. A brief introduction
1. Observation
2. Discussion
3. Application
4. Evaluation
5. Generalization

This cycle should be repeated as many times during the training period as available time and the absorption capacity of the trainees permit, making sure that the teaching points of the sequence of cycles is varied in order to maintain trainee interest and to assure a broad coverage of all the skills and techniques needed.

This sort of training program would anticipate many of the real needs of the future teachers. One former Peace Corps Volunteer told me that almost the only thing he said for the first two weeks in his classroom was "Will you please say that again." He couldn't understand the English his Nigerian students used. He would have been

much better prepared if he had had a chance to hear what these students sound like when they speak in English.

An important feature of the training suggested is the short illustration video tapes or films. These should work better than visits to real classes because of the considerable expenditure of time necessary to get into, observe, and get out of a classroom. Also the films allow a predetermined selection and sequence of presentations; you can never be really sure how a live class will go, whether it will effectively illustrate a point. This obliges the training coordinator to plan his discussions on short notice, where with an edited series of training films the entire discussion sequence can be planned, amended, and replanned as many times as necessary to provide a more complete coverage and balance.

It seems clear that observation of classes is an activity that cannot be prolonged over more than a limited period of time without losing effectiveness. One former Peace Corps Volunteer told me he judged the MLA-CAL training films to have had little effect on his short-term training chiefly because they didn't maintain viewer interest. So much was shown at a sitting that there was no opportunity to digest and assimilate.

Another important feature of this program is the opportunity to take fresh ideas into a class and try them out. This would certainly require special classes and would complicate the administrative aspects of the program. It is easy enough to assemble special students (if they are available in the area—and they are in many), but it would not be a simple matter to send trainees in and out for short teaching

stints. It would be necessary to plan the practice-class curriculum to intersperse intensive teaching activities with songs, games, review, etc. The result might well prove that short, well planned lessons are more effective than forty- or fifty-minute sessions both for the trainee and for the student. In any case it would be advisable to cycle training activities so that an integrated series of illustrations, observations, and discussions are staggered to provide a sequenced output of trainees ready to teach their segments—for the convenience of scheduling the practice class.

It is obvious that course materials for the program described here do not exist, particularly the crucial set of mini-lessons on video tape or film. It is also obvious that they could be produced only by a major effort with a substantial infusion of time, money, and talent. Such a program would have to be general—if only to justify the enormous investment involved. Yet some segments almost necessarily must be specific to a particular language-teaching setting. Perhaps one could envision an extensive collection of filmed mini-lessons from which a selection could be organized for any of various teaching situations, varying student age, level of training, geographical location of classes, type of educational problem presented, etc. This collection could be added to as experience revealed gaps.

It is not likely that a full program of such lessons will be available very soon. In any case, lots of training programs will be planned and offered before filmed lessons could be made ready, even if an early effort were made. For the present, or in the

meantime, what ideas can be applied to current programs?

It is possible to incorporate some of the ideas presented here into present programs. One useful generalization is to reduce the theoretical component, with a corresponding emphasis on more obviously practical needs of the trainees. This is not to imply theory isn't important; only that it cannot be successfully taught in a short time, and an attempt to do so runs the risk of failure to establish concepts plus the likelihood that the trainee's morale will be lowered if he cannot see the relevance of the program activities.

The sequence of a brief introduction, observation, discussion, application, evaluation, and generalization can be utilized, and the essential idea of mini-lessons can be preserved in modified form. The introduction and observation might be replaced by a presentation which would take the form of a description of a typical class situation, with teaching aims and techniques spelled out, and the teaching sequence described in detail. A relatively easy and highly worthwhile enrichment would be an audio-taped example of the lesson from a real class. The sound of a lesson would certainly not be as effective as a film with picture and sound, but a lot goes on in a classroom that can be captured with a tape recorder, and the trainees would have an opportunity to listen to the speech of actual, typical students. Also by editing the tape one could expect a considerable increase of efficiency in presenting only the most important selections, a considerable advantage over physical visits to actual classes.

In this version the first three steps are coalesced into a general presentation, with or without a taped illustration. The application, in the absence of a class of bona fide students, can be done by means of peer teaching. However, peer teaching must be employed with a certain amount of caution. In small groups it is easier to encourage serious application, and specific ground rules should govern the acceptance of a correction by the acting teacher. If horseplay and insincerity cannot be controlled, it is better to eliminate peer teaching entirely. One help in making peer teaching of short segments more meaningful is to make a video tape recording of the segment. The replay is usually an excellent means of an evaluation, the next step in the training sequence.

The generalization, the last step in each cycle, is the training coordinator's opportunity to talk about the possibilities for using, in other situations, the techniques illustrated, discussed, applied, and evaluated. Here, if anywhere, is the opportunity to infuse a bit of theory into the program, in explaining the reasons a technique did or did not work, how it can be modified, further applied, etc. Even here the rationale should be limited pretty much to the matter at hand, to keep the conviction of relevance alive in the minds of the trainees.

In the programs described above the sequence of teaching segments is very important. They must illustrate real teaching problems that can be understood and moved from observation to discussion to application to evaluation. If at all possible, this sequence should be correlated with a teaching program or set of course ma-

terials demonstrated to be teachable and effective, probably the materials the trainee will later be using.

The preparation of an ideal teacher-training program that would fit into a limited amount of training time is an ambitious but worthwhile project, one that should be attempted before we conclude that effective short-term training is inherently impossible and that we will continue sending out poorly prepared teachers as long as we persist in trying to use this kind of teacher training. Certainly research in this area should continue, since the need for limited training will not be diminished in the foreseeable future.

One thing seems perfectly clear: It is neither possible nor feasible to produce an effective short-term training program by condensing a longer one. The needs of the two are different, and there is no appropriate common basis underlying both. The compression of ideas doesn't work because it ignores the need for intellectual absorption, a period of time for concepts to marinate, to acclimate themselves and reproduce in kind.

Something must be sacrificed in short-term training—or we confess to a gross mismanagement of time in our longer programs. I suggest it should be the exposition of theory. The theory itself, to the extent we can understand and manipulate it, is not removed from the training; it is applied in providing sound and effective sequences and methods to display good model teaching. Perhaps *after* successful classroom experience, theory can be captured more quickly; *before,* only an investment of time that a short program makes impossible.

In pedagogy the surface structure concerns the how of teaching: classroom techniques and procedures. The deep structure concerns the why: basic learning theory. We perceive the deep structure through models constructed on our observations of the surface. Our models need more theoretical elaboration, as do the transformational rules that take us from underlying structures to surface behavior. Better theory will come in time and will no doubt force us to reevaluate and modify our applications. Short-term training should, in the state of our present knowledge, limit itself to surface structure, to teaching the application of the best and most productive of current teaching techniques presented as effectively as possible.

*Writing: A Thinking Process**

Nancy Arapoff

Why teaching writing is different from teaching other language skills.

For some years linguists have been writing textbooks designed to teach foreign students spoken English. But only recently, as teachers have found that many students want and need to learn how to write English as well as to speak it, have linguistically-oriented textbooks designed to teach written English appeared. These textbooks have a number of approaches, from variations on the "copybook" method at one end of the spectrum to the "free composition" method at the other end. No doubt most of you have tried some of these approaches, and, I suspect, found all of them lacking in some way. In my experience, this lack has always been in efficiency. None of the textbooks so far published seems to teach anything that cannot be learned from other ESOL courses: from courses in oral production, grammar, or reading.

Obviously, grammar, aural comprehension, reading, and even oral production are to varying degrees involved in writing. Certainly we cannot teach a writing course which never touches on these areas. But at the same time teaching a writing course which covers *only* these areas is redundant. Given the limited time most of us have to teach students as much as we can; about English, we ought to, if purely for efficiency's sake, use a method which teaches the students something

they will not learn in their other courses; something they cannot learn from conscientiously translating vocal symbols into orthographic ones, from oral or written pattern practice, or from reading; i.e., a method which emphasizes that which is *unique* to writing.

Writing is much more than an orthographic symbolization of speech; it is, most importantly, *a purposeful selection and organization of experience.* By experience I mean all thoughts—facts, opinions, or ideas—whether acquired first-hand (through direct perceptions and/or actions) or second-hand (through reading or hearsay). This includes all kinds of writing from the poem to the scientific experiment, for all have a purpose and an organized body of selected facts, opinions, or ideas. How clear the purpose, and how relevant and well-organized the facts, determines the effectiveness of the writing.

Since, then, learning to write does not just involve learning to use orthographic symbols, but primarily how to select and organize experience according to a certain purpose, it follows that teaching our students to write is different in a very important way from teaching them to speak or teaching them to use grammar. A purposeful selection and organization of experience requires *active thought.* When writing, the students must keep in mind their purpose, think about the facts they will need to select which are relevant to that purpose, and think about how to organize those facts in a coherent fashion. The process of learn-

---

* This paper was presented at the TESOL Convention, April 1967.

Mrs. Arapoff is an instructor at the English Language Institute, University of Hawaii.

ing to write is largely a process of learning to think more clearly.

On the other hand, learning to speak and learning grammar essentially involve learning *not* to think. The goal is to form habits; the procedure is to drill the students on pronunciation or grammar to the point where they will no longer have to think about what they are saying. It is more than likely that the habit-forming process which students of oral English and grammar must go through *interferes* with the process of learning to write well.

And the students don't learn to write via a reading course either. Although, unlike pronunciation and grammatical production, the process of reading requires thought, it does not, as does writing, also require *activity.* Reading is a passive process while writing is active. Although they can learn through reading how various writers have selected and organized facts in order to carry out a specific purpose, the students themselves must ultimately be forced to undergo the intense mental activity involved in working out their own problems of selection and organization if they are ever really going to learn to write. This is why the copybook approach, which requires that the students copy or emulate certain writings, doesn't work very well, for while it does require that the students memorize structures, thereby increasing their grammatical ability, and perhaps even teaching them something about style, it does not require them to do much thinking.

Because the combination of thought and activity are unique to writing, we must in planning a writing curriculum devise exercises which necessitate intense concentration. While grammar and reading are both certainly indispensable to such a curriculum, they must be presented in such a way that students will learn to use them as tools. For example, one of the first things they will have to learn is that writing has certain structural differences from speech. One difference is that writing generally has longer sentences—what might be two or three sentences in speech is often only one sentence in writing. So the students should learn how to combine the short sentences of spoken English by modification, or by using sentence connectors of various kinds (conjunctions, words like *however, therefore,* phrases like *in the first place,* etc.). This involves learning grammar, but the students should learn to *consciously* select and use various grammatical devices with which to combine sentences as the problems arise in a writing situation: e.g., when they convert a dialog or narration into a paraphrase.

Of course, one of the biggest problems in teaching writing is that the students must have facts and ideas in order to write and that these must be manifested in the form of grammatical English sentences. But if we allow them to use the facts and ideas gained from their first-hand experiences, they will think of these in their own language and then try to translate them word-for-word into English, often with most ungrammatical results. This is why the free composition approach to teaching writing is just as unsatisfactory as the copybook method, but in a different way. The students make so many grammatical errors that their compositions lose much of the original meaning.

We can, however, avoid the prob-

lems caused by the students' limited knowledge of grammar and of the idioms of English by requiring that instead of using the facts of first-hand experience, they use second-hand facts gained through the vicarious experience of reading. Since what is unique in learning to write is not so much learning to *state* facts as it is to *use* them, we can *give* our students the facts they will be required to use in the form of reading assignments. By using sentences gleaned from reading they can avoid making grammatical errors and actively concentrate on the purposeful selection and organization of these sentences; i.e., they can concentrate on thinking.

A New Method for Teaching Writing

Contending, then, that learning to write is a process whereby students learn to use grammar and facts as tools in carrying out a particular purpose, we are confronted with the question of precisely how we are going to teach them to do this. Obviously, just as writing is a process, so too is the teaching of writing. We must proceed by stages from simple to complex. Because we cannot expect students to learn all there is to learn about writing at once, or even in a short time, we must in some way control the complexity of the writing they will be expected to do at various learning stages.

We can do this by controlling the *purpose* of the writing, for it is largely the purpose the writer must implement which determines the complexity of the selecting and organizing process. While a purpose of some sort is inherent in any kind of writing, it is the writing with an explicit rather than an implicit purpose that we should teach: i.e., expository prose. This kind of writing, because it "exposes" its purpose, lends itself much more easily to analysis than does writing with an implicit purpose (i.e., "fiction" or "literature" or "creative writing"), and therefore it is easier to teach. Too, expository prose is the only kind of writing that the students will need to use in their school work (except for assignments given in certain specialized English courses). Finally, the students will learn a great deal about *all* kinds of writing from learning to write good expository prose.

There are roughly three types of expository prose that students regularly use in school: these are lecture and reading notes, answers to examination questions, and research or critical papers. Each type has a different general purpose: note-taking is intended to *report* the facts, answering exam questions to *explain* them, and paper-writing to *evaluate* them. Each purpose—reporting, explaining, and evaluating—requires a selecting and organizing task of differing complexity.

For example, a student whose assignment is to summarize an essay has a purpose of the first type: reporting. His summary might begin with an assertion like: "The essay 'We Shall Overcome' says that the Negro is slowly making gains in status." This assertion tells us that the writer will use facts selected from the essay which exemplify the Negro's gain in status and that he will organize them in much the same order as they appeared in the essay.

But a student asked in an essay exam to write on, say, the types of

gains in status the Negro has made must go through a more complicated process of selection and organization. His beginning statement might read: "The essay, 'We Shall Overcome' lists gains in status the Negro is making which can be classified as either material or spiritual," and he will have to explain the facts he selects by organizing them into two categories—a more complex process than reporting, requiring deeper thought.

An assignment which requires that the student write a paper giving his opinion of an essay necessitates a still more complicated selecting and organizing process. He will have to begin with an assertion like: "The essay 'We Shall Overcome' is a realistic appraisal of the Negro's gain in status," and then he will have to cite evidence making a case for his opinion; i.e., he will have to evaluate the facts.

The curriculum for writing, then, should be planned in accordance with the three general types of expository prose the students will need to use in school : prose which reports, prose which explains, and prose which evalates. Of course such a task isn't simple. Teaching beginners or near-beginners in English how to summarize, for example, is not a one-step process. Before they can do this successfully, they must learn to recognize structural and semantic clues which identify the important ideas within a given piece of prose. And the most efficient way for them to learn to do this (if we remember that writing involves the unique combination of thought and activity) is by having them use such clues in their own writing. Similarly, teaching reasonably sophisticated students how to write

essays involves the complex process of teaching them how to find topics and sub-topics, how to recognize relevant similarities or differences between facts, and how to make assertions about their findings. Finally, teaching even advanced students how to judge various written pieces on a logical basis is a very involved process which includes teaching them to recognize the two parts of an argument, how to look for fallacies in these, and how to compose their own logically sound arguments.

So, although there may be only three general types of expository prose, teaching these is a long process which takes the students through several stages of writing, beginning with a form very close to speech—direct address-and ending with a form very different-a footnoted thesis. Naturally, as the purpose of the writing becomes more complex, the facts that the students are given to use must become more complex also. However, the teaching process can be most clearly illustrated by showing how the facts from one simple six-line dialog could be used in all stages of writing, from simple to complex:

> Bill: Hi, Mary.
> Mary: Hi.
> Bill: Where are you going?
> Mary: To the beach. Why don't you come along?
> Bill: I think it's going to rain. Look at those clouds.
> Mary: It *can't* rain again today! It's rained every day this week.

Direct Address

> "Hi, Mary," said Bill.
> "Hi," the girl answered.
> "Where are you going?" he asked.
> "To the beach," Mary replied. "Why don't you come along?"
> "I think it's going to rain." Bill

pointed. "Look at those clouds."

"It *can't* rain again today!" his friend exclaimed. "It's rained every day this week."

Narration

Bill greeted Mary.

Mary greeted Bill.

He asked her where she was going.

She said that she was going to the beach. She asked Bill to go along.

He answered that he thought it was going to rain. He told Mary to look at the clouds.

Mary said that it couldn't rain again that day. It had rained every day that week.

Paraphrase

Exchanging greetings with Mary, Bill asked her where she was going. She said that she was going to the beach, and asked Bill to go along; however, he said that he thought it was going to rain, and told Mary to look at the clouds. But Mary said that it couldn't rain again that day because it had rained every day that week.

Summary

When Mary asked Bill to go to the beach with her, he said that he thought it was going to rain, and told her to look at the clouds. However, she said that it couldn't rain again that day since it had rained every day that week.

Factual analysis

Topic #1: Mary

1. Mary asked Bill to go to the beach with her.
2. She said that it couldn't rain again that day since it had rained every day that week.

Topic #2: Bill

1. Bill thougt it was going to rain.
2. He told Mary to look at the clouds.

Assertion

Bill and Mary had opposite ideas about the weather: he was a pessimist and she was an optimist.

Essay

"THE PESSIMIST VS. THE OPTIMIST"

Bill and Mary had opposite ideas about the weather: he was a pessimist and she was an optimist.

When Mary asked Bill to go to the beach with her one day, he was very pessimistic, telling her that he thought it was going to rain, and to look at the clouds. On the other hand, Mary was optimistic. She said that it couldn't rain again that day since it had rained every day that week.

People like Bill, who notice clouds in the sky, are pessimists, while people like Mary, who don't notice them, are optimists.

Argumentative analysis

Argument #1: premise—there are clouds in the sky; conclusion—it is going to rain.

Argument #2: premise—it has rained every day this week; conclusion—it can't rain again today.

Evaluation of the arguments

Argument #1 is reasonably sound: the evidence is both verifiable and relevant although the conclusion may be somewhat hasty. Argument #2 is fallacious: the evidence is verifiable but irrelevant, or, if relevant, leads to an opposite conclusion.

Critical review

In the essay "The Pessimist vs. The Optimist" by ————— in —————, Bill argued that it was going to rain because there were clouds in the sky, while Mary disagreed saying that it couldn't rain again that day because it had rained every day that week. Bill's argument was stronger than Mary's.

Bill's evidence was both verifiable and relevant. He said that there were clouds, which anyone could immediately verify by looking toward the sky. Since rain occurs only when there are clouds, certainly the evidence—clouds in the sky—was relevant to the conclusion that it was going to rain. However, the conclusion may have been somewhat hasty; it does not always rain when there are clouds. But Bill's argument was reasonably sound.

On the other hand, Mary's argument was fallacious. Her evidence, like Bill's was verifiable: one could check with the Weather Bureau. But from the fact that it had rained every day that week it did not follow that it therefore could *not* rain again that day; the evidence was irrelevant. In fact, a stronger logical case could have been made for the opposite conclusion: that because it had rained every other day that week, it would also rain that day, since in some areas there is a rainy season during which it rains almost every day.

Therefore, Bill's argument was sounder than Mary's, and from the evidence given in the essay, the chances for rain that day were higher than the chances for a good beach day.

Term paper

Contrasting Opinions About Weather

People are often either pessimists or optimists about the weather. Evidence of this is widespread. One example is the case of Bill and Mary in the essay "The Pessimist vs. the Optimist". . .

Each of the above samples of writing is, of course, the product of several lessons and "practices." Even learning to convert a dialog into what appears to be a simple form—direct address—involves learning a number of concepts about punctuation, about speaker identification, about stylistic variety. Learning to write a narration involves learning to change verbs to other tenses, to change first and second person pronouns to third person, to change words like *now* and *here* to *then* and *there,* and so forth. A given lesson, then, is designed to teach just a few of many concepts that the students need to learn at a certain stage of the writing process.

The following two lessons appear in the mimeographed text—REPORTING THE FACTS—which we are now using at the University of Hawaii, and they illustrate how learning to write can be a step-by-step process, but at the same time an active, thinking one:

LESSON 10

1. Compare the two models below.

Narration:

Liz called Mary. She told her that it was almost nine o'clock. They had better drive to school.

Mary told Liz that her car had a flat tire. They would have to walk. They would probably be late.

Liz said that she didn't mind being late. They needed the exercise. It would be good for them to walk.

Paraphrase:

Liz called Mary, and told her that it was almost nine o'clock, so they had better drive to school. Mary told Liz that her car bad a flat tire; therefore they would have to walk. They would probably be late as a result. Liz said that she didn't mind being late; besides, they needed the exercise, so it would be good for them to walk.

2. In what ways are so, *therefore,* and *as a result* similar in grammatical usage to *and, in addition,* and *besides?*

3. *Therefore* and *as a result* occur in the same position and have the same punctuation. How does so compare with them in this?

4. What are some other sentences that can be connected by *so, therefore,* and *as a result?*

5. Make a paraphrase out of the narration below. Use *so/therefore/as a result* as well as *and/in addition/besides* where appropriate.

Liz asked Mary how she liked French I. She asked her if she was planning to take French II the following semester.

Mary said that the teacher gave them a lot of homework. She had to stay up late doing it. It was difficult. They also had to memorize a long list of words for

each lesson. She didn't like French I. She wasn't going to take French II.

Liz said that she had been thinking of taking French. She was glad Mary had warned her about it. She thought she would take Spanish instead.

LESSON 11

1. Compare the two models below:

Paraphrase #1:

Liz called Mary, and told her that it was almost nine o'clock, so they had better drive to school. Mary told Liz that her car had a flat tire; therefore they would have to walk. They would probably be late as a result. Liz said that she didn't mind being late; besides, they needed the exercise, so it would be good for them to walk.

Paraphrase #2:

Liz called Mary, and told her that they had better drive to school, for it was almost nine o'clock. Mary told Liz that because her car had a flat tire, and since they would have to walk, they would probably be late. Liz said that she didn't mind being late; besides, it would be good for them to walk because they needed the exercise.

2. What are the differences in the grammatical usage of *therefore/as a result* and *because/since?*

3. In what ways are *and, so,* and *for* similar?

4. *For/because/since* and *so/therefore/as a result* indicate a cause-effect relationship between two sentences or clauses. Which words occur within a sentence stating the cause? The effect?

5. What is the *time* relationship of a cause to an effect?

6. Which of the following three sentences states a cause? An effect? *Both* a cause *and* an effect? *Mary told Liz that her car had a flat tire. They would have to walk. They would probably be late.*

7. What are some ways of writing the above three sentences using one or more of the six cause-effect sentence connectors?

8. *For/because/since* and *so/therefore/as a result* do not occur in the same cause-effect relationship, but they can occur in the same sentence. Why? Give an example.

9. Rewrite the paraphrase you did for Lesson 10. Use *for/because/since* instead of *so/therefore/as a result.* Make all of the necessary changes in punctuation and word order.

Lessons like these, then, are designed to teach only a small amount of the writing process at a time, but to teach it in such a way that the students learn to think more and more actively as they progress. They learn to read more carefully than they have in the past, for they must compare two similar but slightly different models, noting the grammatical and semantic differences between them. And they learn to discover reasons for these differences as they answer the questions following the readings. They learn to review constantly in order to compare and contrast previous lessons with the current one. Finally, they learn to make analogies as they work with an entirely different model, deciding whether their changes in the new model are justifiable on the basis of changes made in the old model.

As they go through the lessons, then, the students learn that grammar and semantics are inter-related, and that they are important tools for them to use consciously in order to make coherent pieces of prose out of different sets of English sentences. In short, they learn, first and foremost, that writing is a thinking process.

Literature in TESL Programs:
*The Language and the Culture**

John F. Povey

As we begin to plan a course which offers an introduction to English literature to non-native speakers, we find that the need for a fresh approach makes *us* first begin to reconsider our justifications for teaching literature at all. Usually our presuppositions remain unquestioned because of the long tradition of such courses for native speakers. Even to pose the question of purpose may cause shocked responses, for is not the value of literature so self evident as to be beyond discussion? Yet for ESL students we must at least define our assumptions, the more so in that a sad amount of literature teaching (and dare I add literary scholarship) seems to maintain only a remote connection with that enobling of the human spirit which is supposed to be the justification of our early assaults on the fortress of Chaucer's medieval style, for example.

There is a basic dichotomy in English studies in this country (as in England). We learn "grammar" until some ill-defined point of competence is reached. (Freshman composition classes are certain to be the last formal English language training a native speaker could receive.) Language studies are gradually phased out in favor of literary studies which finally become the only "English" taught at all. At any age level above about seven years, the division between language and literature is deliberately engineered into the planning of the general syllabus. The fact that in the earliest levels of English learning educationalists perceive the advantage derived from the interaction of language and literature may be suggestive of the direction into which we should lead the ESL student, but this thought would make the theme of another paper and is only observed in passing here. The more significant point is that we have inherited from the format of English studies in this country a division from which we derive most of the extra difficulties which confront us as we plan English courses for the non-native speakers. In educational terms English has become two "subjects," and an "A" for grammar and a "C" for literature or vice versa does not strike us as extraordinary so accustomed are we to the attitude it exemplifies. We have exported this system with lamentable results. Professor Donald Bowen's recent study visit to India confirmed my own African experience that students are being required to study English "classics" without the least attempt being paid to the inadequate language skills they bring to such a study. Even foreign teachers, forgetting their own student days of despair, have inherited much of this attitude about literature. As one student patiently explained in

answer to a class enquiry I had assumed was merely rhetorical, "Why should we teach literature?": "If you didn't have literature what would you teach in the classes when you didn't teach grammar?" I was polite, but I mildly resented the not unique attitude that literature fills up the class programs when there isn't any more grammar to teach. We might recognize that this would give us a very long wait.

Where we have classes of native speakers, many of the difficulties that ought to intrude from the unsuitable division we are making in our classes are kept out of sight. There are signs of the problem in the whimpers that come from freshmen who spend their first class morning of the inevitable survey course approaching the mysteries of *Beowulf* because academics have only a spatial concept of time, even if such planning means that a student flounders into the deep end of the most difficult works first. (Such chronological order does have one advantage. In the face of some revolutionary protest from the dragooned engineering students who always demand, "Why do we have to read Chaucer?" you can always answer firmly, "Because it comes next.") Rapidly such students take refuge in "ponies" which are wretchedly written originally and gain little by being dimly comprehended and garbled in the transition through memory to the "D" blue-book. But these native speakers, for all their problems that we blinkered professors are refusing to see, do have the all important qualification that the English which they use suffuses all their learning. Home-life, play, school, all reinforce their English to such a de-

gree that the fact that literature is an awkwardly isolated part of language learning for them may be overlooked.

Not the same can be said of the unfortunate foreign student struggling with inadequate English to handle the survey courses for freshmen. Hindered by language, denied the short cuts of common cultural assumptions, the non-native speaker flounders. What method can we devise that may help him to learn English in that fullest sense which must surely include an acquaintance with the literature of our language.

This problem necessitates an examination of our defined aims even though they may in themselves contain contradictory elements. This need was brought home to me when I began planning the courses which I had been asked to initiate in the TESL section of the English Department at UCLA. Since I was given a completely free hand in planning such a course, I had to take considerable time in deciding my intentions. When you have only yourself to blame, you cannot indulge in that luxury of inertia that permits you to blame some externally imposed syllabus or text for the inadequacies of the result. I was dealing, I might explain, with advanced non-native speakers only. They usually had first degrees from universities in their own countries. Since most of them were destined to teach English when they left the States, I was the more determined to treat them to a first acquaintance with some of the major authors in the language. I felt that the following were a reasonable series of general aims in the teaching of literature.

1. Literature will increase all language skills because literature will extend linguistic knowledge by giving

evidence of extensive and subtle vocabulary usage, and complex and exact syntax. It will often represent in a general way the style that can properly stand as a model for students. (One would have to qualify here what one assumed was a suitable model. Hemingway's would seem a safer style for a student's emulation than Faulkner's, though both may be admirable for the artists' purpose.)

2. Literature is a link towards that culture which sustains the expression of any language. American literature will open up the culture of this country to the foreign student in a manner analogous to the extension of the native speaker's own awareness of his own culture. We must consider, however, whether we wish in our choice of material to seek for the universal elements in order that the students will find familiarity with the human experience or whether we wish to select the most American of cultural incident. The latter will obviously be more difficult to comprehend but will be guiding the students towards the culture of their target language.

3. We must acknowledge the indefinable, though all-important, concept that literature gives one awareness and human insight. In this respect great literature can be justified as one could assert the value of listening to a major symphony.

4. Literature may guide a few more gifted students towards their own creativity by example derived from their reading of successful writers. There is already fascinating evidence of a second-language literature in English from several countries across the world, especially India and Nigeria.

Although each of these four elements is relevant to the foreign student, the first and second will be of most immediate and specific concern to the ESL teacher. This is because the issues listed as three and four have the clearest analogies with the students' first-language culture. Many of the foreign students in our universities come to us with an intelligent and broad perception of their own literatures, and some are no doubt beginning to experiment with writing in their own language.

We may ask ourselves despairingly whether it is possible for any piece of writing to combine a suitability for teaching the student all these elements appropriately. It is clear that we must, in fact, weigh the varied and sometimes conflicting elements in the function of literature in the classroom. My own concern has been that in our estimate of relevant importance of those aspects upon which we must base our selection of text material, we have, to date, placed far too heavy a premium upon the issue of language. Language has been so stressed that it has been elevated to the totality of expression, whereas it is rather the technique by which expression and ideas are conveyed. I wish to argue that language difficulty for the ESL student may have been exaggerated as a greater dragon than it really is. Obviously language must come first—there can be no other basis for comprehension at all. This is even more obvious in the case of the non-native speaker, for his limitation of comprehension will be more sharply defined since he will not be able to draw upon that common pool of instinctive language recognition which is available to the native speakers.

Yet if we have to accept the primacy of language, we cannot make this our only concern, otherwise the most effective ESL reading material would be those items we created ourselves to the specific linguistic architecture of levels of difficulty. Such works more often become readers without any element of literature in them. The simplified stories from the classics are justified by a similar appeal to language necessity, but they are usually only a thin reminder of what was once a significant book. My basic belief is that we have exaggerated the significance of the element of linguistic difficulty in ESL reading by assuming that reading requires that same total comprehension that comes with understanding speech in our aural/oral methods. The fact that the great impetus to TESL has come from linguistic science may also account for this attitude. The existence of a "recognition" vocabulary is well known, and there is, I believe (though I freely admit this to be an entirely unscientific and subjective impression), a similar partial perception of syntax and style. There can be a general comprehension even when there has not been a precise understanding of a certain syntactic structure. Perception may be general as well as literal. My students saw this when we found Rip Van Winkle sitting under a sycamore tree and one worried individual lamented that he could not understand because he did not know what a sycamore was. I discovered with some embarrassment that I didn't know what a sycamore was either—at least in any botanical sense. We then agreed that if we got as far as "tree," as the context dictated, we would have got as far towards comprehension as

that detail needed.

One especial aspect of language difficulty we are inclined to exaggerate is the dialog parts. One is instinctively doubtful about the accents and colloquial idioms of such sections in a piece. I prepared very anxiously for the introduction of the regional accents in Willa Cather's story "The Sculptor's Funeral." In spite of the apparent lexical problems, I had wanted to use this story to initiate some discussion about the American attitude towards artists and intellectuals. To my surprise they had no difficulty at all in comprehending the dialog because they said (with some exaggeration surely) that it was "like the speech we hear every day on television." I am not always happy with the priority given to the TV experience. Introducing some ESL students to a section of *The Grapes of Wrath,* I elicited the following response: "I see a lot of TV, and this story reminds me of the Beverly Hillbillies, so the characters were stuck in my mind before I knew who John Steinbeck was." It is a clear comment on our newer language-teaching method, with its emphasis upon the heard rather than the read, that dialog appears to offer little difficulty. On the other hand when I tried the students on the introduction to *USA* by Dos Passos, I had a reaction opposite to my expectation. I had chosen this piece because I had wished to discuss the common vision of the American man, the lone hero, enviable in his aloofness. The language looked direct enough in its vocabulary and syntax so that I anticipated no serious difficulties. The students found it inordinately hard to appreciate because of its rhetorical and mannered style. As

one student remarked indignantly, "I had to read the story twice in order to understand what Dos Passos meant." Where I had seen simple enough underlying structures, they saw the occasional inversions and repetitions, and their recognition broke down at once.

Clearly our assessment of the difficulty that will be encountered in reading needs rethinking in the light of the fact that our present students have not learned English as I learned French, through a reading of texts and translation. They have learned English through speech. The omnipresence of TV (shades of Marshall McLuhan) has "massaged" the areas of their easier comprehension. This argument was summed up unexpectedly by a Japanese girl who wrote modestly, "My English is poor. For instance when I hear President Johnson speaking, I don't understand well. But on TV shows I understand quite well in spite of my poor English. This is because most shows concern affairs which I experienced in Japan." (I should like to have pursued this assertion further, but unfortunately the section is culled from a terminal blue-book.)

It has been my experience that the whole area of cultural comprehension is more likely than language problems to cause difficulty. This is aggravated by the fact that confusion shows up in such unexpected ways. In preparing for the difficulties one will encounter it is necessary to strike a balance, as I observed earlier, between writing which stresses cultural universality, the generality of human emotions, and those cultural elements which are most specifically and individually American. Discovery of American attitudes through such a presentation will aid the student's awareness of this country and his adjustment to it.

As an example of my attempts in this direction I would like to describe my experiences in teaching that famous American story "Rip Van Winkle." This story proved very difficult in its language, but the readers persevered. We talked generally about folk tales and the reason that Washington Irving felt it necessary to initiate that form in the Eastern States. In subsequent discussion students told me several tales from their own traditions which concerned the same situation, the man who sleeps for a generation without recognizing the passing time. Several countries seem to have such a tale. Then with the similarities established it was time to stress the American element. "If this story were told in your country, would it come out roughly the same in its characters and motivation?" I questioned. "No," said the Latin Americans. "Our women are satisfied with their position at home, and we have no stories of this henpecking." (That last word caused great delight for its expressiveness.) The Japanese were in general agreement with this view, though they expressed it a little more cautiously. "There is a Japanese word for this. It is *kakadena* which means 'petticoat government,' but I have never read a story about it." There were several other responses from students in the same tone. "A Chinese wife is obedient to her husband. Wives in Taiwan don't take part in social activities at all." The Africans responded more firmly. "It is foolish to put the blame on the wife, for a man's friends would say 'Why don't you marry another one?' " "Our people would blame the wife's bad temper on

the wrath of the unappeased spirit of his dead grandfather." (I admit by the time I got to that latter remark I began to wonder whether I was merely having my leg pulled as I sought for cultural anthropology.)

At this point with the differences clearly established I tried to lead them into the specifically American elements by appealing first to their personal experience here. "Is Rip a typical American man?" I asked. Opinion in the class divided in a way that revealingly exposed the accepted stereotypes. "Yes, Rip is typical because all men are henpecked by their wives in this country." One student felt so strongly about this that he went so unreasonably far as to insist, "And his dog is an American dog, for it too is frightened of a woman." Others thought that Rip was hardly the conventional American since by definition all Americans work hard to gain the material comforts of this society and Rip is indifferent to keeping up with the Joneses.

This division of attitude exposes the nature of the prejudice which is established when the American scene is observed from the viewpoint derived from films and magazines. The possibility of using such comments as the link into a more rational class discussion of American culture is clear. In every piece which we read, we make many cultural presuppositions with unthinking confidence, most of which are going to be quite literally foreign to the non-native speaker. This introduction to a nation's literary culture has got to be undertaken with some concessions to general interest, too. A half-term bluebook produced this disconsolate assessment: "Nothing happens, nothing changes. I think that these writings can be appreciated only by a certain group of people who are interested in things like this and understand them." Include me out, I detected there. But that remark did make me question whether my own "literary" standards had been pitched too high. I therefore fell back upon one of the Hyman Kaplan stories. I had considerable doubts about this. The language is difficult because of its errors and the attempt to record idiosyncratic pronunciation. I wondered, too, whether the tone did not indicate a certain kind of mockery in the characterization for all its general affection: "Foreigners speak funny." Surprisingly it was a great success. My concern that I was proving myself unable to estimate what was a suitable piece for the students' enjoyment was offset by my pleasure in the very warm response they had to Kaplan's predicament. "The characters are all foreign as we are, and so we see ourselves through the story. Kaplan could be one of us." "It shows students having the same problems that we had when we came to this country, and it gives us a good feeling that we can already laugh at them."

It is a common enough truism of linguistic studies that an accurate contrastive analysis between the language of the learner and the target language will facilitate the recognition of likely areas of difficulty. What an overwhelming task it is going to be if we are also going to require a similar contrastive analysis between the cultures. Perhaps this is too strong a view, yet the response of a particularly able Japanese student remains in my mind. We had been reading through Nathaniel Hawthorne's *Ethan Brand* in class. We had discussed the univer-

sality of certain human fears—of darkness and madness. "But how would Ethan have behaved if he had not had that puritanical conscience?" asked this student. "What can an unforgivable sin be to a Buddhist or a believer in Shinto?" Such an enquiry pierced my parochial outlook and opened up to me evidence of the yawning gulfs of misunderstanding of ideas and motivations that may make virtually all a foreign student's reactions distorted by the difference between his intellectual and cultural presuppositions and ours.

We know now roughly how to control difficulties so that items may be presented in an ascending hierarchy of difficulty. Can we begin to plan a similar control of the degree of cultural difficulty by leading the student more gently from the most familiar, the most readily comprehensible, ideas into those elements of our own culture which will be most foreign to him? Those beliefs most difficult for him to appreciate will be those which are in greatest contrast with his own national and racial assumptions.

If we cannot yet do this in a broad, theoretical way, we can only plead for more general and wider individual experiment with materials in the classrooms. Some pieces seem to have an immediate appeal; others unwarrantable seem a dreary flop. Which are which, and why? The linguists have established a very successful basis for the teaching of language at the elementary levels. Perhaps we can be equally successful at this more advanced level of language study in bringing to the foreign student the beginning steps in his acquaintance with our extensive range of literature. It seems a challenge to the humanist as teacher to show others successfully the delights of his own discipline.

Some Co-occurrences in American Clichés

Kenneth Croft

Quite a number of "language" matters which students of English as a second language need to learn about are not treated in textbooks at all. Many of these are partly linguistic in nature and partly non-linguistic, that is, "cultural"—involving other aspects of culture. Actually, hardly anything in the language-learning situation can be said to be purely linguistic, divorced completely from the "cultural" side. Most of the time there seems to be simply a stronger tendency in one direction or the other—more toward the linguistic on the one hand or more toward the "cultural" on the other; but somtimes these matters appear to lie pretty much on "middle ground."

One such matter I've been occupied with recently has to do with our habit of associating words in pairs and groups in clichés. We usually think of the following, for example, in sets of two: *salt* and *pepper, cup* and *saucer, bread* and *butter, hands* and *feet, doors* and *windows; sink* or *swim, sooner* or *later, heads* or *tails.* If we give a native speaker of American English the first member of the set, he will ordinarily respond with the second. Not long ago some of my colleagues and I made a list of over 200 of these pairs. Sets of three are fairly

common, too, but not as numerous as the pairs: *food, clothing,* and *shelter; hop, skip,* and *jump; stop, look,* and *listen; good, bad,* or *indifferent; beg, borrow,* or *steal.* Here, the first two automatically evoke the third. These pairs and triplets appear to have a fixed order, however: as a rule, *left and* will evoke *right,* whereas *right and* will evoke *wrong.*

Another pairing device is the simile, with the word *as* or *like: light* as *a feather, fit* as *a fiddle, happy* as *a lark, fresh* as *a daisy; kicks* like *a mule, sleeps* like *a* log, *grows* like *a weed, cries* like *a baby.* Many of these and many of the previously mentioned pairs have what we might call **a** "tight" association; they are universal, so to speak—used consistently throughout the entire United States. Others have a "looser" association; they vary geographically and also, perhaps, socially. *Black as,* for example, may evoke *night* or *coal* or *pitch.* A situational variation also occurs in some instances: *eats like,* depending on the situation, may evoke *a horse* or *a bird* or even some other heavy or light eater.

It's my guess that relatively few students of English (or teachers, either) realize how extensive our use of pairs and triplets in these ways actually is. To show a little more of this proliferation I'm noting below some additional examples of each type (sets

Mr. Croft, professor of English and anthropology at San Francisco State College, is the author of many English-as-a-second-language texts including *Reading and Word Study* (Prentice-Hall, 1960).

of two and three).[1] But rather than give a straight list of items as they seem most natural to me or to someone else, I ask you to complete them yourself by filling in the blanks. Then you can check your responses with those given at the end of this article. If you are a native speaker of American English or have spent many years in the United States, your responses and the ones given will match very well—perhaps exactly. On the other hand, if you are a non-native speaker and your contact with Americans has been somewhat limited, your response and those given will probably not match very well.

This is an exercise on word association, not idea association—an exercise on how Americans put words (and sometimes phrases) together by two's and three's without conscious thought. The term "co-occurrence" has come into fairly general use during the past decade; it applies to sentence elements that occur together. The items presented here are all co-occurrences in American clichés, the co-occurrence range in each case being extremely limited.[2]

PAIRS WITH A N D   Example: husband and *wife*

1. comb and ——————
2. shoes and ——————
3. tables and ——————
4. stop and ——————
5. top and ——————
6. arms and ——————
7. up and ——————
8. heel and ——————
9. in and ——————
10. thunder and ——————
11. thick and ——————
12. chills and ——————
13. needle and ——————
14. cops and ——————
15. north and ——————
16. fact and ——————
17. lost and ——————
18. sticks and ——————
19. duke and ——————
20. fame and ——————
21. cowboys and ——————
22. Greeks and ——————
23. straight and ——————
24. ladies and ——————
25. prose and ——————
26. far and ——————
27. safe and ——————
28. before and ——————
29. off and ——————
30. various and ——————
31. brothers and ——————
32. sweetness and ——————
33. silver and ——————
34. hit and ——————
35. pure and ——————
36. aches and ——————
37. forgive and ——————
38. judge and ——————
39. supply and ——————
40. do's and ——————

PAIRS WITH O R   Example: same or *different*

41. more or ——————
42. trick or ——————
43. win or ——————
44. rain or ——————
45. double or ——————
46. better or ——————
47. this or ——————
48. heaven or ——————

49. friend or ——————————
50. truth or ——————————

TRIPLETS   Example: red, white, and *blue*

51. knife, fork, and ——————————
52. tall, dark, and ——————————
53. love, honor, and ——————————
54. eat, drink, and ——————————
55. blood, sweat, and ——————————
56. how, when, and ——————————
57. morning, noon, and ——————————
58. healthy, wealthy, and ——————————
59. friends, Romans, and ——————————
60. on land, on sea, and ——————————
61. ready, willing, and ——————————
62. solid, liquid, or ——————————
63. lost, strayed, or ——————————
64. win, lose, or ——————————

SIMILES WITH A S   Example: blind as *a bat*

65. busy as ——————————
66. cheap as ——————————
67. sick as ——————————
68. nutty as ——————————
69. cool as ——————————
70. stubborn as ——————————
71. flat as ——————————
72. slippery as ——————————
73. hairy as ——————————
74. dry as ——————————
75. straight as ——————————
76. stiff as ——————————
77. sober as ——————————
78. old as ——————————
79. scarce as ——————————
80. naked as ——————————
81. easy as ——————————
82. hard as ——————————
83. sharp as ——————————
84. heavy as ——————————

SIMILES WITH L I K E   Example: growls like *a bear*

85. roars like ——————————
86. shuts up like ——————————
87. drinks like ——————————
88. cracks like ——————————
89. spins like ——————————
90. climbs like ——————————
91. laughs like ——————————
92. goes out like ——————————
93. shakes like ——————————
94. leaps like ——————————
95. cuts like ——————————
96. multiplies like ——————————
97. bounces like ——————————
98. barks like ——————————
99. sells like ——————————
100. sticks (adheres) like ——————————

TYPICAL RESPONSES: 1 brush 2 socks 3 chairs 4 go 5 bottom 6 legs 7 down 8 toe 9 out 10 lightning 11 thin 12 fever 13 thread 14 robbers 15 south 16 fiction 17 found 18 stones 19 duchess 20 fortune 21 Indians 22 Romans 23 narrow 24 gentlemen 25 poetry 26 wide (near) 27 sound 28 after 29 on 30 sundry 31 sisters 32 light 33 gold 34 run 35 simple 36 pains 37 forget 38 jury 39 demand 40 don't's 41 less 42 treat 43 lose 44 shine 45 nothing 46 worse 47 that 48 hell 49 foe (enemy) 50 consequen- ces 51 spoon 52 handsome 53 obey (cherish) 54 be merry 55 tears 56 where 57 night 58 wise 59 country- men 60 in the air 61 able 62 gas 63 stolen 64 draw 65 a bee 66 dirt 67 a dog 68 a fruitcake 69 a cucumber 70 a mule 71 a pancake 72 an eel 73 an ape 74 a bone 75 an arrow 76 a board 77 a judge 78 the hills (Methu- selah) 79 hen's teeth 80 a jaybird (a new-born babe) 81 pie 82 nails (a rock) 83 a razor (a tack) 84 lead 85 a lion 86 a clam 87 a fish 88 a whip 89 a top 90 a monkey 91 a hyena 92 a light 93 a leaf 94 a frog 95 a knife 96 rabbits 97 a ball 98 a dog 99 hot- cakes 100 glue

Coral Way: A Bilingual School*   J. L. Logan

The bilingual program which was organized at Coral Way Elementary School, Miami, Florida during the spring of 1963 was part of a Ford Foundation Project awarded to the Dade County Schools to develop materials to teach English as a second language to non-speakers of English. The need for these materials became acute in south Florida after the large number of Cuban refugees came to Miami.

Our first problem at Coral Way was that of organizing a planning and steering committee. We needed brain-power and experience which, fortunately, we had in our county: Dr. Pauline Rojas, who was to direct the Ford Foundation Project, had directed the English-as-a-second-language program in Puerto Rico for twelve years; Ralph Robinett had also been a director of the English program in Puerto Rico; Paul Bell, who is supervisor of bilingual education in this county, had worked in the bilingual schools of Guatemala; others employed in the Ford Foundation Project had directed or worked in the bilingual schools of Cuba. These people, plus the district director for Coral Way School, the assistant principal, and the principal, made up the planning committee which developed a philosophy and a set of guidelines, and from these recommended an overall organizational pattern. The committee worked with one thought in mind: Select that

*This paper was presented at the TESOL Convention, April 1967.

Mr. Logan is principal of Coral Way Elementary School, Miami, Florida.

which had proved successful in bilingual schools of other parts of the world—Latin America, Mexico, Cuba, Puerto Rico, Europe—and incorporate the best into a program that would be compatible with the basic Dade County curriculum and the Coral Way School plant. The committee at no time nor in any way attempted to develop a program around the personnel in the building.

The committee made the following recommendations:

> That the Dade County Curriculum Scope and Sequence be followed and the time allocations for each skill area be observed.
>
> That each child receive his instruction for a part of the day in his vernacular with a native teacher of his language.
>
> That each child receive his instruction for a part of the day in his second language with a native teacher of the second language.
>
> That he spend a part of each day in a mixed group, at which time both or either language might be used.
>
> That second language materials be purchased or developed to reinforce or supplement vernacular instruction.
>
> That a summer workshop be planned to train personnel and that the school day be organized to effect daily in-service training and planning.
>
> That non-instructional help be employed to assist instructional personnel.

With these guidelines clearly defined it was then the principal's responsibility to name committees and plan the summer workshop. A personnel committee started interviewing teaching applicants immediately. The regular teachers in the building were offered an opportunity to teach in the program if they could attend a

50

six-week summer workshop. Those teachers who could not and those who did not wish to work in the program transferred to nearby schools.

The University of Miami was at this time (the 1962-1963 school year) training a class of thirty Cuban refugee teachers to teach Spanish in the Florida schools. The state certification department had agreed to give three-year provisional certificates to these teachers after the completion of one year of prescribed work. From this group of thirty, the committee selected six: two for the first, two for the second, and two for the third grades. (The program during the first year included only the first three grades.) A scheduling committee also started to work immediately developing a workable schedule that would give the teachers one hour of planning time during the day and at the same time give the pupils the recommended time allotted for each subject area. This scheduling was accomplished by using aides to assist with music, art, physical education and supervised play. The bilingual aides were former Cuban teachers who were not certified to teach in Florida.

The principal and other members of the planning committee were also meeting at the time with groups of parents whose questions seemed to be repeated over and over again:

"If my child spends part or half of his day working in a second language, what will he miss?"

"How can you crowd a full day's work into one-half day?"

"What kinds of Spanish printed materials will you use?"

"What about library books?"

"Will reading achievement be lower?"

"Will it be Cuban Spanish?"

These questions went on and on, and the committee continued its program of public relations. Meetings were held with parents in all grade groups. Speakers explained the program to parents at PTA meetings. Teachers talked with parents who were undecided about enrolling their children in bilingual classes. About eighty percent of the parents wanted their children in the program—we had anticipated this—and for the children whose parents did not want them to participate, a regular self-contained class at each grade level was provided.

The school year started with four bilingual classes and one regular class at each grade level—grades one, two, and three—but by the end of the first year self-contained classes became smaller because the parents, as they saw the progress the children were making in the second language, requested that their children be transferred to the bilingual classes. At the end of the second year the number in the regular classes had dwindled to less than one-half of one class or about fifteen pupils. At the present time there are 941 pupils in the school, and only eleven in the regular sixth grade class. After this school term all pupils will participate in the bilingual program.

The 1963 six-week summer workshop day was divided into two parts. During the forenoon the twelve teachers, six English-speaking and six Spanish-speaking, were enrolled in two three-semester-hour classes, Basic Linguistics and Structure of the English Language. In the afternoon from 12:30 to 3:30 P.M. the teachers worked in grade level groups developing the second-language program and

adjusting this program to the Dade County Curriculum Scope and Sequence for the elementary grades. Textbooks were examined, and from the vocabulary in these books the basic language patterns were developed. From these language patterns the yearly, monthly, and weekly plans were developed. Even though the language lessons were structured, they were flexible to the extent that adjustment to the progress of the pupils could be easily made. In addition, hundreds of visual aids were prepared, and they were "finger-tip" filed for instant use.

The scheduling was not easy. In addition to being guided by the recommendations of the steering committee, the group had to keep in mind that the program had to be compatible with Florida state law, Florida accreditation standards, Dade County School Board policy, and of course, good school administration. The schedule had to be flexible because of the plan for grouping the pupils according to their knowledge of their second language. During the first year there was a great deal of shifting of pupils from one group to another.

The organization provides for first grade pupils to gradually move into the second language, beginning with fifteen minutes per day during the first four weeks to one hundred fifty minutes per day during the last twelve weeks of school. A typical day for a first grade child during the last two marking periods would be: vernacular, one hundred sixty-five minutes; second language, one hundred fifty minutes; mixed groups—English and Spanish— seventy-five minutes. As the pupils move through grades two to six, the time for mixed grouping increases, and second-language and vernacular time decreases. In the sixth grade two classes are mixed for the complete day.

It is the opinion of those who have worked in the school that the one hour of daily planning time has made the greatest contribution to the success of the bilingual program. This one hour of planning time is scheduled while the pupils go to music and physical education. At each grade level, music is scheduled to follow physical education or vice versa in order to provide the one-hour time block. Each day during this planning time the teachers of a grade level meet as a group to do team planning. A team consists of one English- and one Spanish-speaking teacher.

The three days each week the music teacher is not in Coral Way School, the aides continue her program or do follow-up activities in what the music teacher has introduced. In physical education a Spanish-speaking aide assists the teacher during the entire day. One bilingual aide works in the library part of each day helping pupils with their selection of Spanish books. In addition to helping with the pupils, the aides assume clerical responsibilities such as pupil accounting, typing report cards (Coral Way has a special report card), posting information in the pupils' cumulative folders, preparing visual materials, and helping with the ordering of Spanish books and other Spanish materials. Incidentally, we experienced some difficulty in finding suitable printed materials in Spanish.

At the present time the *Miami Linguistic Readers* are being used to introduce reading to the Spanish-speaking pupils. These materials have been

developed for grades one and two. In addition to these, the regular state-adopted textbooks are used for all English instruction. To teach Spanish we are using materials from the following publishers: Laidlaw (health and readers); D. C. Heath *(Miami Linguistic Readers,* science, *Fries American English Series);* Silver-Burdett (math); Follett (library books).

One of the evaluations of the scholastic achievement of the pupils in the bilingual program at Coral Way is being done by Mabel Richardson. Briefly, Mrs. Richardson is attempting to do three things:

1. To compare the academic progress of the English-speaking pupils in the bilingual program, grades one through three, with the academic progress of pupils, grades one through three, who attend a regular Dade County school. The pupils in the bilingual program are taught one-half day in English and one-half day in Spanish. The control groups are taught the full day's activities in English.

2. To compare the academic progress of the Spanish-speaking pupils who are in the bilingual program with the academic progress of Spanish-speaking pupils who attend a regular school in Dade County. All instruction for this control group is in English.

The assumption is that there will be no significant differences in the academic progress of the pupils in the control groups and the progress of the pupils in the bilingual program at comparable grade levels. For these comparisons, data from the Dade County testing program has been used. In this county Stanford Achievement Tests are given to all elementary pupils at the beginning of October each year. Results were obtained for the first three years of this program.

3. To determine if, and at what point, the students in the study become bilingual. Will the English-speaking pupils in the study have learned Spanish? Will the Spanish-speaking pupils have learned English?

At the end of the school year 1964, 1965, and 1966 the Cooperative Inter-American Tests were given to all students in the bilingual program in Coral Way School. These tests have equivalent forms in English and Spanish. Each pupil was given his second language test first, and a day or two later he was given the same test in his native language. These two tests give an idea of how much of the second language the pupil has learned.

Mrs. Richardson is completing the first stage of this evaluation at the present time and hopes to make the results of the study available to those interested. She hopes to carry this study through the next three years to gain a more comprehensive evaluation of this unique program.

With one exception the basic overall organization of the school today is the same as the original plan. However, because of an increased enrollment two rooms, one at first and one at second grade level, have been set up as self-contained classes. In these rooms the bilingual teacher directs all activities, one-half day in English and one-half day in Spanish. The first presentation of a new concept may be in either language; this same concept is then received and enlarged in the other—either that same afternoon or the next day.

One major problem concerns the needs of pupils transferring to Coral Way. Those pupils who came after

the program was under way were assigned to a small group (with a second-language teacher) for a part of each day to learn the basic language patterns.

In summary, we feel that the success of this program is due largely to:

1. A flexible organizational plan
2. Good consultant services available on call
3. One hour of planning time each within the school day
4. The use of aides
5. Democratic planning within the school
6. Personnel enthusiasm
7. Community enthusiasm
8. Personnel with a bilingual point of view
9. Cooperative and team teaching
10. Additional funds for books and materials
11. The second language being taught by native speakers of the second language.

Teaching Short Serial Items in a Target Language

Faze Larudee

In teaching short serial items such as the numbers one through ten, days of the week, and months of the year, language teachers are faced with the question, "How should these items be taught so that the student may not have to recall one in order to remember the name preceding or following it?" More specifically, how can a student be taught the days of the week in a target language so that he may be able, for example, to recall *Wednesday* without having to remember that *Wednesday* comes after *Tuesday* or before *Thursday?*

For the past three years I have found the solution to this problem in the application of a simple teaching technique consisting of the following steps: [1]

Step 1. The teacher writes on the blackboard, for example, the names of the days of the week in both English and Persian in opposite columns. Since the ultimate goal is to teach each item as a separate and independent unit, the days of the week should appear in random order. Nevertheless, it is important that items opposite each other in the two columns be counterparts. Furthermore, in order to reduce the students' tendency to translate, items in the native language column (Persian in this case) should appear in their abbreviated form. The following example will demonstrate an arrangement of items in step 1:

Tuesday	sěs.
Sunday	yekš.
Monday	doš.
Thursday	pænjš.
Saturday	šæm.
Wednesday	čars.
Friday	jom.

Step 2. The teacher reads the items in the English column and points simultaneously to their counterparts in the Persian column as the class listens. It may be necessary to repeat this step once or twice.

Step 3. The teacher substitutes each item of the target language column in a short and familiar sentence and asks the class to repeat the sentence after him. In the course of this repetition drill, however, the teacher names one of the items more often than the others. For example, the class repeats after the teacher the following utterances as he points to the Persian items and uses their English counterparts in the sentences:

1. We had English on Tuesday.
2. We had English on Sunday.
3. We had English on Thursday.
4. We had English on Tuesday.
5. We had English on Monday.
6. We had English on Tuesday.
7. We had English on Wednesday.
8. We had English on Saturday.
9. We had English on Tuesday.
10. We had English on Friday.
11. We had English on Tuesday.
12. We had English on Thursday.
13. We had English on Tuesday.
14. We had English on Monday.

[1] In this explanation English is used for the students' target language and Persian for the native language. The same steps can be followed, however, in teaching any target language.

Mr. Larudee is professor of linguistics at Inter American University of Puerto Rico and author of *Reading Persian: A Programmed Course Based on the Structure of Written Persian* (Ann Arbor Publishers, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1964).

15. We had English on Tuesday.
16. We had English on Saturday.
17. We had English on Wednesday.
18. We had English on Tuesday.

Step 4. After a short repetition drill, the teacher gives the items in the English column for substitute items to be used in the same pattern as presented in step 3.

Step 5. When the class seems to respond to the most-frequently-referred-to item with ease, and usually with a smile of satisfaction, the teacher erases this particular word in English, gives only the visual cue by pointing to the Persian word, and waits for the class to respond in English. Invariably a few seconds of laughter and fun break the tenseness of drilling.

Beyond this point the teacher has two basic choices: (1) He may test the ability of the individual members of his class to recall the particular item; or (2) he may continue to elicit choral responses until he has taught all of the items before calling upon the individual students to respond.[2]

Step 6. After all the items in English have been erased, and a period of drill for overlearning has followed, the teacher asks each student to name the days of the week in order. This is to test the students' ability to *rearrange* the material he has just learned. If the response indicates the

___

[2]In general, individual drill should be combined with choral drill for making the best use of the class time and for holding the interest of the class. For this purpose:
  a) Teacher stimulates and points to the individual student for response.
  b) Teacher repeats the student's response, signals for the class to respond, and so on.

need for further drill, it should be conducted.

Step 7. The teacher uses various days of the week in a question which he poses to individual students for response. If these responses point to the need for additional drill, some of the previous steps should be repeated for reinforcement.

Step 8. The teacher divides the class into pairs of students who will conduct a controlled conversation simultaneously in which one question is asked with days of the week as substitute items. Answers will be given either in the affirmative or negative, or in the negative followed by the affirmative. For example:

Q1: Did it rain here on Saturday?
Al: Yes it did; it rained hereon Saturday.
A2: No, it didn't rain here on Saturday.
A3: No, it didn't rain here on Saturday; it rained here on Sunday.

Q2: Didn't it rain here on Saturday?
Al: Yes, it rained here on Saturday.
A2: No, it rained here on Sunday.
A3: No, it didn't; it rained here on Sunday.

Step 9. In order to ascertain the students' mastery in the use of the new items, a transformation drill should be conducted. Such a drill will require the use of the newly learned material in conjunction with other changes, e.g., changes in number, addition of possessive and verbal suffixes. For example:

Q1: Did you have English on Saturday?
A1: Yes, we had English on Saturday.
A2: No, we didn't have English on Saturday.
A3: No, we didn't; we had English on Thursday.

Q2: Didn't we have English on Thurs-
     day?
Al: Yes we did; we had English on
     Thursday.
A2: No, we didn't; we didn't have Eng-
     lish on Thursday.
A3: No, we didn't have English on
     Thursday; we had it on Wednes-
     day.

This technique has proved to be ef-
fective and economical of time and ef-
fort. Furthermore, students exposed to
this technique demonstrate the ability
to recall each item of the series both
independently and as a member of the
series to which it belongs.

Review

GUIDED WRITING AND FREE WRITING: *A Textbook in Composition for English as a Second Language.* LOIS ROBINSON (Harper and Row, 1967, 216 pp.) .

The title of Lois Robinson's textbook, GUIDED WRITING AND FREE WRITING, well expresses what the book purports to do—to give students practice in guided writing as preparation for free composition. Exercises in rather closely guided writing alternate in each lesson with assignments in freer composition presented in such a way that the student is led to use the structures that he has been practicing. The procedure, with some variation, is as follows: A structure pattern is presented and a brief rule for its formation or use is given. The student then practices the pattern orally, sometimes by answering questions, sometimes by completing statements, sometimes by inserting elements in the pattern. Guided writing exercises generally come next. The most common ones consist of paragraphs of questions to be turned into paragraphs of statements. Other types call for copying paragraphs, supplying in spaces left blank the elements being taught—verb forms, subordinators, or articles—or for completing statements. In the free expression assignments that follow, students are given the opening sentence of a paragraph and sometimes the concluding one. Suggestions may be made for material to include in the paragraph or phrases to use.

All of the writing assignments, both guided and free, are a paragraph or more in length. A typical guided writing assignment is the following, de-

signed to teach the present perfect tense. (126)

THE LUNCH-COUNTER HABIT

NOTE: When you eat in public on a narrow shelf while sitting on a stool, you are eating at a lunch counter.

DIRECTIONS: Turn the three following paragraphs of questions into three paragraphs of statements, affirmative or negative, noting how the present perfect tense and the past tense alternate throughout the exercise.

Did you eat at a table or did you eat at a lunch counter in (name of your country) ? Have you acquired the lunch-counter habit since coming to this country?

Have you now drunk many cups of coffee while sitting on a high stool? Did you climb on a stool and have a cup of coffee yesterday? Have you learned to pile catsup, chopped pickle, and raw onion on the same hamburger? What did you put on a hamburger yesterday? . . . etc.

_____

The student will produce a composition as follows:

_____

I ate at a table in Turkey. I have acquired the lunch-counter habit since coming to this country.

I have now drunk many cups of coffee while sitting on a high stool. I climbed on a stool and had a cup of coffee yesterday. I have learned to pile catsup, chopped pickle, and raw onion on the same hamburger. Yesterday I put mustard and chopped pickle on my hamburger . . . . etc.

_____

Here is a free writing exercise from the text on the same grammatical point. (130)

NEW EXPERIENCES

DIRECTIONS : Write a paragraph beginning, "I have had a variety of new ex-

periences since coming to the United States." Use the following phrases only if you find them useful.

have had a leisurely dinner at
have danced for hours in
have gone to ———— again and again to
have enjoyed lectures
have enjoyed concerts
have had long conversations with
have taken pictures of

———

Generally the assignments make acceptable English paragraphs. Sometimes an attempt to pack a large number of uses of a structure is less fortunate from the standpoint of content or of style, and the student is given an admonition to the effect that in a normal writing situation such a structure might not occur so many times in the same paragraph.

A strong feature of the book, however, is that the assignments are varied and interesting. Paragraphs covering such aspects of the American scene as the cable cars in San Francisco, the subways in New York City, life in a small town, atypical American kitchen, an American drug store, the PTA, or historical incidents of local interest are interspersed with paragraphs dealing with the student's life in the university and his views on current problems such as civil rights or international politics.

Another excellent feature is the sequencing of grammatical material so that the point being taught builds on those just previously drilled on. The text is divided into twelve sections headed according to the major grammatical emphasis in each. Thus there is Section A—The Simple Present and Present Progressive Tenses, Section B—The Articles, Section C—The Past Tense, and so on. However, within each section other items are taught which fit in well with these points of emphasis. Section A teaches, using the present and present progressive verb forms, negative and question patterns with *do* and *be,* the uses of *there is* as opposed to *it is,* uses of *do* and *make,* idioms with *get,* and the distinction in use between *some* and *any.* In Section C *wh-* questions and adverbs of place and time are taught with the past tense. This drill leads to Section D where adverbial clauses and the past progressive are introduced, and sequencing of tenses in complex sentences appears. In the next section the teaching of the past perfect comes in naturally in drilling on this sequencing, and in Section F this sequencing is carried out in the use of the modals in sentences expressing unreal conditions. Thus review is built in, and there is no abrupt transition from one grammatical item or from one lesson to another.

Students and teachers oriented in traditional grammar and methodology will not be disturbed by new terms and will find the approach through presentation of a rule followed by application a familiar one. Others may regret the fact that, although grammatical explanations are generally wisely kept to a minimum, the lessons do not begin with examples from which the principle may be derived by observing the language in operation, and may find the rules a bit burdensome. The section on articles is perhaps the least fortunate in this respect. Some forty rules are presented which the student is immediately expected to apply with few examples in context to guide him.

Some users of the book may question the amount of time devoted to copying

paragraphs, making only slight modifications. In a manual (29 pages) accompanying the text—a manual which, incidentally, may serve as an excellent guide to methods for those with little experience in teaching English as a second language—the author anticipates this, and suggests that for students who are fairly proficient in English and who become impatient with following the guided writing exactly without inserting words and phrases of their own, the instructor may say something like this occasionally:

> These exercises can sharpen your eyes regarding written English. They can help you to observe details. They can show you numerous small points of usage which you may have been overlooking. *(Manual,* p. 11)

She suggests that the guided writing assignments be strictly held to, that students should be checked against departing from them even when they can do so without error, and that guided writing and free writing should be strictly separated to make for the development of greater accuracy.

The text does provide this opportunity for careful, accurate writing and gives an orderly approach to the main points, though by no means all of the details, of English grammar. It is designed, says the author, to prepare foreign students to go into regular college freshman composition courses with native Americans, and thus does not teach composition in the sense of teaching rhetorical principles—patterns of organization, methods of development of a topic, and the like. Though it was prepared to be used with foreign students in American colleges and universities, the book, with its variety of topics for writing and careful sequencing, should be a most welcome aid in teaching accurate writing to students of English as a second language who are at the intermediate level of proficiency in the use of written English in secondary schools or the upper years of elementary school both in this country and abroad.

JANET ROSS
BALL STATE UNIVERSITY

Announcements

The 1968 TESOL Convention will be held at the Gunter Hotel in San Antonio, Texas, March 6–9. The Convention will provide programs of interest to ESL teachers at all levels—elementary, secondary, and college. In addition, Russell N. Campbell, Convention Chairman, has announced that an innovation in the program will be made this year. One of the plenary sessions is to be devoted to the reading of papers on research in English language teaching, testing, and linguistics (linguistics should be interpreted to include sociolinguistics and psycholinguistics as well as theoretical and applied linguistics). Members are invited to submit *one page abstracts* of papers they wish to present to:

Professor Robert Kaplan
Department of Linguistics
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, California 90007

Abstracts must be received before January 15, 1968. From these a committee will select a number of papers for presentation at the TESOL Convention. In addition to summarizing the proposed paper the abstract should indicate presentation time (maximum 20 minutes). Also, please indicate any special apparatus needed in the presentation such as slide projectors or blackboards. All papers submitted will be considered for publication in the *TESOL Quarterly.*

Publications Received

Blossom, Grace A. *The Reading Problem of the Bilingual Child and a Solution: Book English is a THIRD Language to Bilingual Students*. Mesa, Arizona, 1967.

Finocchiaro, Mary. *English as a Second Language: From Theory to Practice*. New York: Regents Publishing Company, 1964.

Jones, Lyle V. and Joseph M. Wepman. *A Spoken Word Count*. Chicago: Language Research Associates, 1966.

Kane, John and Mary Kirkland. *Contemporary Spoken English*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1967.

Lancaster, Louise. *Introducing English: An Oral Pre-Reading Program for Spanish-Speaking Primary Pupils*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1966.

Language Research in Progress: 4. A Cross-Referenced List of Documented Language Research Projects, Current June–December 1966. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, February 1967.

Macnamara, John, ed. *Problems of Bilingualism. The Journal of Social Issues*, XXIII, 2 (April, 1967).

Preston, Dennis R. and Michael B. Kozoll. *English Language and Literacy*. Book One of the Wisconsin Series in Adult Basic Education for Spanish-Speaking Agricultural Workers. Madison: University Extension, University of Wisconsin, 1967.

Robinson, Lois. *Guided Writing and Free Writing: A Text in Composition for English as a Second Language*. New York: Harper and Row, 1967. (Also, a teacher's guide to accompany this text.)

Taylor, Grant, consulting ed. *Saxon Series in English as a Foreign Language*. McGraw-Hill Book Company:

Taylor, Grant. *Learning American English*. 1956.

Taylor, Grant. *Mastering American English*. 1956.

Crowell, Thomas Lee, Jr. *Modern English Workbook*. 1961.

Crowell, Thomas Lee, Jr. *Modern Spoken English*. 1961.

Weeks, Albert J., Jr. *Reading American History*. McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1963.

Wise, Sheldon, ed. *Spoken English for Turks*. Books One–Fourteen. Istanbul: Robert College, 1967.