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

In Memoriam

Richard C. Sittler
1925 – 1968

Professor and Chairman

Department of English as a Second Language

University of Hawaii

Honolulu, Hawaii

Deep and Surface Structure, and the Language Drill*

William E. Rutherford

In recent years much has been said and written about the relevance of transformational theory for the language-teaching field. Moreover, the number of texts paying at least lip service to transformational principles is growing. Discussion of these principles with reference to pedagogy has extended from the misconstrued "transformational-grammar" popularizations all the way to the position set forth by Chomsky at the 1966 Northeast Conference—and thereafter widely misunderstood—that linguistic theory has at the present time nothing to contribute to a language-teaching technology. However, between these twin misconceptions—on the one hand by a number of textbook authors as to the real meaning of "transformation," and on the other by a large number of linguistic half-sophisticates as to the relevance for language teaching of *any* aspect of transformational grammar—there can be found a very significant body of published research which either "applies," or characterizes the application of, certain findings of generative grammar to the construction of language teaching materials. The key word in the last passage is "findings," for it is above all the

results of transformational research, not necessarily its theoretical framework, which is of great value to the language teacher. Transformational grammar does not tell us anything about language acquisition, but what it has revealed is the extent to which languages have deep and surface structure differences, underlying regularity, and universal similarity, discoveries which seem to have great pedagogical relevance. It is the implication for language teachers of the first of these revelations which is the subject of discussion in this paper.

It is obvious to any native speaker of English that the difference between sentences like

1. (a) **It's a shame he never wins**
   and

   (b) **It's a game he never wins**

is something considerably beyond the mere difference between "shame" and "game." Put another way, substituting "game" for "shame" in the above frame "It's a — he never wins" seems to relate the two sentences only in the most superficial sense and at the same time leaves the unmistakable impression that some kind of fundamental distinction has been ignored. It is obvious to most linguists, for example, that (a) is related to **That he never wins is** *a* **shame** in a way that (b) is not, and that (b) is related to **He never wins the game** in a way that (a) is not. Furthermore, "it" in (a) is not the same "it" as in (b) since it is possible to say **Tennis is a game he**

---

never wins but not **tennis is a shame he never wins,** and we know from analysis, of course, that "it" in (a) is the extraposed "it," whereas in (b) it is the pronominal "it." Yet, one of the best known and most widely used ESL texts presents as one so-called *pattern* not only such sentences as "It's easy to speak English" and "It's difficult for us," in which "it" reflects extraposition and pronominalization, respectively, but also "It's hot outside" displaying still another "it," that associated with the weather. Following mass presentation, all of these forms are put through the ubiquitous mammoth substitution drill, in which strings like "easy for you to learn English a year ago" find themselves in the strange company of such items as "warm" and "snowing," only because, presumably, they all occur after that little two-letter word "it." The above sample is no isolated occurrence; more often than not, the overriding consideration in the construction of ESL classroom drills is that they focus upon strings which *look alike,* or in other words, which display *surface similarity.*

Confronted by masses of often unrelated data, the average student, like the small child, will probably be able over a long enough period of time to extract from this data and internalize the rules of the language he is studying. But this is doing it in a way which is not only hard but also costly and time-consuming. ESL materials are oriented almost invariably toward imparting as a final goal the ability of the student to give phonological shape to surface structures. Yet, mastery of deep structure principles is just as important, if not more so, since it is these which govern semantic interpretation. It follows, however, that control by the student over deep structure differences will not take place unless he is aware of them. And I believe that one of the aims of language pedagogy must be to bring about that awareness.

Realization of this aim will depend ultimately upon the nature and organization of the textual resources employed. In such materials not only must the linguistic facts and their presentation have derived from a thorough understanding of the findings of linguistic research, but also the construction of at least some of the drills which incorporate these facts must reflect to some extent the theory within which the facts were revealed. In other words, some drills must be designed to strengthen unconscious perception by the student of the deep structure principles of English, and of the fact that surface structure alone is not sufficient for semantic interpretation. Such drills, it can be added, will serve also to measure not the student's memory capacity but the extent to which English grammar has been internalized.

Drills labeled *transformation* are by now a feature of every language text that comes on the market, with a number of such texts also claiming in general to be "transformational." Yet, although the term *transformation* does not and cannot mean in applied linguistics what it means in formal linguistics, we are never told by the applied linguist precisely what it does mean. *Transformation* in its linguistic sense characterizes a formal procedure whereby deep structures

are mapped into surface structures; *transformation* in its pedagogical sense can only signify a relationship between two phonologically realized surface structures which manifest common deep structure. In some materials, however, the term simply means that something is changed into something else, whatever that may suggest. This last definition fits a kind of drill which has been a feature of language texts since long before the advent of generative grammar, and there is therefore no reason to build it up as something new. What *is* new in pedagogy is the opportunity now to build into drill construction the kind of structure-level distinctions which formal linguistics has been able recently to delineate more and more explicitly. In other words, new products of linguistic research should prompt some new classroom applications.

English abounds in constructions which look alike on the surface but are different underneath, and interesting drills can be devised which exploit the contrast. For example, noun complements and restrictive relative clauses produce many instances of close similarity, so that a drill based upon this pairing might proceed something like

2. (a) Stimulus: **He has a silly idea that she doesn't care.**
   Response: **She doesn't care.**

   (b) Stimulus: **He has a silly idea that she doesn't care about.**
   Response: **She doesn't care about the idea.**

Whereas an appropriate label for the above would be *restatement,* the following drill, in which the comple- ment includes a subjunctive, might be an example of *transformation:*

3. (a) Stimulus: **the suggestion that he reconsider**
   Response: **Somebody suggests that he reconsider.**

   (b) Stimulus: **the suggestion that he reconsidered**
   Response: **He reconsidered the suggestion.**

The drill label in these particular examples—whether it be transformation, restatement, structural replacement, etc.—is not so important. The principle involved is one in which the student responds in such a way as to verify the extent to which perception of an aspect of English deep structure has taken hold.

In the remainder of this paper I shall enumerate some deep structure contrasts which are either obliterated or obfuscated in surface structure, and which are highly amenable to implementation in drill construction for purposes of second language acquisition.

4. Prepositional phrases of *attribution* resemble those of *description:*

   (a) **It's a matter of importance.**
   (b) **It's a matter of business.**

(a), however, is synonymous with the preposed adjective construction "It's an impôrtant mátter," whereas (b) is synonymous with the compound construction "It's a búsiness màtter." That the syntactic difference is more obvious in the second pair is due in part to contrasting stress patterns.

5. Post-copula verb-ing and to+verb nominals resemble the present pro-

gressive and "be to" verb construc-
tions, respectively:

    (a) **His business is selling. . . . to
        sell.**

    (b) **His business is branching out.
      . . . to branch out.**

Only the nominals permute with their
subjects, of course: **Selling is his busi-
ness,** not * **branching out is his busi-
ness.**

6. "The shooting of the hunters," by
now a part of every linguist's store of
examples, represents in its ambiguity
a contrast which is a part of everyday
speech. Take for instance,

    (a) **the promise of aid to alleviate
        suffering**

    (b) **the promise of A.I.D. to al-
        leviate suffering.**

"Aid" is the deep structure object of
"promise" in (a); "A.I.D." is the deep
structure subject in (b). Related to
(a) is **Someone promises aid (in or-
der) to alleviate suffering.** Related to
(b) is **A.I.D. promises to alleviate suf-
fering.**

7. The verb+to+verb category ob-
scures at least a triple distinction with
examples like

    (a) **We prepared to eat lunch.**

    (b) **We stopped to eat lunch.**

    (c) **We had to hurry to eat lunch.**

  (a) is a verb + complement con-
struction whose constituents are not
movable. Examples (b) and (c), both
of which, unlike (a), can insert "in
order," represent purpose and de-
pendency relationships, respectively.
Only in (c), however, can the to+verb
part prepose: **(In order) to eat lunch,
we had to hurry.**

8. Deletion possibilities with for+NP
in "too/enough" constructions pro-
duce very deceptive surface similari-
ties:

    (a) **The people are too crowded to
        dance.**

    (b) **The room is too crowded to
        dance.**

"For the people" has been an obliga-
tory deletion in (a), whereas it is op-
tional in (b).

9. Unlike many other languages, both
pre- and post-copula comparisons in
English use "than":

    (a) Fiats are more economical than
        Fords.

    (b) Fiats are more economical than
        comfortable.

Restoring deleted parts in both sen-
tences produces **Fiats are more eco-
nomical than Fords** are and **Fiats are
more economical than they are com-
fortable.**

10. Relativizing on different parts of
a NP dominating N Prep NP will pro-
duce

    (a) **the keys to the house that he
        bought**

    (b) **the keys to the house that he
        brought**

where under no circumstances can the
owner have brought the house, nor is
it likely that he has bought the keys.

11. Lees's well known "drowning
cats" example is not hard to duplicate:

    (a) **Moving targets are hard to hit.**

    (b) **Moving targets is hard work.**

and if the student eventually under-
stands why the old saying "Too many

cooks spoils the broth" uses a singular and not a plural verb, something will indeed have been accomplished.

12. The preposition in a verb+prep combination, with following direct object, resembles a prep phrase of duration:

    (a) **He waited for a minute.**
    (b) **He waited for a signal.**

Intonation distinguishes them, however, since the sentence-final contour will normally descend on "waited" in (a) and on "signal" in (b).

13. A wh- clause embedded as subject sometimes looks like the same clause functioning as sentence adverbial:

    (a) **Where he comes from is important.**
    (b) **Where he comes from, the family is important.**

14. Confusion occasionally arises within embedding itself, i.e. wh-X vs. wh-X-ever:

    (a) **Who he lives with is a secret.**
    (b) **Whoever he lives with is a secret agent.**

Correspondence across the copula applies to the whole clause in (a) but to only "whoever" in (b).

15. Noun complements, in addition to example 3 above, can include for+NP –to+verb instead of that+S:

    (a) advice for them to consider seriously
    (b) advice for them to consider the proposal

16. Pseudo-cleft sentences resemble both sentences with an embedded wh-clause as subject of an active verb:

    (a) **What he wants is more of your business.**
    (b) **What he wants is none of your business.**

and passive sentences with embedded wh- clause as subject:

    (c) **What he did was criticize.**
    (d) **What he did was criticized.**

Underlying (c) is **He criticized.** Underlying (d) is **Someone criticized what he did.**

17. Verb root vs. participle also furnishes the only surface distinction between

    (a) **They said they'd study English.**
    (b) **They said they'd studied English.**

but of course "they'd" in (a) is **they would,** in (b) **they had.**

18. There is also the present perfect with transitive verb vs. prenominal past participle (after passive, relative clause, and deletion transformations):

    (a) **He's invited a guest.**
    (b) **He's an invited guest.**

The same principle applies to the present progressive and prenominal verb-ing:

    (c) **It's confusing the issue.**
    (d) **It's a confusing issue.**

Prenominal verb-ing is sometimes a real adjective, sometimes not:

    (e) **It was a moving train.**
    (f) **It was a moving experience.**

19. By+NP following the passive can make real manner adverbial look like the subject of the corresponding active:

(a) **It was done by striking work-ers.**

(b) **It was done by striking a match.**

The NP following "by" is of course a prenominal verb-ing modifier in (a) and a poss+ing nominalized sentence, with the possessive deleted, in (b).

20. Passive transformations focusing on "Suzy" in both **They taught Suzy to be a dancer** and **They thought that Suzy was a dancer** will yield, through the regular passive

(a) **Suzy was taught to be a dancer.**
and through the second passive

(b) **Suzy was thought to be a dancer.**

21. Surface structure clouds the distinction between verb + complement and permuted indirect object with "for":

(a) **We found him a nuisance.**

(b) **We found him a job.**

Even sentence order can play a role in the interpretation of what would otherwise be ambiguous, since **I had Mary for lunch and I made her a sandwich** is fine, but **I made Mary a sandwich and I had her for lunch** has cannibalistic overtones.

22. Specified vs. unspecified "whoever," as in

(a) **Whoever wants it just called.**

(b) **Whoever wants it can have it.**

have paraphrases which split along the "some/any" axis: **The someone who wants it just called. /Anyone who wants it can have it.**

23. Auxiliary attraction distinguishes sentence negation from constituent negation, as in

(a) **At no time was he able to make a profit.**

(b) **In no time he was able to make a profit.**

24. Intonation is one thing that distinguishes -ly sentence modifiers from manner adverbs in sentence-final position:

(a) **She's answered all the questions, clearly.**

(b) **She's answered all the questions clearly.**

However, when "clearly" separates Aux and the rest of the VP constituents, the sentence is ambiguous:

(c) **She's clearly answered all the questions.**
and if it preposes.

(d) **Clearly, she's answered all the questions.**

it can be only a sentence modifier, synonymous with **It's clear that she's answered all the questions.**

25. In superlatives with infinitival complements, such as

(a) **The first person to finish is the winner.**

(b) **The first person to congratulate is the winner.**

"person" is subject of "finish" in (a), object of congratulate in (b), and only in (b) is the sentence grammatical without "first": **the person to congratulate,** not * **the person to finish.**

26. -ed suffixation applies to verbs to form participles, or to nouns to make them possessives:

(a) **a perfectly planned structure**

(b) **a perfectly proportioned structure.**

Only (b) has the paraphrase **a structure of perfect proportions.**

27. The number of different "so"s in the language is at least four, but the subordinator "so" and the sentence connector "so" are deceptively similar:

(a) **He's giving me a gift so I'll give him one.**

(b) **He's giving me a gift, so I'll give him one.**

"So" in (a) is of course "so that," with "that" being deleted.

28. There are formations in which the only distinction, other than lexical, between verb + particle and verb + preposition is in stress:

(a) **What's he lôoking úp?**

(b) **What's he lóoking àt?**

Noun complement and cleft sentence again throw verb + prep and intransitive verb + prt together:

(c) **It was his request that they môve ón.**

(d) **It was his request that they móved òn.**

The identical stress contrast also marks similar constituents in adjective constructions with "too":

(e) **The truck is too big to gô thróugh.**

(f) **The tunnel is too small to gó thròugh.**

where (f) again is an instance of verb + prep. Although (e) looks like intransitive verb + prt, it is really an example of verb + prep, with deleted prepositional object. An intransitive

verb + prt followed by a locative adverbial sounds almost exactly like a verb with two locatives:

(g)   **They wôrk oût in the gym.**
(h) **They wôrk oŭt in the field.**

Only in (h) is there a constituent break before "out," allowing insertions like **They work all day out in the field.**

29. Contour is the only distinctive factor separating a restrictive relative clause such as (a) It was a movie that she was interested in going to. from a cleft sentence construction such as (b) It was a movie that she was interested in going to.

30. The compound/nominal phrase opposition is prevalent in everyday speech. Thus (a) a **Frénch instrùctor** is an instructor of French, who may or may not himself be French, whereas (b) a **Frênch instrúctor** indicates only that the instructor is of French nationality. The same contrast is even more common with verb-ing: (c) **living stàndard;** (d) **lîving wáge;** (e) **cútting èdge;** (f) **cûtting remárk.**

31. When a third element is added, the complexity is compounded:

(a) **ôld míning còmpany**

(b) **góld mìning còmpany**

(c) **gôld mîning próspector**

in which

(a) **is a mining company that's old,**

(b) **is a company that's for mining gold,** and

(c) **is a prospector who mines gold.**

Possibly the most interesting area of all for deep and surface structure contrasts is where the deep structure difference is reflected in two instances of otherwise identical surface appearance

by only a slight phonological contrast—a case, in other words, of not morphophonemic but *syntacto*-phonemic realization.

32. Notice, for example, that for most speakers the following two phrases do not mean the same, although in print they are identical:

  (a) **something I have to do**/hæftə/

  (b) **something I have to do** /hævtə/

The underlying forms for (a) and (b) are **I have to do something** and **I have something to do,** respectively.   The same contrast is also present in

  (c) **something he'd done**

  (d) **something he hád done**

Oppositions such as these can form the basis for construction of gigantic minimal pairs, which are extremely useful for increasing student perception of important syntactic distinctions.

33. A similar principle is involved in the following pairs of sentences:

  (a) **Who's the person you want to call?** /wanə/

  (b) **Who's the person you want to call?** /want tə/

where somewhere in the derivational history of (a) is **You want to call the person,** in (b) **You want the person to call.** Sentence (b) is perhaps ambiguous for some speakers, although (a) can have only one interpretation. Again, even though the deep structure difference between (a) and (b) is a highly important one, the two are distinguished in speech by only a small phonological contrast, and in writing not at all.

34. Insofar as items like "wanna, hafta, gotta," etc. (as opposed to "want to, have to, got to") carry weak stress, they resemble modals. The clearest indication of this is perhaps "gonna" vs. "going to":

  (a) **I'm going to work.** /gónə/

  (b) **I'm going to work.** /gówiŋtə/

Notice that the main verb in (a) is "work," whereas in (b) it is "go." Moreover, "work" in (b) isn't even a verb at all but a noun, like "school" in **I'm going to school.** Sentence (a) is therefore very much like **I'll work,** whereas (b) is like **I'm riding to work.** Additional differences become apparent in pairs like

  (c) **They're going to battle with their allies.** /gówiŋtə/

  (d) **They're going to battle with their allies.** /gónə/

where in (d) the use of "gonna" makes the allies the enemy. This is so because "battle with" in (d) is verb + prep, the object of which is interpreted semantically as the opposing force. "Battle" in (a) is a noun, part of "go to battle," and "with" in the following prep phrase is interpreted semantically as *comitative* "with." The "allies" are therefore still part of the alliance.

A few suggestions were offered earlier concerning how such utterance contrasts could be made use of in the classroom situation, and it was pointed out that *restatement* and *transformation* type drills provide the most obvious framework for such practice. It should also be noted that contrasts of this or any other kind must not be attempted unless the paired structures have already been separately intro-

duced and separately mastered. The significance (and fascination) of the deep structure *distinctions* will be lost if the student does not have a prior independent command of the *individual* structures under scrutiny. The one area where deviation from this principle can be not only tolerable but profitable is that where classroom activity focuses upon only *perception* of contrasting patterns, "contrast" in this instance being of the surface phonological variety cited in examples (32) to (34). An "utterance discrimination" exercise—where the student identifies by A or B a mixture of utterances differing, for example, only in the manner of "something I /hæv tə/ do"/ "something I /hæftə/ do"—might well appear after mastery of the syntax of A, but not before that of B.

The details, however, of practical incorporation into drill work of the deep and surface structure phenomena under discussion ought to be fairly obvious to those skilled in the compilation of language-teaching materials. It is important to recognize that drill types which are already in common use, such as those mentioned above, can be made use of for this purpose. In the belief that ideas for classroom application will not be difficult to come by, the weight of discussion has concentrated upon attempting to reveal not only how wide the range of coalescent deep and surface structure formations in English really is, but also how important it is to establish as one of the goals of language pedagogy the perception by the learner of such phenomena.

Linguistics, Psychology, and Pedagogy Trinity or Unity?*

Ronald Wardhaugh

Most of us would agree that a variety of different educational goals exists within what we call TESOL (teaching English to speakers of other languages), but we would probably insist that we should share a common pedagogy in which the linguistic, psychological, and educational variables find a unity.

The problem I have chosen involves an examination of these three different variables to discover what the relationship among them has been in the past, is now, and could become in the future. What should a teacher engaged in TESOL know of linguistics, of psychology, and of pedagogy? How much does each of these three disciplines contribute to the others? Are they perhaps quite separate with nothing at all to contribute to each other? May not any unity we find be in reality a forced one, a marriage of convenience *(à trois,* of course), or a rationalization of existing practice rather than a theoretically valid unity? Do we, to refer to my title, have a *trinity* or a *unity?* The examination I propose seems particularly necessary at this point in time when the three disciplines themselves are in a state of change, when linguistics is filled with controversy con-

cerning the proper goals of linguistic endeavor, when learning psychology is apparently moving away from studies of rats in mazes and of pigeons in boxes to computer simulation of behavior and to studies of electrical, chemical, and neurophysiological functioning, and when pedagogy is concerned more and more with content, with strategies of learning, and with the structuring of knowledge.

It should be pointed out, however, that even in this apparent disunity in the disciplines there is a very remarkable kind of unity. Each of the disciplines is reverting to types of inquiry which certain former practitioners of the discipline pursued. In current linguistics Chomsky has looked so far into the past for historical antecedents to his interests in linguistic theory and language acquisition that he has even been called a "neomedieval philosopher" by one of his critics[1]. In current psychology there is a return to some of the concerns of early psychologists, to such concerns as reasoning and the genesis of ideation. No longer is the inside of the "black box" forbidden territory. In current educational thought there has been a noticeable return to a kind of neo-pragmatism, to a "John Dewey with a hard nose" approach, to quote a recent issue of *Saturday Review*[2]. However, this kind of unity, or disunity if you wish to call it such, is not the kind I

[1] Charles F. Hockett, review of Biological *Foundations of Language* by Eric H. Lenneberg, *Scientific American,* 217:5 (November, 1967), 14.
[2] December 16, 1967.

want to concentrate my attention upon. Rather I propose to show that in each historical period an attempt is made, conscious or otherwise, to unite the prevailing knowledge of language, the prevailing understanding of language learning, and the prevailing concept of educational goals into a pattern of language teaching. Such a pattern may actually be said to represent the best thought of its time, so that it demonstrates the "conventional wisdom" of its period. It would, of course, be quite untrue to say that such a pattern is universally subscribed to in its period, for apparently there has never been a time when one pattern of second-language teaching existed to the exclusion of all others.

At the risk of oversimplification I am going to characterize this pattern for each of three historical periods, periods which, for convenience only, I shall call the *prelinguistic* period, the *linguistic* period, and the *contemporary* period. I also very deliberately use the word *characterize,* for I believe that at any one time we can characterize our own discipline both as it exists at that time and as it seems to have existed at other times. Such characterizations may be myths, but they are no less important for that because they provide us with a foundation, or a rationale if you prefer that term, on which to base our teaching. Let us look then at characterizations of these various periods, taking the prelinguistic period and its pattern of language teaching first.

In the modern part of the prelinguistic period, that is, in the years immediately before, and to some extent during, the beginnings of modern linguistic science, there was, in the school rooms at least, a confusion of speech and writing, a belief in the appropriateness of a universal Latinate model for all languages, and no real search for theories which might account for the complexities of a natural language. In psychology the emphasis was on such concepts as the association of ideas, mental discipline, over-learning, memory, and forgetting. It is not surprising then that when the educated élite of the period prized the classics and placed great value on encyclopedic formal knowledge, the prevailing pedagogy in second-language teaching should have been one which emphasized grammar-translation, learning *about* a language rather than learning a language, and reading and writing rather than listening and speaking. Obviously, there were strong undercurrents of dissent from such emphases, but they were no more than that. If one wishes to choose representative books for the prelinguistic period, he need go no further than the phrase books in which there are the foreign language equivalents of such an expression as "The postillion has been struck by lightning" or the famous *Coleman Report*[3] with its claims about the desirability of teaching students to read foreign languages.

Let me pause to make one point quite clear. I am not saying that second languages were *not* taught successfully in this period. Undoubtedly they often were. The goals set out for language teaching were probably achieved quite regularly by those teachers who believed in what they were doing.

---

[3] Algernon Coleman, *The Teaching of Modern Foreign Languages in the United States* (New York: American and Canadian Committees on Modern Languages, 1929) .

These goals certainly differed from the goals we have today, but that is quite another matter. We must also presume that the teachers did find a unity among linguistics, psychology, and pedagogy and that they could justify what they were doing either in terms of stating a set of principles on which their practices were based, hence *a priori,* or in terms of a rationalization to justify practice, hence *a posteriori.*

More relevant to us as teacher trainers than the prelinguistic period is the linguistic period, for it was in this period that most of us were trained ourselves, and it is just such training that is behind us in our work today. However, as I intend to emphasize, the students we are training today are almost certainly not going to be working in what I am referring to as the linguistic period. They are going to be working in a period which will have to be characterized in quite a different way from the characterization that I am now going to present for the linguistic period.

In the linguistic period of second-language teaching the study of language became more "objective" because the prevailing scientific viewpoint in language study valued dispassionate observation of data. The period also witnessed important attempts to wrestle with the implications of various distinctions: for example, the speech-writing distinction and the Saussurean *langue-parole* distinction. However, in connection with the latter it must be emphasized that there was greater concentration on *parole* than on *langue.* There was also a widespread belief that, given any language, a linguist could describe, through ei-

ther postulation or discovery, its significant units, significant contrasts, and significant patterns. This characterization needs no further amplification; it is doubtless very familiar to us all.

We undoubtedly have a similar familiarity with the prevailing psychology. This too became more "scientific" and "experimental." We have heard about the laws of learning *(à la* Thorndike) and about such notions as transfer and interference. We are aware of both Watsonian behaviorism and Skinnerian reinforcement,   and we know better than to ignore the patterns discussed by the Gesaltists. In psychology the period was one in which psychologists emphasized habit formation, induction, and transfer, both positive and negative, and they too, like linguists, ruled the inside of the head almost entirely out of bounds as a legitimate area of concern.

When the pressures of war and international involvement made it necessary to teach second languages to large numbers of students in situations which enabled their teachers to employ subtle forms of coercion, a new unity was found, and it is not surprising that this unity reflected the kind of linguistic, psychological, and pedagogical interests just mentioned. Just as it is possible to choose a phrase book and the *Coleman Report* as representative works of the prelinguistic period, it is possible to choose a similar representative work for the linguistic period. Lado's book *Language Teaching*[4] is just such a work, for it is a deliberate attempt to formalize in

---

[4] Robert Lado, *Language Teaching, A Scientific Approach* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1984).

extremely simple terms the prevailing views of linguistics and of psychology, and to integrate these into a statement about pedagogy. However, it could well be argued that in actual fact Lado's statement about language teaching is a rationalization or justification of a set of practices that had grown up un-systematically and accidentally rather than a rigorous statement of axioms and derivative practices. The book is actually a rather simple statement which characterizes the TESOL prac-tices of the 1950's and tries to give them a strong theoretical base. As a characterization it offered teachers a rationalization for what they were do-ing and a justification, too, for the use of such technological innovations as language laboratories and even teach-ing machines. It is not necessary to go into the details of the pedagogy pre-sented in *Language Teaching,* for most of us are undoubtedly familiar with the book. I think that we need only say that the book offers an account of language teaching which possesses all the advantages of a characterization, for it is economical, clear, and simple; however, at the same time it has all the disadvantages since it is really a statement of belief and as such perhaps unassailable and invulnerable.

When we turn from the linguistic period to the contemporary scene in linguistics, psychology, and TESOL in order to discover what each of these disciplines is like today, we should likewise look for evidence of disunity or unity. Are we still subscribers to the point of view formalized by Lado? If we are not, what characterization do we have to substitute for Lado's? What are we saying or what do we intend to say to the next generation

of language teachers, that generation which is actually in our classrooms to-day seeking answers from us?

First of all, linguistics as a discipline has undergone a tremendous change in the last decade, a change of the kind that Kuhn in his book *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*[5] has called a revolution. The goals of the dis-cipline as pursued by Chomsky, Fill-more, and others are vastly different from those of Bloomfield, Trager, and Hockett, and the problems that in-terest them are also different. In no way do I mean this statement to be a criticism of the interests of struc-tural linguists, for linguistics is surely a big enough discipline to include widely diverging interests! However, it is true to say that the major thrust in contemporary linguistics is not to-wards an exploration of the formal characteristics of grammatical models and towards an understanding of the subtle interplay of syntax and seman-tics. There are also far different claims made today than a decade ago about what it means to *know* a lan-guage and to *acquire* a language even though this particular problem is usually discussed only in relation to first-language acquisition, with sec-ond-language acquisition hardly even mentioned.

In psychology, too, there have been great changes. Just as linguists have disputed the proper goals of linguis-tics, so have psychologists disputed the proper goals of psychology. One result of such dispute has been rather less observation of lower animals and rather more emphasis on understand-

---

5 Thomas S. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962).

ing the processes of perception, cognition, and learning: that is, on understanding the higher mental processes. Psychologists, too, are attempting to model the inside of the head and to simulate human capabilities in order to gain a better understanding of cognitive structures, categorizing abilities and information transmission, and of the various strategies and plans that an organism has available to it or can acquire. Even the postulation of innate structures and properties is found to be quite acceptable. In education, too, there is a return to the organization of knowledge, to the self discipline of learning, and to the range of individual variation in interest and ability.

One result of all this activity is that the linguistic method of language teaching is under severe attack from various sides. For illustration of this point I will quote a few criticisms and offer a comment or two on each. First, a criticism by Paul Roberts. Speaking of the wartime language schools, Roberts says:

> If you put a bright young soldier into a room with a native speaker of Japanese and keep them there eight hours a day for eighteen months, the soldier will learn quite a lot of Japanese, even if his text is just a Japanese translation of Cicero and his instructor is a nitwit. Unless, of course, the soldier simply goes mad, which also happened now and then.[6]

Obviously there is considerable truth in Roberts' statements. The linguistic method worked in many cases but other methods worked, too. The really interesting questions are, "Why does

a method work and why does it work very well at one time but not well at all at another time?" A second comment comes from Robert Politzer at the conclusion of a report on an experiment in which various combinations of drill and explanation were compared:

> In conclusion we point out that the independent variable under investigation—place of or absence of explanation—does perhaps not have the importance attributed to it in *some* of the current pedagogical discussion. That class differences (even with classes taught by the same teacher!) turned out to be more significant than treatment differences is an indication that in the actual practical teaching situation the Foreign language teacher should indeed pay a great deal of attention to such variables as the time of meeting of the class, the degree of eagerness or tiredness of the student at certain times of the day, etc. As many Foreign language teachers have no doubt suspected for some time, such variables may, in the long run, make at least as much of a difference as some of the refinements of teaching methodology. [7]

Politzer's comment brings us a little closer to a full awareness of the complexity of the problem of understanding exactly what variables are important in language learning. Perhaps we should be a little more honest than we are and admit that we do not really know how people learn. At best we can make only more or less satisfactory guesses, and these guesses account for only parts of the language-learning process.

---

[6] Paul Roberts, Foreword to *A Linguistics Reader,* ed. Graham Wilson (New York: Harper & Row, 1967), p. xxvii.

[7] Robert L. Politzer, "An Investigation of the Order of Presentation of Foreign Language Grammar Drills in Relation to Their Explanation." (United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, Bureau of Research, Project 5-1096, September, 1967.)

The third statement is a claim about language learning and language teaching by William Bull:

> Learning to talk like a Spaniard means first to think like a Spaniard. This book is dedicated to the proposition that it is easier to learn to think like a Spaniard if the teacher can explain how a Spaniard thinks.[8]

The claim is a very strong one indeed, that we should teach Spanish by teaching the thought processes of Spaniards. The claim suggests that we know a lot about these processes. I would suggest that we know next to nothing about these processes and the claim is spurious. The book from which it comes also seems to suggest that somehow a generative-transformational grammar of Spanish offers some kind of characterization of the thought processes of Spanish speakers. Again this claim must be disputed. Still another instance of a similar kind of claim comes from a paper presented by Karl Diller at the Tenth International Congress of Linguists in Bucharest in 1967:

> In sum. . . generative grammarians would agree that a language is learned through an active cognitive process rather than through an externally imposed process of conditioning and drill. Further, they would agree that grammatical rules are psychologically real and that people must use these rules—consciously or not—in speaking or understanding a language.[9]

Chomsky himself has given us the following very clear warning about such claims, and I suggest we heed it:

> I am, frankly, rather skeptical about the significance, for teaching of languages, of such insights and understanding as have been attained in linguistics and psychology . . . [and] . . . suggestions from the 'fundamental disciplines' must be viewed with caution and skepticism.[10]

We must heed it if we are to resist the stampede in what I have called the contemporary period of language teaching towards the adoption of a new pedagogy in which the new linguistics, the new psychology, and the new demands made of our educational system will find themselves welded into a new unity which will have *as little theoretical justification as any past unity.*

Let me substantiate this last statement since it obviously requires a defense. If we look back to what I have called the prelinguistic period, we can now see that there was really little or no reason for the particular unification of linguistic, psychological, and pedagogical understandings that occurred. We can make the same statement for the linguistic period. During this period there were in existence other views of linguistics, psychology, and education than those particular ones which found their way into the linguistic method. However, the kind of unity that the method provided did give its practitioners an approach, or a theoretical basis, or a rationale, within which to work. As

8 William E. Bull, *Spanish for Teachers: Applied Linguistics* (New York: Ronald Press, 1965), p 18.

9 Karl Diller, "Generative Grammar and Foreign Language Teaching."

10 Noam Chomsky, "Linguistic Theory," Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, Reports of the Working Committees, p. 43.

Edward Anthony has pointed out,[11] an approach is axiomatic so that it is by definition beyond proof or disproof. An approach is a matter of belief, and the beliefs on which the linguistic method was based came from many sources. It may even be said that on occasion an approach is based not so much on axioms or beliefs as that axioms and beliefs are developed in an apparent attempt to justify existing methods. Perhaps at some time we would do well to examine the linguistic method in detail to see if it is not just an instance of this latter process of justification. Today, though, the system of beliefs associated with the linguistic method is held by a declining number of the key people in second-language teacher training. In such training we are engaged in formalizing a new approach which will be based on beliefs that we find to be acceptable today. But while we seek to formulate a set of axioms, actual teaching innovations are occurring in the classrooms. Gradually there will be an inevitable merging of theory and practice, and *ipso facto* a new unity will emerge. This will happen, but it has not yet happened.

There is though, let me add, a kind of puzzle in all of this. We do not need to have this new unity because it is intrinsically better than either of the previous unities I have characterized. Indeed, I do not know how we could test for *better* or *worse* in this sense. We need a new unity for an entirely different reason. *We need it in order to reflect our current charac-* *terization of the basic disciplines and to justify what we are doing in classrooms.* We need it so that we can feel that our practice is theoretically justified, so that we can consider ourselves to be up to date, and so that we can be properly committed to our jobs. At the moment many of our younger teachers feel rather insecure. They find the linguistic method quite unacceptable since it employs the wrong rhetoric. They cannot believe in it; consequently, the method will not work for them. But they have nothing to replace it with, for there is no new rhetoric available as yet. For them there is no self-fulfilling prophecy, the prophecy which says that to make something work you must believe in it; believe in something and it will work for you.

Let me conclude by saying that it is just such systems of belief and commitment which are above all important in our task of training teachers in TESOL. It is up to all of us to help the next generation of TESOL teachers find an approach to their teaching which will serve them as well as the linguistic method has served us and probably still serves us. I myself do not agree entirely with Alfred Hayes when he writes:

> [Teachers] must somehow cease to regard 'methods' as matters of 'belief,' while learning to understand and to question the assumptions underlying suggested approaches.[12]

Certainly we must train teachers to question, but they need to believe in what they are doing, too. Blind un-

---

[11] Edward M. Anthony, "Approach, Method, and Technique," *English Language Teaching,* 17 (January, 1963), 63-67.

[12] Alfred S. Hayes, Foreword to *Trends in Language Teaching,* ed Albert Valdman (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966), p. vi.

questioning belief is what we must avoid, but belief in a unified approach is what teachers must have in order to succeed in their teaching. One of the greatest challenges we have before us as trainers of the next generation of teachers in TESOL and other disciplines is to help them to articulate a set of beliefs which will allow them to be as successful as we have been, and which at the same time gives them the opportunity to grow and change as the theoretical advances in linguistics, psychology, and pedagogy continue. It is an exciting challenge and one which demands our fullest attention.

*Language Testing—The Problem of Validation**

Bernard Spolsky

Foreign-language tests fall naturally into two classes according to the purposes for which they are used. In the first class are tests used for the control of instruction. They are the concern of the classroom teacher who wishes to find out how effective his teaching and the students' learning have been or to discover what needs to be taught. The second class are tests used in the control of a person's career. Used by administrators or counselors, they are intended to help make decisions about someone's qualifications for a given task or about the type of training he should follow.

Each of these classes may be further divided according to the temporal relation of the test to its goal. Tests of the first class concerned with testing what has been taught are achievement tests; those concerned with what is about to be taught are diagnostic tests. Tests of the second class concerned with what the subject can do now are achievement tests; those concerned with what he should be able to do in the future are predictive tests. But this temporal distinction is less important than the major functional one; exactly the same test can serve as a diagnostic test before

some material is taught and as an achievement test after it. Similarly, proficiency tests are generally used as predictors of future performance.

This functional classification agrees with one that can be made on operational grounds: tests of the first class are relatively simple to prepare and straightforward to interpret, while tests of the second class involve serious theoretical and practical difficulties in preparation, interpretation, and especially, in validation. Why this is so becomes clear if we consider the steps to be followed in preparing a test.

Take the preparation of a test of the first type, an achievement or diagnostic test, to be used by a classroom teacher either before she starts a unit or chapter in the textbook or after she has finished. The starting point is the syllabus, with its list of items to be learned in the unit. The purpose of the test will be to decide how many of the items on the list have been mastered by the students. For our example, let us assume that we have an elementary class in English as a second language; we wish to test their knowledge of vocabulary, and our syllabus is defined by Lesson Eleven of Book One of *English for Today.*[1] Notice that the first, and in many ways, most important task of test writing has been done: the syllabus (or textbook in this case) gives us a list of the sixteen new words in the lesson. There is no point in our going

Mr. Spolsky, presently Assistant Professor of Linguistics at Indiana University, is the associate editor with Paul Garvin of *Computation in Linguistics: A Case Book* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1966). In September, 1968, Mr. Spolsky moves to the University of New Mexico where he will be Associate Professor of Linguistics and Elementary Education.

1 *English for Today,* ed. William R. Slager (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962).

beyond the list unless of course we wish to test words previously taught. From it, we select the words to be tested. If we have time, we can put every word in the test, but there is no need, for using some appropriate techniques, we can choose a representative sample. Next, we have to decide on the testing technique we are going to use. It is here that we are called on to define more precisely what it means to "know vocabulary"; we need to translate the general term into a more precise one. Here are some possible operational definitions, each describing a possible technique:

(a) When presented with a word on the list, the student taking the test should say, "I know it" or "I don't know it."

(b) When presented with a word on the list, he must select which one of a group of definitions is appropriate:

> glass— something you drink out of
>
> something you paint with
>
> something you draw with

(c) When presented with a picture of the object named by a word on the list he indicates its name:

> glass
>
> cup
>
> bottle

(d) When presented with a picture, the student must write down what it is.

There are of course many other techniques,[2] but these may be considered a representative sample. Of course,

they each raise minor problems. The first, (a), might not be considered a normal sort of test, but it is likely to be a most useful technique with teachers and students who are cooperating closely in the learning process. The second and third raise a special problem: when multiple choice items are given, the student should know the meaning of the incorrect answers as well as the correct one; otherwise, the choice is unduly limited. For example, in (c) above, *bottle* would be a bad distracter, for the word is not introduced in Lesson Eleven (or in fact in Book One). Similarly, (b) has a bad definition; the word *drink* comes in Lesson Sixteen; in Lesson Eleven, all you do with glasses is wash them. A more serious problem in choosing a test technique is deciding whether it is a valid representation of the skill we want to test. Is there a serious difference between being able to recognize a definition and being able to give a definition? The former technique is easy to mark, the latter takes much longer. But it is quite easy to try out all the different techniques, and decide for ourselves whether they correlate so well that we only need to use one in the future.[3] Once we have decided

---

[2] See, for details, Robert Lado, *Language Testing* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961), or Rebecca Valette, *Modern Language Testing: A Handbook* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1967).

[3] *The Interpretive Information for the Test of English as a Foreign Language* (Educational Testing Service, 1967, revised January 1968) for example describes an interesting comparison of the scores on the "writing" section (a set of multiple-choice questions) with the scores of the same students on a set of essays graded by a team of examiners. The correlation is .74, which is close enough to suggest that the saving in time is worthwhile, unless of course we are planning to interpret the scores as though they had 100 percent validity. And on this see Paul Holtzman's paper in *NAFSA Studies and Papers,* English Language Series, Number 13: ATESL Selected Conference Papers (1967).

on the items and technique, the rest of the task of preparation is simple. And interpretation is straightforward, too. As long as the test is a representative sample of items, its result will say, "This student scored sixty percent on the test; he knows sixty percent of the words on the list." If the test is a diagnostic test, we will know what words need be taught; if an achievement test, we will know how effective our teaching has been. What has made test preparation and interpretation so simple has been that we have been able to ask a question to which there is a quantifiable answer. We have not asked whether or not the student knows English vocabulary, but rather how many of the words on this list he knows. Our results are clear, for they say he knows a given percentage of the words in Lesson Eleven of the text-book.

Basic to this relative simplicity was the existence of a list of items to be tested. Clearly, such lists are not available for all tests used in control of instruction. But it is equally clear that effective teaching depends on the availability of clear specifications. Normally, we have a syllabus or textbook or both, with lists of vocabulary, grammatical structures, etc. With such a syllabus or textbook, test making is straightforward. A control of instruction test is concerned with the question, "Have the items listed in the syllabus or textbook been learned to some criterion level?" It is not concerned with what should be learned. It would be wrong to include in a test of this class items that are not included in the syllabus.

When we say then that an achieve-ment test is not a good one, we are

referring to its inability to test a de-fined body of material; we are not saying anything about what should constitute that material. That is the task of the syllabus or textbook writer. Now, there are clearly cases when the distinction between test writer and textbook writer are blurred. One such case is when the test writer is trying to evaluate achievement in something that has not in fact been specified. He then has to do the textbook writer's job of specification before he can pre-pare an achievement test. This hap-pens when one has a set of materials that can be listed as items and pat-terns, but one wishes to test the ability of the students to know more than the items or patterns they have been taught. For example, one may wish to find out about a student's ability to speak naturally on a topic other than those he has been trained for in memorized dialogues, or to use pat-terns with words other than those included in the pattern drills. But in such cases, we are really moving out of the realm of achievement tests, and into the area of proficiency, the second class of tests. These cases in fact set the limit; the first class in its purest form consists of tests defined not only functionally but also operationally—functionally, in that they are used in the control of instruction, and opera-tionally, in that they are tests prepared on the basis of specifications of be-havior or items that have been pre-pared, independently of the test, as part of the development of materials, textbooks, and syllabus.

The second class of foreign-language tests is defined functionally as tests used primarily in the control of a sub-ject's career. They serve to make

judgments possible on such questions as:

1. How well will the subject do at learning foreign languages in general, or one foreign language in particular? Should he be advised (permitted, encouraged) to study a language? Should his employer (or the government, or the armed forces) invest time and money in his studying a language?

2. How well does the subject perform in the given foreign language? If he needs to use the language in government or other service, will he be successful? If he is a graduate student in a given field, will he be able to read books in the foreign language?

Tests aimed to handle the first set of questions are predictive tests; their task is to make some sort of judgment possible on the question of the student's language-learning aptitude, and will need to make available information on any factors that will be relevant to language learning. This type of test sets many basic problems about the nature of second language acquisition, but will be left out of consideration in this paper.[4] Here, we shall be concerned with tests intended to answer questions of the second sort, proficiency tests.

Fundamental to the preparation of valid tests of language proficiency is a theoretical question of what it means to know a language. There are two ways in which this question can be answered. One is to follow what John Carroll[5] has referred to as the integrative approach, and to accept that there is such a factor as overall proficiency. The second is to follow what Carroll called the discrete-point approach: this involves an attempt to break up knowing a language into a number of separate skills, and further into a number of distinct items making up each skill. We are using the overall approach when we give a subjective evaluation of the proficiency of a foreign speaker of our language. In such cases, we usually do not refer to specific items that he has or hasn't mastered but to his ability to function in a defined situation. We do not say, "He is unable to distinguish between the phonemes /i/ and iy/," but rather something like "He doesn't know enough English to write an essay, but he seems to be able to follow lectures and to read his textbooks without much trouble." The key assumption of the discrete-point approach is that it is possible to translate sentences of the second type into a list of sentences in the first, and the key requirement for discrete-point testing is that we could quantify "He knows the words on this list."

Detailed instructions on how to prepare tests like this are given in the books by Lado and Valette referred to earlier. Drawing in particular on the powers of techniques developed by taxonomic linguistics to describe in detail the surface structure of languages, Lado shows how it is possible to construct tests that permit very fine discrimination of the strengths and weaknesses of foreign-language

---

4 For a discussion of this problem, see Paul Pimsleur, "Testing Foreign Language Learning," *Trends in Language Teaching,* ed. Albert Valdman (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966).

5 John B. Carroll, "Fundamental Considerations in Testing for English Language Proficiency of Foreign Students," *Testing* (Center for Applied Linguistics, 1961).

learners. Basic to Lado's approach is a theory calling for systematic description of the surface structure of the language being learned, combined with comparison with the language of the learner; it leads to a notion that tests as well as teaching material should be based on contrastive analysis, and prepared accordingly. Using these techniques, it is possible to develop tests that may be scored objectively (although some studies have raised some questions about the type of question used)[8] and the results of which lead to such precise interpretation tion as "the subject confuses medial /l/ and /r/." Tests of this nature are obviously of very great value in the control of instruction, whether as diagnostic or achievement tests.

But we must ask whether such an approach, assuming that all we have to do is to list all the items, permits us to characterize overall proficiency. If so, overall proficiency could be considered the sum of the specific items that have been listed and of the specific skills in which they are testable. To know a language is then to have developed a criterion level of mastery of the skills and habits listed. There are rather serious theoretical objections to this position. First, a discrete-point approach assumes that knowledge of a language is finite in the sense that it will be possible to make an exhaustive list of all the items of the language. Without this, we cannot show that any sample we have chosen is representative and thus valid. We must then argue for selection on the basis of functional necessity. This involves defining the functional load of the ability to distinguish between a pair of phonemes or of the ability to recognize the appropriateness of a given verb form. To do this, we would have to collect a list of minimal pair utterances in which the distinction is vital, but there turn out to be very few real minimal-pair situations, that is, situations where a single linguistic difference in a given situation will lead to complete misunderstanding. I have been told for instance the true story of a foreign lady speaking to her Italian maid: she asked to have the meat *(carne)* brought to the table, but had it given to the dog *(cane)* instead; rather strong punishment for speaking an r-less dialect. The rarity of such situations is a result (and theoretical cause) of the redundancy of natural languages.[7] Thanks to redundancy, we can communicate satisfactorily without knowing any given item in a language. This is most obvious in the area of vocabulary, where it is quite clear how many of the words in the dictionary are unknown to the average native speaker; it is true also in the area of phonology, otherwise speakers of different dialects of the same language would never be able to understand each other. It is probably not true in the case of many syntactic rules, but many of these are likely to turn out to be universal, and so irrelevant to foreign-language testing. More important, though, is the fact that syntactic rules are untestable unless fleshed out with vocabulary and phonology or spelling.

---

6 See for instance, Eugène Brière, "Testing the Control of Parts of Speech in FL Compositions," *Language Learning,* XIV, 1 & 2 (1964).

---

7 For *a* brief account of this, see John B. Carroll, *Language and Thought* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964).

All of this suggests the impossibility of characterizing levels of knowing a language in linguistic terms, that is, as mastery of a criterion percentage of items in a grammar and lexicon. A more promising approach might be to work for a functional definition of levels: we should aim not to test how much of a language someone knows, but test his ability to operate in a specified sociolinguistic situation with specified ease or effect. The preparation of proficiency tests like this would not start from a list of language items, but from a statement of language function; after all, it would not be expected to lead to statements like "He knows sixty percent of English," but "He knows enough English to shop in a supermarket."

Functional statements of language proficiency may take various forms. One of the most thorough examples of a fairly complete scale is that prepared by the Foreign Service Institute for the classification of officers of the U.S. State Department. These Absolute Language Proficiency Ratings, as they are called, involve a division into language skills (reading, writing, speaking, and comprehending) and a numerical rating for each. The numerical ratings are generally described by a brief title, and range from "elementary," through "working" and "professional" to "native or bilingual." For each level of each skill there is a short description, again emphasizing skill. For example, to receive the rating S-3, one must be "able to speak the language with sufficient structural accuracy and vocabulary to satisfy representation requirements and handle professional discussions within a special field." There is then a longer

description, suggesting the type of language-learning experience that is associated with the level.[8]

Starting with functional statements of this sort (and there should be little problem in preparing such descriptions for each of the situations in which proficiency tests are used), the language tester's problem is to find a reliable, valid, and economical method of rating a subject's proficiency in these terms. The first question is one of strategy. The discrete-point approach implies that it is possible to give a linguistic description of each level, to list the words and grammar needed to achieve this, but this is not possible either in theory or practice. The practical approach followed in the past has been to decide in some ad hoc way (the opinion of teachers, for instance) on the sort of items to be tested and the sort of test to use, but even though such a test can be made extremely reliable, it proves impossible to show its validity with sufficient precision to justify interpretations or improvements.[9] A more helpful strategy is to prepare proficiency tests in two stages. For the first stage one must forget considerations of expense and time. Expensive tests, using panels of trained judges, and having the subject function in situations of the sort

---

[8] The Absolute Language Proficiency Ratings are described in a number of mimeographed circulars. More accessible is the sample quoted by John Carroll in his article in *Foreign Language Annals* I, 2, (December 1967), and the description by Frank Rice in the *Linguistic Reporter* (May 1959) .

[9] This problem has been discussed, among other dates at a seminar held at the 1967 Conference of the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, the proceedings of which have been published in *A TESL Selected Conference Papers.*

described in the rating scales, should first be developed as yardsticks. The second stage then involves taking cheaper procedures, of whatever kind, and correlating them with the more expensive measures. The degree of correlation will show the value of the ad hoc tests and make clear the degree of doubt that must be kept in their interpretation.

The exact nature of these more practical tests is not important; one would presume that they would be similar to many of the tests presently being used,[10] but they would permit of greater confidence in use, greater possibility of improvement (for we could then be in a position to speak about improving the validity of an objective test), and greater refinement in interpretation. It is probable that we would be able to develop simpler tests (e.g., the overall proficiency test using redundancy I have been working on[11]), and so ultimately justify the expense of the validation procedures.

The central problem of foreign-language testing, as of all testing, is validity. With tests of the first class, used by classroom teachers in the control of instruction, this problem is not serious, for the textbook or syllabus writer has already specified what should be tested. With tests of the second class, it remains a serious difficulty, for we have not yet found a way to characterize knowledge of a language with sufficient precision to guarantee the validity of the items we include or the types of tests we use.

---

[10] John Carroll, for instance, has investigated the correlation between the FSI Absolute Language Proficiency Ratings and the MLA Foreign Language Proficiency Tests for Teachers and Advanced Students.

[11] Bernard Spolsky, Bengt Sigurd, Masahito Sato, Edward Walker, and Catherine Arterburn, "Preliminary Studies in the Development of Techniques for Testing Overall Second Language Proficiency," *International Review of Applied Linguistics,* (in press).

EDITOR'S NOTE:

The papers of Donald M. Topping and Edgar Wright were presented at the TESOL Convention in March, 1968 in a section meeting entitled "Literature in the ESL Program." The following statements by the chairman of the section, John Povey of the University of California at Los Angeles, serve to introduce them well.

The question of literature is a vital one for ESL teaching since literature is the most expressive function of a language—yet its position in an ESL program has never been adequately defined because such consideration reaches into the most fundamental assumptions of language and language teaching, and we have too often accepted such fundamentals as received data and concentrated our thought and time on methods—the hows rather than the whys of TESOL teaching practice.

The intention of these two papers is not to be specifically practical. We do not offer a convenient methodology of tricks and techniques for classroom problems—our aims are more general: to dwell upon the fundamental concepts of the language/literature dichotomy which we have created to plague ourselves. The recognition of this division and its effects must be the elements which precede more immediate, more practical classroom needs—though I hope we shall pave the way for these, too.

Linguistics or Literature: An Approach to Language

Donald M. Topping

As mature and unemotional scholars of the humanities and linguistics—and I like to think of linguistics as a humanistic science—it should be possible for us to make an objective evaluation of the contribution that linguistics has made to the teaching of languages, and at the same time to recognize its limitations. It is my belief that such an evaluation will show clearly that language teaching does belong in the purview of linguistics rather than in that of literary scholars, and in fact, that literature has no legitimate place in a second-language program whose purpose is to teach language skills to a cross section of students who are preparing for studies or work in a variety of disciplines.

Some of the basic tenets of linguistics upon which the new methodology was founded were (1) language is noise; (2) the noises are

Mr. Topping is Assistant Professor of Linguistics at the University of Hawaii. He is the author of *Spoken Chamorro: With Grammatical Notes and Glossary* soon to be published by the University of Hawaii Press.

articulated by human beings; (3) these noises recur in highly restricted and systematic patterns within a given speech community; (4) every human being learns one of these systems (sometimes two) at a very early age; (5) the system becomes habitual as the child matures; (6) learning a new language involves learning a new set of habits; (7) old habits will interfere with the new habits one is trying to acquire when learning a new language; (8) language is a viable phenomenon, subject to natural evolutionary changes just as every other living thing in nature.

Operating from these tenets—and there are others—what are some of the basic guidelines that linguists brought to the problems of language teaching and learning? Some of them might be stated as follows: (1) Since language is noise, it should be taught as such: hence, the aural-oral approach. (2) Since the noises occur in highly restricted patterns, they are presented as such: pattern practice. (3) Since language becomes a kind of habit, it is presented in such a way as to instil habits: mimicry and memorization. (4) Since old habits interfere with new habits which the learner is trying to acquire, the predictable areas of interference are chosen by scientific method for special concentration: contrastive analysis. (5) Since language is a viable phenomenon, the language of the present speech community which gave it birth—today's language—is that which is taught.

These guidelines to language teaching, as offered by linguists, at one time seemed quite bold, even revolutionary. They enjoyed a full-blown and rather lengthy hey-day. But now, with the exception of a few diehards, they are accepted by most people as commonplace. Many, including most linguists, would view them as trivial, for it has become sadly obvious that the approaches demanded by these guidelines are effective only on the most elementary level of intensive language teaching. They serve well to bring a new, untarnished student from zero proficiency to something higher than zero. But the level of proficiency that is possible to achieve through these methods is far below that which we know to be adequate for any significant communication.

The problem that consistently plagues the teacher of second languages is what to do after mimicry and memorization of dialogues, pattern practices, and substitution drills. Where does he turn to find the resources, devices, and techniques to take him beyond this primary level of language instruction—the fun part—to a level which will enable the student to function effectively in the second language? I refer to that group of students usually classified as intermediate or advanced.

Solutions have been proffered from a variety of sources. "Total immersion in the community," cry the heuristic psychologists. "Start them on good elementary level readers," drone the Educationists. "Let us lead the students through the rich and varied world of the literature," sing the poets. Meanwhile, the linguist has retired to his re-write rules and distinctive features, for the problem is no longer his.

Unfortunately, none of the proffered solutions has met with much success. The immersion scheme is like dropping

a non-swimmer into the middle of the Rio Grande. With luck, he might make it, but the odds against it are pretty high. Elementary readers for mature students would offer about as much enrichment as a Metrecal diet for sumo wrestlers. The avenue of literature is probably the most serious one, and the one which concerns us here. Hence, it deserves a more careful examination before dismissal.

Some of the advocates of literature in a second-language program have presented portions of their theses in print, arguments which I think speak for a sizeable body of the literati. And, they have presented their arguments well. Consequently, I am reluctant to paraphrase their glowing prose. I ask for pardon for reducing their arguments to outline form here in the interest of brevity.

One of the arguments for the use of literature in an ESL program was set forth in a recent issue of the *TESOL Quarterly.* I quote a portion therefrom:

> 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 the students.[1]

The first of these statements is based on some very wrong assumptions. Reading the works of a literary giant—even in my own language—will have no more positive effect on my own language skills than the grading of freshman composition papers would have, in a negative way,

on the hapless teaching assistant. At best, reading may improve our reading skills; but its effect on one's own speaking, listening, and writing skills will be nil. The notion that literature will "represent . . . the style that can properly stand as a model for the students" is equally unrealistic, if not downright erroneous. It is as though watching the two-time Makaha surfing champion, Fred Hemmings, would improve our own surfing, when our primary concern is just to make the wave without wiping out, not to win trophies. Would that we could all be Joyces, or Hemingway, or Faulkners—depending on one's particular literary idols. The fact remains that literary genius is not acquired by reading the works of the masters.

Indeed, such a practice might well work directly against that which we are trying to achieve. What most of us are not aware of—probably due to the lack of any serious syntactic analyses of literary prose[2]—is that our gifted authors, our masters of the word, are taking liberties and licenses with the syntax of our language that never entered the heads of us pedestrian academicians. And that is precisely what distinguishes their writing from that which appears in faculty memoranda, reports, and learned papers. Now, if our purpose is to teach control of standard English syntax, including compound and complex constructions, then we are doing our students a terrible disservice by asking

---

[1] John Povey, "Literature in TESL Programs," *TESOL Quarterly,* I, 2 (June, 1967) , 41-42.

[2] Richard Ohmann, among others, has done some significant work on samples taken from literature. His article, "Generative Grammars and the Concept of Literary Style," *Word* 20:3 (December, 1964), 423-39, shows what can be done in the way of structural analysis as it relates to literary style.

them to imitate those who practice artful violation of the syntactic rules.

The fact that the works of literature contain a different kind of syntax and vocabulary has certainly been recognized by at least some of the advocates of literature in the second-language program. Special readers for foreign students are known to most of us,[3] and have enjoyed a certain degree of popularity among teachers who have faced classes of what Kenneth Croft calls "high intermediate" level students. Some of these texts contain selections of "edited" American literature, in which sentences have been completely rewritten and vocabulary deliberately restricted to 4,000 items, a practice which the author feels "has not changed the original stories much, although an author's style is inevitably affected to some extent by this amount of editing."[4] Other texts,[5] perhaps designed for lower advanced levels, or higher intermediate levels, do not countenance editing, but contain copious footnotes glossing vocabulary items and paraphrasing idioms. The chief difference that I can see between editing and paraphrasing is that in the latter the student sees what has been edited. Reading texts of both of these formats are admired and used by a good many. At best, they represent a compromise between those who would teach the literature as it was written and those who recognize that the language of what we define as good literature is too complex and unusual for all but the best

of our second-language students, who are already beyond need for further careful training in language.

At least one advocate of the edited editions[6] would have us adapt the selections on the basis of "an inventory of grammatical patterns in an ordered sequence which serves as the syllabus for the language program." This in itself is a commendable goal, not unlike that medieval ideal of counting the number of angels that can dance on the head of a pin. Just imagine the difficulty of revising even the shortest of the Hemingway stories so that the sentences followed an ordered sequence of structural types. I seriously doubt that the end product would win any prizes beyond rejection slips.

If one must go to all the trouble of rewriting or editing editions of literary works, does the end justify the tedious means? Just what is it we are attempting to accomplish by insisting that our reading material be *bona fide* literature? The goal has been eloquently stated at least once:

> 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 culture.[7]

Without saying it directly, that statement implies that America's literature reflects the "culture of this country" that we want the foreign student to know. Another writer refers to literature as "artefacts of our culture."[8] If we seriously expect the works of American literature—as it has been

[3] For example, Kenneth Croft's *Reading and Word Study* (Prentice-Hall, 1963).
[4] *Ibid.,* p. vi.
[5] Dorothy Danielson and Rebecca Hayden, *Reading in English* (Prentice-Hall, 1961), for example.

[6] Charles T. Scott, "Literature and the ESL Program," *The Modern Language Journal,* XLVII, 8 (December, 1964), 491.
[7] Povey, p. 42.
[8] Scott, p. 490.

defined by our English Departments—to help a foreign student tune in on the contemporary American scene that he is attempting to cope with, then we are deluding ourselves. Rip van Winkle does not reflect my American culture anymore than the Pony Express reflects our system of transporting mail. What our literature reflects-even that of ten years ago—is tradition, a past stage in the evolution of American culture. The student who needs to learn about contemporary American culture does not need to dig up the fossils of past eras. That sort of study is for the specialist. And we can hardly expect the student of a second language to do the work of a specialist, particularly when his primary concern is to acquire a tool that will help him to specialize in something of his own choosing.

There still remains one significant plea for the inclusion of literature. We must "help students realize the literary experience." [9] Just what is meant by the literary experience, I'm not quite sure. Is this what the instructor of the sophomore survey class expects the students to have when he carefully explicates the imagery of Shelley's "Hymn to Intellectual Beauty"? Or, is it the experience that the vast majority of our native English-speaking students get as they pore over the ever-increasing number of "ponies" and "Outlines of Literature" at the off-campus book stores, so as to avoid reading anything original that falls into the category of literature? Is it not highly unrealistic to expect a student of agriculture, botany, or even linguistics to undergo some sort of esoteric literary experience in a lan-

guage and a tradition that are totally alien to him, while our own native-born students look upon courses in literature as dreary requirements that must be fulfilled for graduation? This is but a dream of the poor literary acolyte who finds himself in the novel situation of having to teach his language because he is a native speaker, and because there are more foreign students who need training in language than there are students of literature. His job is part of the apprenticeship of the literary guild. Unfortunately, this situation is widespread, and is not likely to change in the immediate or near future. We must leave the literary experience for those who seek it, and stop inflicting it on the reluctant students who are turned on by other things.

It is clear that the mere inclusion of literature in any second language program is not going to fill the gap alluded to earlier in this paper, a gap that is recognized by all. Students must learn to read selections beyond the sentence and paragraph level, and they should be learning something about the culture in which they are now, or anticipate, trying to function. If the first of these is our primary goal, then we need to concentrate on language. If the second, then we should explore the available materials produced by scholars of our contemporary society—namely, psychologists, sociologists, and anthropologists. If it is the tradition we wish to impart, in addition to language, then let us utilize the available clearly written history texts.

It is my contention that our primary obligation to the student is to teach language skills above and be-

---

[9] Scott, p. 490.

yond those reached through the familiar aural-oral methods. These skills must include the ability to read and write long, complex constructions which the graduate student, or even professional, is likely to encounter. In addition, we must give our students cultural orientation to the society in which they are attempting to function, either vicariously, as in an overseas learning situation, or actually, as in most of our university environments. The medium of literature, in the traditional sense of the term, cannot fulfill either of these demands.

For the cultural orientation, I would expect the student who is living in the United States to assume a good portion of the responsibility himself. Let him take a few deep breaths of the life around him. It may consist of the crackling air at a Saturday football game, the weighty atmosphere of a learned debate, or the heady, sweet smoke of a pot party. Precisely what he inhales is not so important as the variety. It's all American, and that is what it's all about. If we want to supplement his cultural experiences with reading, then we should make available such source material as the Davenport News and the Los Angeles Times, the Watchtower and Ramparts, the sermons of Billy Graham, Stokeley Carmichael, and Mario Savio. Our students are much more likely to want to read of the Pueblo rather than "The Open Boat," or of the siege of Hue instead of *The Red Badge of Courage.* These are the reflectors of contemporary America, the America that our students need to know.

If not from literature, where is the student going to get the needed experience in the reading and writing of the more complex language con-

structions which are essential to his linguistic growth? Memory and pattern practice only help to scratch the surface of a new language. It is beneath the surface that the student must be led, towards what is now commonly referred to as the deep structure. We cannot hope to teach, or even expose the student to the infinite number of surface recombination of the deep structures of the language. Even Shakespeare, in all of his plays and sonnets, used only a small fraction of the surface structures available to him. Since familiarity with all of the complex surface constructions of a language is not a reasonable goal, it is our responsibility as language teachers to teach something of the processes involved in encoding and decoding the surface recombination of the relatively small number of deeper level syntactic structures.

At the present time, the materials for doing this are extremely limited and unsophisticated. If they are to be developed and refined to the point where the average teacher of a second language can put them to good use, it will be necessary for the theoretical linguists to come down out of their trees and upper level strata to teach us more about the generative processes in our language so that they can be transmitted, not by theory, but through practice to the teachers and learners of second languages. Until this happens, we either continue to pattern practice ourselves *ad nauseum,* or we plunge hopelessly into the endless morass of literature, unable to see our way out of the entanglements of embedments, deletions, and transformations of adult language, literary or not.

The Other Way Round

Edgar Wright

We have become accustomed to linguists examining literature as language, to their looking at a novel or a poem as a language text. Less attention, too little I would say, has been given to looking at matters the other way round, that is, to looking at language as literature. This is of course, in very general terms, part of the subject matter of the discipline of "literary criticism," but the approach I wish to take is not, at this level, a critical one. Nor do I wish to plunge into the discussion about the desirability or usefulness of using a literature "text" for teaching language, important as the sensitive and selective use of such a method can be. I wish, in this brief paper, to attempt to look at literature as a use of language, and to note more particularly where the second-language reader may have difficulty because of the medium of language. More specifically, I want to question how it is that language becomes literature, working from the premise that literature starts from, and as, language. I shall not bother much with the problem of defining literature, fundamental as that is. We all have some idea of what it is. Most of us would agree, I think, on two broad generalizations about it. The

Mr. Wright, Professor of English and Chairman of the Department, Laurentian University in Sudbury, Ontario, is the author of *Mrs. Gaskell, A Re-assessment* (Oxford University Press, 1965) and articles and materials for teaching English as a second language. He taught for ten years at University College in Nairobi, Kenya.

first is that it presents, through the medium of language, values of various sorts that the language community esteems. The second is that we associate special skills of language with the presentation; language as art is involved. Both of these aspects have as their basis the language medium.

The teacher of literature knows this, but all too often forgets or ignores it, acting as though content were all and using a poem or novel in the way that a preacher uses a Bible text. The message to be preached is Lawrence, or Wordsworth, or Melville, or Emily Post. Or perhaps it is a way of life—American, British. Doubtless the Chinese do it as well. The values preached may be right, though I suspect that in the second-language situation they often aren't. One of the pleasing ironies of the literary situation is the way that the countries are fighting back with their home produced weapons—African literature, Malayan literature, Philippine literature, and the rest—all extolling their own values and ways of life.

I have made the statement that literature is inescapably language; a wonderfully obvious statement if you like, but let us see if we can dig something more valuable than a platitudinous tautology out of it. We can begin with the aspect of the language community, the values and behaviors which we call a "culture." Literature is language, but it is a selected anthology of the language whose items are valued because of their institu-

tional value or their pleasure value or the mixture of the two. The culture, then, is the context of situation in which literature occurs; literature is a linguistic reaction of a special sort to the context. The culture will lay down, dictate if you like, the appropriate language reaction to a particular event. Sometimes, very rarely, as with the use in religion of Sanskrit or Classical Hebrew or until recently Latin, a special language quite divorced from the first language will be used. Here it is the use, the ceremony, that is important, and for the listeners, as well as for the users, there is no literary value involved; ceremony is all. But where the first language is involved, the effect rests on a relationship between the culture and a norm of language. If we are native speakers we appreciate this relationship, which occurs as deviations from the norm. The appreciation is, for the commoner situations, intuitive (just in the way that, as Chomsky pointed out, we intuit what a well-formed sentence is), but the intuition is only apparent. In reality it is learned behaviour, just as language itself is learned behaviour. And if we haven't learned the language properly or fully, or if we haven't learned the culture properly or fully, then we can't intuit these relationships properly. For example, anyone who has studied Shakespeare's *The Tempest* with Africans knows that they see the relationships in the play as colonial ones: Prospero is the imperialist, Caliban is the native, the island is a colony. Who can blame them! But—and this is my point— what gets lost is one aspect of the language. I am not at the moment concerned with the play's poetry, but with the fact that its language is a context indicator which is misread. If we distort the language context, then we shall inevitably distort or misinterpret or only partly realise the meanings related to the language, whether the meanings are of fact or of attitude or emotion.

Within specific situations we need also to be aware of the particular register. I use the term "register" within its development in British linguistics to mean the formal characteristics of language—whether of vocabulary or syntax or, in speech, of tone,— imposed by a particular situation; for example, the situation of being a mourner at a funeral or a guest at a bright cocktail party, or being an employee talking to the boss. We all know that appropriate registers will enforce a shift in social dialect; we modify our language to suit occasions. Sometimes the shift is small, sometimes very noticeable. The formality scale suggested by Martin Joos,[1] ranging through five types from "frozen" to "familiar," considers one area of this phenomenon. Our reading of literature depends very much on our ability to distinguish registers as we read, and of course on the writer's ability to record them accurately. This is a very sophisticated linguistic feat, one that is normally beyond the scope of even a well-advanced second-language student.

So far I have stressed the close relationship between language and cultural or social context. This is spelt out at some length in the recent *Report of the Royal Commission on*

---

[1] *The Five Clocks* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1967).

Bilingualism and Biculturalism[2] published in Canada, which should be required reading for any one concerned with these problems. However, I wish to make one further point on the language use aspect. When we read literature written in English by Africans—to use this as an example-how do we judge it?—especially if the language seems to be what we call clumsy or even incorrect. Do we assume that the language levels and forms we are used to in our own context are also appropriate, correct, for the African context. When, for example, proverbs are used, do we label them quaint or unusual? Or, more probably, do we overcompensate and praise the "new look" they give to style? One thing we could do would be to realise that in the first language, and therefore in the social context, the proverb will have a proper place in the various registers of the language, and that the choice of one proverb rather than another may even have its formality signal. Or, to take another example, language we call pompous or stilted may well be the appropriate language for an occasion which, in the vernacular and so in the accepted language behaviour, would require some degree of ceremony.

These are vital matters; the importance of context and register are not sufficiently realised in their directly linguistic effects. But you may be muttering that language is something more prosaic than this, a matter of morphology and syntax, words and usage and patterns. In fact, these elements of language are the elements through which the required

register or tenor is realised, but we can look at the details more closely, for they lead us into the area of style and meaning. Meaning in particular is culture-bound. Shaw made this point in *St. Joan* when the Duke of Warwick's chaplain, Stogumber, accuses Cauchon of being a traitor. Warwick smooths down the ruffled Cauchon:

> I apologise to you for the word used by Messire de Stogumber. It does not mean in England what it does in France. In your language traitor means betrayer: one who is perfidious, unfaithful, disloyal. In our country it means simply one who is not wholly devoted to our English interests.[3]

You all probably have your private collections of similar mishaps, and most of us would consider the problems of precision or of culture shift fairly well-known ones. I don't want to linger on this, and I shall only draw your attention to one point: that the choice of words will control these connotations, and that this ability to control the power of words by placing them in the context of other words which limit their range of reference is a language art and builds up from the normal use of language.

I want, however, to pause a little at a linguistic level we should agree is basic, the syntactic patterning of sentences. This is one basis on which the language patterns of literature are created. (Others are the sound or phonological patterns, sometimes assumed not to exist in written literature, the collocational patterns and the patterns of larger units of discourse which we

---

2 (Ottawa: The Queen's Printer, 1967.)

3 Scene 4 (London: Longmans, Green and Company, 1966). p. 101.

are more accustomed to consider under the heading of "form.") As native speakers we intuit deviations from the normal patterns, or nuances of meaning in the choice of one pattern rather than another, of the active rather than the passive voice, for example. We can probably sense as well as any great deviation from normal sentence lengths over a stretch of discourse. We will be aware if some special sentence pattern is given prominence; we note it as a style marker. We respond with added attention to the use of an inversion. We can mess about with the position of subordinate clauses or drop adverbs into carefully chosen positions. And so on. We can do this because we have control of both the sentence elements and the permutations of combination. Alternatively, we may admit that we cannot achieve an effect we want, agreeing instead to admire someone who can. At least we are able to appreciate when the effect is achieved.

The second-language speaker can do only a limited amount of this, either in practice or response. Now this is not a matter of correct or incorrect English, or of good or bad English; it is a matter of carrying the language beyond the level of being a simple vehicle for factual information. I had better note in passing that when actually incorrect English is used, this is obviously the negation of a language art, unless the incorrectnesses are selectively and deliberately used to create some sort of new or dialect pattern—as with the novels of Tutola.[4] But to return to information levels; language at the level of literature uses patterns which can cope with registers, emphases, all those indications which we lump together as language effects and which are conveyed with, if not altogether by, the syntactic patterns and the relationships between them. Look at this from the reverse side, from the viewpoint of an African writing English who can contrive all sorts of patterns in his vernacular but has not quite got the hang of how to handle the appropriate patterns in English. Many African languages, for example, have a special tense, a narrative tense that is only used when a sequence of events is being recounted in the past. The use of this tense will automatically switch on in a listener the response of "listening to narrative" and will heighten the cumulation of intensity. Now we read a paragraph from a novel written in English:

> Then came the war. It was the first big war. I was then young, a mere boy, although circumcised. All of us were taken by force. We made roads and cleared the forest to make it possible for the warring white to move quickly. The war ended. We were all tired. We came home worn out. . .[5]

The apparent naivety of the short sentences and groups, the repetition of the patterns, have the hall-marks of an attempt to recreate in English the effect of the narrative tense. To a degree it works, and it is certainly not "incorrect" English. But this isn't the best way to do it with English syntax. Yet one suspects that for an African the style would be much

---

[4] The first and best known of Amos Tutola's novels is *The Palm Wine Drinkard* (London: Faber, 1952).

[5] James Ngugi, *Weep Not Child* (London: Heinemann, 1964), p. 27.

foretelling: the narrative form would be suggested.

Poetry raises the problems of language in more concentrated manner. Tradition has it that this is the highest literary art. It is certainly the art that displays, and therefore demands, recognition of the most subtle and complex uses of language resources. It also places a very special emphasis on phonological patterns, of metre, sound, and so forth. I would state quite bluntly that very few of even the best second-language speakers have much idea of what the metrical and stress patterns *do* in a poem. What then are we supposed to do with a poem if we handle it as literature, i.e., as something more than the paraphrase of what is paraphrasable. These patterns, with the effective relationship of the patterns to meaning— let alone the aesthetic pleasure in the handling of the rhythm and words— are language uses that are lost to the majority of native English speakers. Africans appreciate poetry and have much of it; appreciation of it is far more general than among English speakers by comparison, for in the vernacular the art of oral narrative, and with it poetry, is part of the general culture. But I hold it useless to expect speakers of English as a second language to appreciate poetry in English at more than a very limited level.

What applies more obviously to poetry applies in reality to all the language qualities of literature. Enjoyment of the art, understanding of the fact that art is being used, sensitivity to the effects or meanings created by the art, are developments from an already existing basis of ability to use and be at ease with a sufficiently wide sample of language potential. Which reflection brings us directly face to face with that terrible term "style." It should by now be possible to see that the word *style* stands for two quite distinct things: (a) the effects that a language use can create, and (b) the means used to create those effects, or, to use psycholinguistic jargon, the affective and the effective aspects of language. To expect appreciation of the effects with insufficient knowledge of the language is to come close to the position of those ardent aesthetes who claimed that one did not need any knowledge of Greek to realise that Homer, when read aloud, was great poetry.

We have to ask whether we need, then, to give up the study of literature in the second-language context. (You will notice that I avoid the expression "the *teaching* of literature"; one can only teach the skills requisite to the understanding.) I don't think so, but we do need to bear in mind certain requirements:

1. That, in the words of Halliday, Macintosh, and Strevens "no student [should be] pushed into literary work until he has sufficient linguistic ability to understand, enjoy and appreciate the literary texts that he will be studying." [6] This raises all sorts of problems about levels of text.

2. That attempts to inculcate "taste," to imply that such and such a piece of writing is "beautiful" or "moving," are meaningless until a student can recog-

[6] *The Linguistic Sciences and Language Teaching* (London: Longmans, 1964), pp. 184-185.

nize the basis for such remarks. Instead we should examine the manner in which particular language uses operate, so that stylistic principles such as those of register, syntactic patterning, and collocations are both theoretically understood and can begin to be applied in practice. We therefore should think of teaching—now I can use the word "teach"—*principles* of language analysis applicable to style, and then to work out ways of extending the range of language use to exemplify them.

3. That anyone handling literature in the second-language context should be aware of linguistic principles and their relation to the analysis of style.

There are many other points that I could make, but I shall content myself with one more. Many nations are now producing literature using English. This is normally evaluated in one of two ways: (1) as though it were written in standard English instead of being written in say, Ghanaian English or Philippine English— though we have accepted such variations as American English and Australian English. This leaves us wide open to misinterpreting the literary qualities (let alone the meaning) carried by that particular dialect; and (2) in an even worse way—patronisingly, without any real attempt at evaluation. This is the "isn't it clever to do so well when it isn't his own language" approach. There is a third way I had better mention, which consists of failing to distinguish between a dialect use and incorrect English;

but at this level things really fall apart.

We really know precious little about the literary effects which the new dialects of English can produce within the language community of the dialect, any more than we know much about the ways in which literary values within the vernaculars are evaluated. Monographs such as that by M. J. and S. F. Herskovits, which prefixes the stories collected in their *Dahomean Narrative,*[7] show that every language community has its own, often highly sophisticated, awareness of literary values, but that these are strictly related to the social context and to the language potentials which are themselves part of the culture. Literature is a convention, both in the widest social or cultural sense and in the narrower linguistic sense; it is a convention, or rather a system of conventions, that we have to learn. This means that we have to work at the language conventions, to move first through the stage of knowing the components of the language and then the range, potential, and possibilities for choice among the components, before we move through language into literature. Let me conclude with a couple of quotations. The first has to do with the art of architecture; it is from Sir Kenneth Clark's book on *The Gothic Revival:*[8]

> The language of a new style must be learnt gradually, and only when a great many objects in that style have been collected and examined from an entirely non-aesthetic standpoint, can we begin to look at them as works of art.

---

7 (Chicago: Northwestern University Press, 1958.)

8 (London: Penguin, 1964.)

The ethnologists made possible an appreciation of negro sculpture; the pietists did the same for fifteen century painting.

We might add that the linguists will need to do the same for styles. Note the reference to a "non-aesthetic standpoint."

My second quotation is not only, I hope, opposite, but allows me to fall back with a sigh of relief into the arms of impeccable authority. What greater authority than Henry James!

This comes from *The Portrait of a Lady:*

Madame Merle was not superficial—not she. She was deep; and her nature spoke none the less in her behaviour because it spoke a conventional language. "What is language at all but a convention?" said Isabel. "She has the good taste not to pretend, like some people I have met, to express herself by original signs."[9]

9 (New York: Houghton, Mifflin Co., 1891) , p. 167.

*The President Speaks**

Edward M. Anthony

We have travelled a long road, spatially and professionally, since January 30, 1965, when a group of us met in Chicago to agree that

> . . . steps be taken towards the formation of a new association for teachers and others interested in the teaching of English to those who do not speak it as a native language.[1]

We have come a long way, and by a devious route. We have arrived at San Antonio by way of Tucson, San Diego, New York, and Miami. Subtly, in our pilgrimage, we changed the name of these meetings. We had the Tucson Conference, the San Diego Conference, the New York Conference, and then the Miami Beach Convention—the difference in terminology reflecting the founding of a nationally significant organization with the initials TESOL. You'll notice that I am avoiding the pronunciation of the name—there still appears to be some doubt about it. In private, I pronounce it *tessle,* to rhyme with *wrestle, vessel, nestle,*—and *guess'll,* as in *I guess'll take a trip to San Antonio.* When people ask for phonological guidance, I say that our name is pro-

nounced T as in *beret,* E as in *gate,* S as in *island,* O as in *people,* and L as in *talk.* But this is a temporary solution. As a card-carrying linguist, I am required to advise that we wait until usage settles down and until someone describes it for us.

I want to talk today briefly about one person, the man who has contributed more, in my opinion, than any other single individual to the teaching of English to those who do not speak it. He was, I am convinced, ultimately responsible for the fact that we are meeting today in convention assembled to deal with this particular discipline. He was not present at the 1965 Chicago meeting, nor has he been an officer of this organization. And yet his influence pervades virtually all of our deliberations. At least six of the present board of directors felt this influence directly, and all of them indirectly. This man is, of course, Charles C. Fries, who died late last year in Ann Arbor at the age of 80. And so my task of choosing something to say at this first meeting after his death was not difficult. Considering his place in our field, it would be almost presumptuous of me to speak of anyone else on this occasion.

Kenneth Pike, a student of Professor Fries, used to tell his classes (perhaps he still does) that he had never come across any notion in linguistics that Leonard Bloomfield had not, in some way, in some place, touched upon. The same could, I feel, be said about Charles Fries in relation to the teaching of English to

---

1 From a one-sheet undated memorandum "Proposed Association of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages" issued by Sirarpi Ohannessian, Interim Secretary to the Planning Committee.

speakers of other languages—not just his pioneering 1945 work *Teaching and Learning English as a Foreign Language,* but in his other books, his articles, and in his classes as well. As Albert Marckwardt says in the introductory portion of *Studies in Languages and Linguistics,* published in 1964 in honor of Mr. Fries:

> It has always seemed to me that Charles Fries stood head and shoulders above his colleagues simply because in the course of a fruitful academic life he had three or four first-rate ideas, which is three or four more than fall to the lot of many of us.[2]

People who enter the field of language teaching, specifically English language teaching, usually ask the same sort of questions, and those of us who have been in the profession for a long time answer them—each in our own way. I'd like today to take just a few, six or seven, of these common questions and answer them in quotations from Fries—some of them directly from his works and some of them paraphrased from my memory of the man as he was in those classes which a number of us can remember very well.

One query which comes up again and again, although one hopes with somewhat less frequency than formerly, is *What is good English? What is correct English?* What is the nature of the type of language we should teach? Here I have two pertinent quotations, one from a short booklet by Fries, published as long ago as 1927

and called *What is Good English.* He says, in answer, perhaps surprisingly:

> The artistic view is the practical approach. From this point of view language is a means to an end, and that end is specifically to grasp, to possess, to communicate experience. Accordingly, that is good language, good English, which, on the one hand, most fully realizes one's impressions, and, on the other, is most completely adapted to the purpose of any particular communication.[3]

By 1940, in *American English Grammar,* he is more specific, and tells, not only what *is* but what *isn't:*

> All considerations of an *absolute* "correctness" in accord with the conventional rules of grammar or the dicta of handbooks must be set aside, because these rules or these dicta very frequently do not represent the actual practice of "standard" English classroom. We assume, therefore, that there can be no "correctness" apart from usage and that the *true* forms of "standard" English are those that are actually used in the dialect to which they do not belong. These deviations suggest not only the particular social dialect or set of language habits in which they usually occur, but also the general social and cultural characteristics most often accompanying the use of these forms.[4]

In the background of all Fries's work on language there is the insistence that language is embedded in culture. Perhaps you will forgive me a personal reminiscence or two. At the University of Michigan, the old Michigan, the old Michigan when he was director of the English Language

[2] Albert H. Marckwardt, "Charles C. Fries-An Appreciation," in *Studies in Languages and Linguistics in Honor of Charles C. Fries,* ed. A. H. Marckwardt (Ann Arbor: The English Language Institute, 1964), p. 1.

[3] Charles C. Fries, *Teaching of English* (Ann Arbor: The George Wahr Publishing Company, 1949), p. 120. (This volume includes as its first five chapters *What is Good English,* first printed in 1927.)

[4] Charles C. Fries, *American English Grammar* (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company 1940), p. 15.

Institute, Professor Fries, the staff, and the new intensive course students gathered every eight weeks year after year for a lecture by Professor Fries which was intended to give the incoming students a notion about language. He spoke of the nature of language learning, and Bob Lado translated into Spanish. I can hear it now, and can even remember Bob's Gallego Spanish:

"La ciencia linguistica es una ciencia bastante reciente . . ." But I wanted here to mention his comments on learning a language in a foreign (that is, American) culture. He used to divide travelers to another country into four groups: the sentimental tourist who believes that everything in the new culture is marvelous, and uncritically approves it; the ultranationalist, who believes that his own country comprehends the best of all possible worlds; and the statistician who wants to know the cold facts—what the population is, the number of births and deaths, the percentage of divorce, and the like. Dr. Fries, however, always finished with, and recommended, the artistic approach to a foreign culture—entering into the culture, not with the notion of approval or disapproval, but with the desire to understand. This, he felt, was a necessary ingredient in the learning of a foreign language. I can hear him now . . . .

He had an answer, too, to those who said *I want something practical. Do I really need to investigate the history of a language, to learn everything about a language before I get into a classroom? What I need is technique.* He said:

To many of us the recording of the facts of the loss of final *n* in the inflections of early Middle English looks to be even less valuable than a game of checkers. But the scientist has learned that sound knowledge and understanding can rest only on a broad basis of established facts, and he knows it is impossible to estimate in advance the importance of any fact. Time after time he has witnessed the overthrow of widely accepted theories and explanations which were too hastily reached and not honestly earned by patient investigation of all the facts.[5]

I shall resist the temptation to relate that quotation to some of the things which are going on in linguistics and language teaching today. After all, the quotation first appeared in 1927, before some of the current practitioners were born. In this connection, I think Dr. Fries would have approved of Masefield's lines:

Adventure on, for from the littlest clue
Has come whatever worth man ever
    knew;
The next to lighten all men may be
    you.[6]

A question which comes up often in English teaching here in the United States, but perhaps more often abroad is *I'm a native speaker of English. Why can't I teach it? Isn't it enough to be a native speaker?* One answer, from an article called "As We See It":

The native speaker . . . unless he has been specially trained to observe and analyze his own language processes, finds great difficulty in describing the special characteristics either of the sounds he makes or of the structural devices he uses. His comments about his own language more often mislead rather than help a foreigner.[7]

---

5 *Teaching of English,* p. 104.
6 John Masefield, "The Ending," *Poems,* Part Two (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1953) p. 471.
7 Charles C. Fries, "As We See It," *Language Learning,* I, 1 (January, 1948), 13.

I can remember Dr. Fries's delight when he came upon an actual example of a foreign speaker of English who verified the claim that a trained foreign speaker can teach better than an untrained native speaker. In his travels he found an English teacher who spoke English atrociously—she was very fluent, yet her pronunciation was so bad she could hardly be understood. Because she was fluent, she would have had great difficulty in unlearning her bad habits and substituting good ones. But she had been trained. So, when she entered the classroom, she was able to control—consciously—her pronunciation, and give her students a good model for one brief hour. And her students came out of the class pronouncing English better than she would ever be able to do.

Then the often discussed question: *When can I say I have learned a foreign language? What does it mean to say I know a foreign language? How long should it take?* He says:

> A person has "learned" a foreign language when he has . . . first, within a limited vocabulary mastered the sound system (that is, when he can understand the stream of speech and achieve an understandable production of it) and has, second, made the structural devices (that is, the basic arrangements of utterances) matters of automatic habit. This degree of mastery of a foreign language can be achieved by most adults, by means of a scientific approach with satisfactorily selected and organized materials, within approximately three months. In that brief time the learning adult will not become a fluent speaker for all occasions but he can have laid a good, accurate foundation upon which to build, and the extension of his control

of content vocabulary will then come rapidly and with increasing ease.[8]

And the final common question: *Language teaching is a combination of many elements—the teacher, the text, the test, the curriculum, the class, the course. Where should we begin? Which of these elements is most basic?* And the answer according to Fries:

> . . . only with satisfactory basic materials can one efficiently begin the study of a foreign language. No matter what happens later, the ease and speed of attainment in the early stages of the learning of a language will depend primarily upon the selection and sequence of the materials to be studied.

That, from "As We See It," in *Language Learning.* And, again:

> The most efficient materials grow out of a scientific descriptive analysis of the language to be learned carefully compared with a parallel descriptive analysis of the native language of the learner. Only a comparison of this kind will reveal the fundamental trouble spots that demand special exercises and will separate the basically important features from a bewildering mass of linguistic details.[10]

For his dedication to his work and for his leadership in his field, the University of Michigan gave Professor Fries a citation on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the English Language Institute there. It said, in part:

> Professor Fries's entire professional life [was] devoted to the English language and to persons desiring to extend their command of it . . . Among his chief contributions to English-language pedagogy were the freeing of descriptive grammar from the semantic

---

8 Charles C. Fries, *Teaching and Learning English as a Foreign Language* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press 1945), p. 3.
9 I, 1 (January, 1848) 12.
10 Ibid., p. 13.

and conceptual shackles of the Latin school and the tailoring of instruction in English to the language habits of foreign nationals. A host of former students, and of students of former students, daily confess his seminal insights in their scholarship and in their teaching.

The citation says "a host of former students, and of students of former students." It calls to mind something that happened to me in Honolulu at the NCTE Convention last November—the last meeting of this kind that Fries attended. It was a big conference; I was there only for the pre-convention workshop, and to my lasting regret I did not see him. Just before I left, I expressed this regret to a former student of mine at the University of Pittsburgh who is now teaching at the University of Hawaii, I asked her to tell Mr. Fries, when she met him at a reception there, of my regret. She agreed to do this and added, "I'll tell him I am one of his grand-students." While this remark makes me a member of a generation I am not quite ready to join, I was deeply touched.

I would like to finish my talk with a quotation from Bernard Bloch. It was about another man, but we can apply it equally well to Fries:

> If today our methods . . . are in some ways better than his, if we see more clearly than he did himself certain aspects of the structure that he first revealed to us, it is because we stand upon his shoulders.[11]

I, therefore, with the authority vested in me as President of this organization, and with the unanimous consent of the Executive Committee of TESOL, dedicate this Second Convention to the continuing memory of a great linguist, a recognized scholar, but most of all to a great teacher— in his books, in his classes, in his life—Charles Carpenter Fries.

---

[11] Bernard Bloch, "Leonard Bloomfield," *Language,* XXV, 2 (April-June, 1949), 92.

The Pros Have It*

Harold B. Allen

Even between those of us who speak what we like to think is the same language communication is not always satisfactory. There is the account of the American who had rented an English car to tour the byways of the western counties. On one narrow lane in Devonshire he was suddenly confronted by another car that had just rounded a curve and was bearing down upon him. Politely he pulled over to the left—the left, of course—until he scraped the hedgerow and thus allowed enough space for the other car to pass. As it did so, the driver, a woman, leaned over and shouted to him the one word, "PIG!" Now that's strange, he thought, as he pulled back onto the road and picked up speed to round the bend. He couldn't figure out what he had done to justify her calling him that. Sometimes really mysterious, these English! Then, as he tooled round the curve at a fast clip, he drove his little car into a large pig lying in the middle of the lane.

It is true that the first international conference on the teaching of English was held last August. Although most of the 800 teachers who gathered in Vancouver came from the United States and Canada, some did manage to attend from Australia and from England. But this was a meeting of teachers of English to native speakers of English. It is also true that the British Council and the United States Information Agency have held joint official meetings on both sides of the Atlantic in order to explore avenues of cooperation throughout the world in the common enterprise of teaching English to non-English speakers.

Both the organization which Dr. William R. Lee helped to found in England and our own TESOL are very, very new. Neither organization is bound by precedent and tradition to operate within prescribed and circumscribed patterns. Each, on the contrary, was established with clear recognition of the expanding demands for TESL and TEFL teachers and teaching, and of the need for new ideas and fresh approaches in meeting those demands. I anticipate the day when a TESOL representative will meet with the British association and another day, not too far distant, when a way will be found to hold an international conference which a substantial number of the members of both organizations will be able to attend. I look forward to other areas of cooperation, such as the mutual availability of publications for all members and perhaps even joint sponsorship of materials of common concern and of studies and other projects. The presence of Dr. Lee at the 1968 TESOL Convention must specify only the beginning of a permanent close associa-

---

* This paper was presented at the TESOL Convention, March 1968.

Mr. Allen, Professor of English and Linguistics at the University of Minnesota, and President of TESOL during its first year (1966-67), edited the book of readings entitled *Teaching English as a Second Language* (McGraw-Hill, 1965) and is the author of *TENES: A Survey of the Teaching of English to Non-English Speakers in the United States* (NCTE, 1966).

tion between TESOL and the British Association of Teachers of English as a Foreign Language.

The formation of our two sister organizations we can consider an important step toward further professionalization of an activity that only recently had begun to be thought of as professional at all, that is, the teaching of English to people, of any age anywhere, whose first language was something other than English. And such professionalism is our commitment, our objective, our goal.

To say this is not to advocate the *reductio ad absurdum* that no one should legally be entitled to teach a single English word to non-English speaking persons without having obtained a license to practice. To say this is, however, to support the development of a profession with minimal standards of academic preparation with a built-in responsibility for the maintenance of those standards and for the protection of sound practices in application of those standards in actual teaching and publishing and research.

The medical profession has its research scientists, its specialists, and its family doctors; and it also has volunteer nurses' aids. In our field we already have a small group of professionally prepared specialists and teachers, a tremendous number of relatively unprepared teachers, as well as an additional group of volunteers— dedicated amateurs (our own nurses' aids) —all of whom will need professional direction and help if they are to work adequately within their own limited capacity. For some time to come we will have American military wives pulled into an English-teaching assignment in some foreign country, faculty wives and AAUW members volunteering to help with the English of the wives of foreign students, and English-speaking volunteers in bilingual Headstart programs or the like.

Our problem here is threefold: to expand the facilities for obtaining approved professional preparation for future teachers, to develop at least minimal professional awareness and competence in the thousands of teachers who now lack any kind of background for this specialized kind of teaching, and to bring professional help to the volunteers.

Our British colleagues have been at this sort of thing much longer than we have. With the formation of the British Council after the Second World War there was recognized a group of teachers professionally committed to teaching English abroad as their permanent occupation. These people developed a substantial body of practical knowledge, empirically acquired and tested, that enabled them to utilize their basic university education in the day-to-day situations of the English classroom in India, Nigeria, Ceylon, and elsewhere throughout the world. Much of this knowledge appears in that rich repository over the years, the periodical *English Language Teaching,* founded in 1946 and edited by Dr. Lee since 1961. But formal academic preparation for this admittedly professional work began somewhat later in the United Kingdom. For some time it was confined to the Institute of Education of the University of London, where Dr. Lee himself taught, then it became available at Exeter and the University of Edinburgh, and more recently it has

been offered at Leeds and the new university in Sussex.

In the United States, on the contrary, it was the academic preparation that first gained prominence, although it was devoted almost exclusively then to the training of teachers and prospective teachers from other lands. I refer, of course, to the initial activity of the English Language Institute at the University of Michigan. More than to any other person it is to the Institute's founder, the late Charles Carpenter Fries, that we must attribute the beginning of the professional point of view in this country. It was Fries who realized that the teachers of English to speakers of other languages needed to know something about principles of language learning, contrastive analysis, phonetics, and linguistic structure, and that they needed controlled practice in teaching under critical observation. It was Fries who thus developed this country's first program leading to a degree in English as a second language.

The rush of foreign students to this country after the Second World War affirmed the need for adequately trained instructors, so that gradually other institutions began to offer the necessary specialized training, always then on the graduate level and usually as either a master's program or short-term emergency certificate program. Five years ago Albert Marckwardt reported to the National Advisory Council on Teaching English as a Foreign Language that the next ten years presented a critical need not for classroom teachers abroad but for teacher-trainers, experienced persons with graduate preparation and the ability to direct the work in teacher-training colleges.

In 1963–64, according to a report of the Center for Applied Linguistics, seven institutions offered the doctorate in English as a second language or in some other field with ESL as a concentration. In 1966, the year of the last report from CAL, the total was eight. In 1963 eighteen institutions offered the M. A., directly or through some other department; in 1966 the total had jumped to twenty-four. In 1963 four institutions offered an undergraduate major leading to a bachelor's degree; in 1967 ten had such an undergraduate program. Actually, the picture is brighter than that, for six of the less substantial programs reported in 1963 had vanished by 1966 and fifteen stronger new ones had been established. Since 1963 still other institutions have opened up graduate and undergraduate programs. The Catholic University in Puerto Rico and Hunter College have introduced certificate programs; Sacred Heart College in Puerto Rico and the Church College of Hawaii have developed undergraduate majors in English as a second language; and George Washington University, Illinois Institute of Technology, and Pacific Union College have begun to enroll students in master's programs.

The *TESOL Newsletter* received last week reveals that Hunter College and Ohio State University should be added to the list of schools with an M.A. program. And I think that I might use this occasion to announce that at long last my own institution, the University of Minnesota, will begin in September to offer a program leading to the master of arts in teaching English as a second language. The minor in this program will also be a certificate program. We are very for-

tunate in being able to bring to Minnesota as director of this new program and as professor of linguistics and English Betty Wallace Robinett, editor of the *TSEOL Quarterly.* And we are glad that she will be able to continue her editorship by bringing the *Quarterly* office with her.

This growth in the number of programs is good and desirable; but it also creates a new problem. Descriptions in bulletins, of course, are never quite adequate, but it may well be suspected that the increased popularity of English as a second language as a teaching field has led to the development of at least a few programs that are someting less than substantial. I suggest that the time is at hand for our new profession to police itself. With growth comes responsibility; and if we do not accept that responsibility, no other group will. Some of you are familiar, I am sure, with the recently published guidelines for the preparation of teachers of English. Over a two-year period, with the support of a grant from the U.S. Office of Education, a nation-wide series of conferences involving concerned persons of all kinds was held by three cooperating organizations— the Modern Language Association, the National Council of Teachers of English, and the National Association of Departments of Teacher Education and Certification. The resulting guidelines, published last autumn, clearly and specifically set forth the minimal desirable background in language, composition, and literature, for the prospective teacher of English and language arts in our elementary and secondary schools. They will have a profound effect upon regular English

teacher preparation in the next few years.

Two years before TESOL was born, the Center for Applied Linguistics submitted to the U.S. Office of Education a proposal for a similar, though less elaborate, study for the purpose of ascertaining the minimal components in the training of the teacher of English as a second language. Circumstances led to the rejection of the proposal, but these circumstances had nothing to do with its merits. The need was admitted.

What I would present now is a two-fold proposal. First, our organization should, as its inherent responsibility, seek funds from the U.S. Office of Education or elsewhere to conduct a study leading to the establishment of guidelines for the preparation of the teacher of English as a second or as a foreign language. These guidelines will, of course, vary according to the ultimate teaching position—whether the prospective teacher will deal with elementary children in this country or abroad, or teach foreign students in the United States, or act as a language consultant in a school system in this country, or serve as a teacher trainer or program director here or in other countries. Let me observe that if we undertake such a project, we will be following through upon a specific request made to TESOL in a decision taken by the National Advisory Council on the Teaching of English as a Foreign Language at its meeting in May, 1967. That Council also has recognized the need for standards.

Second, I propose that our organization, Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, prepare now

for the time when, upon the completion of a guideline study, it can become an accrediting agency to certify the quality of those programs purporting to train TESL and TEFL teachers. If we are to develop real professional integrity, we must seize the opportunity, while we are a young and developing profession, to plan for the establishment and the maintenance of minimal standards of professional competence.

Do not mistake me. No more than some of you would I like to see a monolithic and uniform set of requirements established throughout the country. I am for diversity; I am for freedom to experiment, freedom to draw upon opportunities existing in special local situations. But I also am for standards of quality and for the sound building of programs upon the basis of minimal standards.

I have already made this joint proposal to the Executive Committee. I believe that the case is clear and the need is imperative. If we are to be a profession, we must have standards that the professional worker meets. If we are to be a profession, some agency must establish those standards. If we are to be a profession, some agency must recognize appropriately those institutions that acceptably prepare teachers to meet those standards. I look forward to the time when the prospective language arts consultant can say to a superintendent of schools, and the prospective instructor in English as a second language for foreign students can say to a dean, and a prospective teacher abroad can say to a contracting agency such as USIA or AID or a foreign college, "I have

been trained in a program accredited by TESOL."

After the matter of preparation, the second aspect of the threefold problem is that concerning teachers now in service who face pupils from non-English speaking homes. If they are elementary teachers, they have been prepared to do almost everything except meet this responsibility. If they are English teachers in junior or senior high school, they have been prepared to teach English only to native speakers. What of them?

Much of the picture is still far from bright. True, it is encouraging to note the steps taken in New York to develop a detailed syllabus for these teachers to use and to provide some inservice training. It is encouraging to follow the work of Elizabeth Ott's project in Texas. It is encouraging to note the continuing inservice training activity in Miami. But there still is too little constructive support by cities and states for real inservice training in ESL for teachers already on the firing line. Administrators still are reluctant to recognize the foreign language problem in their communities as one demanding the attention of people with special professional competence.

The brightest spot may well be that provided by the federal government. Each year more opportunities have been opened for teachers and supervisors to take intensive work in an NDEA Institute in English as a second language. This coming summer seventeen such institutes will be funded by the U.S. Office of Education, providing openings for 680 teachers of Spanish, French, Indian, and

Chamorro-speaking children. Now 680 is not 6800 and not 68,000, but it is progress, for presumably these teachers will be potent forces for professionalism in their communities once they return from the summer work.

Also encouraging are other developments on the national scene. Some of you will recall that a year ago last fall William Slager, the president of NAFSA'S English section, ATESL, accompanied me on a visit to the new commissioner of education, Harold Howe, to present our joint argument for a top-level assignment of a specialist in TESL concerns in education. I don't pretend to believe that Bill and I were actually the movers—Chanticleer didn't really make the sun come up—but I like to think that it is not entirely a coincidence that last fall a section for English to speakers of other languages was set up in the division of educational personnel training. Its acting chief has been Bruce Gaarder, whose eloquent testimony before a Senate subcommittee I urge you to read in detail in the *TESOL Newsletter* (II, 1 and 2, January/ March, 1968).

The legislation that Dr. Gaarder was asking Congress for became a reality, PL 90-247, December 15. As a result of that act a new Bureau of Educational Personnel Training was established February 1. Just what form an ESOL subdivision will have has not been determined, so I am informed, but certainly we must insist on no lower status for ESOL than it has just been granted. This legislation I urge you to read in detail in the *Newsletter,* for it marks a good step forward by the federal government in recognizing the crucial prob-

lem of our non-English-speaking citizens of all ages. You will find that federal funds are now available for research in bilingual education, for in-service training for teachers involved with bilingual or potentially bilingual children or adults, and for the setting up of school and community programs for teaching these people.

In reading the Bilingual Education Act, note particularly the content of the introductory paragraph, Section 702. Remember that this act is really an extended amendment, Title VII, of the larger measure known as the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, a major feature of which—the result of considerable pressure from certain forces—is the allocation of the funds to local agencies, states, municipalities, and other units—for their own use as they see fit.

I ask you to observe this feature very carefully, for here is both a danger and a hope. The danger lies in the possible expenditure of these funds by people not professionally qualified to make judgments in the TESOL field. Many of us know that political and other considerations are already drawing the attention of unqualified persons to this new federal handout. Every single one of us, every member of TESOL, must assume an individual responsibility to prevent as best he can the misuse of these funds. We must act as watchdogs to see that only the most competent persons, with professional consultants from outside the state or community, be entrusted with the administration of any kind of program in bilingual education. But we should do more than that. Here is the hope. The hope is that TESOL people themselves can move to initiate

and plan and guide such programs. You who are departmental chairmen, supervisors, and consultants, you who have any responsibility for bilingual education, have here a rich opportunity to improve the teaching where you are. Some of you have said that on the local level money has been lacking for what you know should be done. But now you can get it if you have a program that can be approved. TESOL itself a year ago found that it could not go through with its plan to make available teams of two or three consultants for week-end TESL workshops. But now a local school system can set up such a workshop and finance it with a federal grant, probably through the state department of education.

Another federal source of help as we move toward professional standards in our field is the Education Professions Development Act, PL 90-35, enacted June 29, 1967, which provides grants for fellowships for teachers of bilingual children and for teachers' institutes. (See Richard L. Light's article elsewhere in this issue.) The new feature is that an institute held by a college or university must now be approved by the appropriate state agency, so we have now a new responsibility for acquainting our state departments of education with the needs of the bilingual situation in our states.

A third source of federal help is still only a promise. We had hoped for a great deal when last year Congress enacted the International Education Act, with its provisions for teaching English to foreigners—including teachers, scholars, and students. But this act is only on paper, for so far the Congress has not passed any enabling legislation providing funds to implement this act.

Well, there is much more to be said about going—and growing—professional. I would like to say something about the third aspect—that of bringing professional help to the volunteer teachers in adult education and to the many who are individually bearing the burdens of tutoring foreign visitors or new citizens. Since publishers do not see this as a lucrative market—though I think they are wrong—this is a peculiar responsibility of TESOL to see that sound materials are prepared and are made available to these people.

I would like to discuss also the recent growth of research in language learning and the special attention to bilingual problems in that area. I would like to point to the growing number of theory and methods books for teachers, and the rising quality of textbooks reflecting recent research and scholarship.

But I would have to give two other talks to deal with those topics; and I have used up my allotted time.

In this paper I have tried to suggest that as a new organization we have inherited much that created a foundation for a solid profession of teaching English as a second language, and that as a new organization we have the charge of building upon that foundation. The needs long recognized for sound English teaching overseas and in this country to our foreign visitors and now recognized with respect to our own people in this country will never be met as they should be met until all of us concerned with

the needs—today and in the years to come—accept the challenge of being professional. We must help to formulate guidelines demanding high standards of professional preparation, and we must be prepared to accredit institutions purporting to offer that professional preparation. Only then can we reasonably expect to attain the high standards we can now project in both teaching and teaching materials.

Let us keep on going—and growing— professional. After all, the pros have it.

Teacher Training Bilingual Education and ESOL:

Some New Opportunities*

Richard L. Light

Two recently enacted laws—the Education Professions Development Act (EPDA) and the Bilingual Education Act—authorize support for programs which are of particular interest to the specialist in English as a second language. Both laws offer broad opportunities for helping people assist children who speak a first language other than English—the first through the training of persons involved in ESOL programs in the schools and the second by providing for the planning and establishment of bilingual education programs.

During the five years (1964-1968) that NDEA institutes for advanced study in ESOL have been supported, 41 programs have been conducted by colleges and universities throughout the country. They have enrolled some 1,650 participants at a cost of, about three million dollars and have, we believe, made a significant contribution to the preparation of teachers of English as a second language. It is likely, however, that the need for training noted in the survey of the teaching of English to non-English speakers (the TENES survey)[1] has not greatly diminished, particularly in view of increased emphasis everywhere on language programs for the "disadvantaged."

The new Education Professions Development Act provides an opportunity to expand support of programs to train persons in English as a second language. At the end of June 1968 this act replaces the legislation which has authorized the NDEA institutes. It provides for support of a wide variety of programs to train educational personnel, ranging from short term institutes for teachers, supervisors, and teacher trainers, to full-time fellowship programs for experienced teachers. Generally speaking, projects to train all educational personnel, including administrators, teacher aides, and other specialized personnel serving elementary and secondary school programs are eligible for support. Projects may include preservice, inservice, short-term, long-term and/or part-time training. They may include degree or non-degree training and may be carried out at any academic level (except that support is not available for regular undergraduate training programs).

The new act continues the Teacher Fellowship Program originally authorized in 1965 as well as the institute program. The latter, however, continues without the previous limit of separate categories—thirteen in all—which existed under the NDEA. All subjects usually taught in the schools are now eligible for support, but the

---

1 Harold B. Allen, *A Survey of the Teaching of English to Non-English Speakers in the United States* (Champaign, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1966).

intent is to continue support of the thirteen categories, including ESOL, at least to the 1967–1968 level. The authority for the fellowship program is expanded so that projects may now include graduate fellowships directed to any graduate degree, including the Ph.D. They may also include funds for the development and strengthening of advanced training programs in the colleges and universities.

The EPDA has also broadened eligibilities for sponsorship of projects so that states and local educational agencies as well as colleges and universities can design projects to train teachers and others. The guidelines encourage these organizations to make an application for one of the three types of Educational Personnel Development grants available-planning, pilot, or operating. The planning grants—generally for less than $10,-000—are primarily to assist those institutions and agencies that have not participated in Federal programs in the past because they lacked the resources for the development of excellent proposals. Grants for pilot projects will also be available, particularly for innovative programs for which there is little evidence available of effectiveness of the approaches to be used. Where sufficient evidence of the effectiveness of the plan does exist, then there need be no pilot phase in the program, and immediate application may be made for an operating grant.

Three national priorities for training educational personnel are set in the new guidelines. The number one priority is for programs to train persons to work with the disadvantaged—the guidelines specify that one third of all funds allocated for fellowships and institute programs will be directed to needs in the education of the disadvantaged. Since in most schools in the United States children who do not have a command of standard English are clearly disadvantaged, programs to train persons working in English as a second language are unavoidably included under this priority.

Another priority concerns those projects which are directed to training teachers and others in subjects that are in critically short supply. Training programs in English as a second language again are clearly aimed at such a priority group. The TENES survey has provided ample evidence of the shortage of well trained teachers of English as a second language in the schools; results of the survey indicate that one of the greatest needs is for training those teachers who have had little or no formal work in subjects helpful in teaching English as a second language. The types of programs supported under the NDEA tend to bear this out—thirty-seven of the forty-one ESOL institutes supported have been designed for teachers with little or no formal training in linguistic or English-as-a-second-language methodology.

The third national priority suggested in the guidelines is for projects directed to "particularly acute training needs in education." Included in this category are school administrators, trainers of teachers, auxiliary school personnel, and personnel for pre-school programs. Few ESOL institutes under the NDEA have been specifically designed to reach these groups. It is likely, however, that school administrators in areas with large populations

of non-English-speaking children, for example, could benefit from a program designed to acquaint them with some of the special problems faced by these children and what can be done to help them.

Of the three national priorities suggested in the new guidelines—disadvantaged youth, national shortages, and acute training needs in the education professions—the ESOL institutes have been clearly involved in the first two.

A number of program features are specifically encouraged in the new guidelines, and the ESOL institutes under the NDEA have anticipated many of them. One of the criteria to be used in evaluating projects, for example, is the extent to which relevant work and practice teaching are integrated into training programs. Virtually all of the ESOL institutes have had a practice-teaching component and many have provided experience in development or adaptation of materials for ESOL. In this respect they have generally been ahead of institutes in other fields supported by the NDEA. Although the trend for all institutes has clearly been in the direction of more such practical courses, it has been estimated that of the 1,000 institutes in all fields conducted in the summers of 1966 and 1967, only about half had components designed to show classroom applicability of the subject matter being taught.

Another feature encouraged under the new guidelines is the use of combinations of resources such as State educational agencies, local educational agencies, departments within colleges and universities, and other organizations, in the planning and operation of a program.

Institutes under the NDEA have generally had *informal* arrangements with organizations outside of the colleges and universities. The institutes to train teachers of English as a second language to American Indian children, for example, have generally had informal arrangements with the Bureau of Indian Affairs for such matters as selection of participants and use of facilities. But there have been few *formal* arrangements for *joint planning and operation* of ESOL institutes under the NDEA. One exception is the consortium of four colleges and universities working with the New York City Board of Education to train teachers of English as a second language in New York City in the summer of 1968. This type of arrangement, where each organization has a meaningful contribution to make, is encouraged under the EPDA.

The extent to which projects attempt to improve on past experience through new and innovative approaches is also a criterion to be used in evaluating proposals under the new act. This does not mean that the guidelines are urging innovation for the sake of innovation, or that everyone must constantly come up with something new. It does mean that the guidelines do not preclude the notion that there is room for new approaches to training educational personnel under the EPDA. Although most ESOL institutes have followed a typical program design which includes courses in linguistics, methodology, cultural anthropology, and others, there have also been innovations under the NDEA. Among these are an ESOL institute held overseas; a program designed to train teachers in preparation of ESOL materials; several programs

to help teachers work more effectively with children who speak a non-standard dialect of English; and an institute which has provided a social internship experience allowing participants to spend short periods of time with minority group families. Such developments are encouraged under the EPDA; with increased flexibility in the guidelines a wide variety of program designs is possible. Donald Bowen, who has worked closely with the institute program since its inception, has in a recent article, made a number of very useful suggestions for improving such training.[2] His suggestions—nine in all—range from encouragement of more academic year programs in ESOL to increasing course offerings in some programs to include advanced instruction in areas such as sociolinguistics and psycholinguistics. Any of his suggestions, with a few possible exceptions, could be incorporated in projects under the EPDA.

Another feature called for in projects under the new act is some provision for the strengthening of ongoing programs in the host institution. Projects which will train teachers and at the same time bring about change in the regular program of the institution are encouraged. Such changes are obviously preferable to the continuing need for massive retraining of recently graduated teachers who have not been adequately prepared for work in English as a second language.

Arrangements for independent eval-uation of individual projects are also called for under the new guidelines. Such evaluations will be an essential element in considering continuation of project funding each year and will be especially critical in the decision to move from the pilot to the operating stage.

These are some of the outstanding features of the guidelines for proposals under the EPDA, and there are others. But the essential message is that if you have identified a need in training educational personnel and if you have a design for an effective program to meet that need, there is a good chance that the program will be eligible for support under the EPDA. Guidelines for preparation of proposals under this act may be obtained from the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202.

A second law of interest to the specialist in English as a second language is the Bilingual Education Act. This act is designed to meet the special educational needs of children 3 to 18 years of age inclusive who come from environments where the dominant language is other than English. Numerous surveys have documented the educational problems of these children and persuasive arguments have been made in favor of bilingual education to help them.[3] Now the Bilingual

_____

[2] J. Donald Bowen, "Concerning Summer Institutes in TESL," *Workpapers in English as a Second Language* (Los Angeles: University of California at Los Angeles, 1967). See also his article, "Maximum Results from Minimum Training," *TESOL Quarterly,* I, *2* (June, 1967) 23-32.

_____

[3] See for example *The Invisible Minority . . . Pero No Vencibles* (Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1966) or *Mexican-American Study Project, Advanced Reports 1* and *7* (Los Angeles: University of California at Los Angeles, 1965 and 1967) for studies on the education of Spanish-speaking children. For an effective argument in favor of bilingual education see A. Bruce Gaarder, "Testimony on Bilingual Education," *TESOL Newsletter,* II, 1 and 2 (January/March, 1968).

Education Act provides an opportunity to support the planning and operation of such programs—programs which go beyond reliance solely on good ESOL instruction to include the teaching of school subjects through the child's first language as well as a component in English as a second language. The concern outlined in the guidelines is for the need to help these children develop greater competence in English, for the realization of their full potential as speakers of two languages and for their education in general. Guidelines for submission of proposals under this act are now in preparation and the tentative version includes the following information.

Bilingual education is defined as the use of two languages as mediums of instruction for any part or all of the school curriculum except the languages themselves. Since bilingual education is, with a few notable exceptions, relatively unknown in the United States, encouragement will be given to the development and operation of bilingual programs and services which either have not existed for the affected persons of the target group or which are to be improved or extended to a significant extent by means of the project. New and imaginative programs in bilingual and bicultural education in a variety of settings, particularly to show how other programs of Federal assistance could better be used in support of similar education, will also be encouraged. Allowable activities include pilot bilingual education projects, research projects, development and dissemination of special instructional materials, training of persons to work in bilingual education programs, and the establishment, mainte-

nance, and operation of such programs.

Although consideration will be given to bilingual education programs in many different languages, the major focus of the act will be on the areas of greatest need, notably the Spanish-speaking population in the Southwest and the Puerto Rican population in some of our large cities. Also included, are Aleut, Eskimo, and American Indian children wherever they may reside in a State, and target group children in Puerto Rico, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. The act may also serve, through literacy projects, the corresponding adult groups, particularly those who are parents of children participating in bilingual education programs.

The question of the participation in programs under this act of children who are not members of the target group may arise in certain cases. Some parents, for example, may want their monolingual English-speaking children to have the benefits of bilingual education. According to the guidelines in their present tentative form, children who are not members of the target group may be included in approved projects if their exclusion would impair the feasibility or effectiveness of the proposed project, and—when many such children are involved—if the extra costs of their participation are borne by the grantee.

There are two classes of eligible applicants under this act: (1) a local educational agency or combination of such agencies, or 2) colleges or universities applying jointly with one or more local educational agencies. Among the criteria which will be used in judging proposals are project de-

sign, qualifications of personnel conducting the program, recommendations of the corresponding State educational agency, and other criteria that may be adopted with the advice of the Advisory Committee on the Education of Bilingual Children. Special criteria which will be considered in assigning priorities to proposals include whether or not the project plans to begin bilingual schooling in grade one or earlier, plans for eventual extension of bilingual schooling through at least grade six, includes a strong English-as-a-second-language component, uses teachers who have native fluency in a foreign language and who have studied through that language, and whether or not the project provides for inservice training both for teaching English as a second language and for teaching through the non-English language.

Guidelines for submission of proposals under the Bilingual Education Act should be available soon and will be sent if requested from the Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education, U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202.

Both the Education Professions Development Act and the Bilingual Education Act have great potential for helping the child who speaks a first language other than English. The extent to which that potential is realized will depend in large measure on the response of the ESOL profession.

Writing to Learn

Pauline M. Rojas

Drill-type exercises should form a part of every beginning lesson in English as a second language because this type of writing helps build in right practice and prevents the student from practicing mistakes. Wrong practice is as effective for learning as right practice, so even when a student is required to rewrite and correct, he is merely canceling one wrong practice with one right practice. Drill-type writing helps the students avoid wrong practice in much the same way that oral drill does. In oral drill the teacher models, and the students repeat. In drill-type writing the students abstract from the exercise itself the model or models which they need and in this way are prevented from practicing mistakes.

Types of writing exercises which serve as written drill are sometimes called imitative or controlled writing. They vary in form and in the amount of help they give students. In the beginning the students need a great deal of help, but as they advance in control of structural patterns and vocabulary, they are able to do more and more independent writing of the kind customarily labelled "composition." So long as they are unable to write without making the kind of mistakes that native speakers of English would never make, they need to be given abundant drill-type practice exercises.

Mrs. Rojas was Director of the English Section, Department of Public Instruction, Puerto Rico, for approximately ten years. She has recently retired as Director of the Ford Foundation Project in the Dade County Public Schools in Miami, Florida.

Teachers will find that preparing this kind of writing assignments requires time and thought. However, since the students should correct their own papers, teachers can use the time they spend in correcting for preparing the writing exercises. While students write, teachers will need to circulate among them, giving them help when necessary. This procedure not only gives the students immediate reinforcement but keeps the teachers informed of individual progress and achievement. If the students are required to file all of their written work in folders to be kept by the teacher, they can see at the end of the course the steady progress each has made. When testing is desirable, the same type of exercises used for providing learning practice may be used for testing.

Some common types of controlled writing are copying, completion, dictation, answering questions based on reading material, writing a paragraph by answering questions, filling blanks, and rewriting by making substitutions. The difficulty of a given exercise will depend on the nature of the material and the amount of help the exercise and the teacher afford the students. The following sample drill-type exercises have been developed from material found in *English for Today, Book Four* (McGraw-Hill, 1966). Similar exercises could be prepared from other textbooks.

COPYING—Paragraph 1, p. 37.

After this paragraph has been dealt with orally and read, the students

might copy the title and the first and last sentences after reading them orally and observing punctuation, capitalization, and spelling. As they write, the teacher supervises and helps them correct their work. The students should also be helped to observe how the first sentence initiates the subject matter of the paragraph and the last sentence sums up what the paragraph says.

COMPLETION—Paragraph 2, p. 51.

The teacher copies on the chalkboard one or two sentences, such as that below. The students copy each sentence, filling the blanks by referring to the textbook.

On many. . . . . . . farms. . . . . . . now furnish percent of the . . . . , labor. . . . . percent and percent.

DICTATION—Paragraph 12, p. 39.

The students read this paragraph aloud and discuss it with the class under the teacher's guidance. They are then assigned the paragraph to study at home for a dictation lesson the next day. On the following day, the teacher dictates the paragraph, and the students write. Then the students open their books and correct their work under the teacher's supervision.

ANSWERING QUESTIONS— Paragraph 8, p. 53.

The teacher puts questions such as those below on the chalkboard. The students answer the questions orally and then write the questions and answers.

What does it take to develop a modern farm?

   (A. A long time and a lot of money.)
How long has Don been farming on his own?
   (A. Ever since his father died twelve years ago.)
What did he have to do in order to buy new machinery, new fertilizers, and new feeds?
   (A. He had to borrow money.)
When does he hope to pay off all his loans?
   (A. In a few years.)
Note: If the questions are not carefully worded, the students will have to formulate answers with little or no help from the textbook.
Example: How did Don get new machinery?
   (A. He borrowed money.)
The students here have to substitute *borrowed* for *had to borrow.* If they can make this kind of conversion, they do not need drill-type writing.

WRITING A PARAGRAPH BY ANSWERING QUESTIONS— Paragraph 1, p. 37.

The students answer the questions below orally first. Then they might write the answers in the form of a paragraph on the chalkboard as a group composition or write individually with the teacher circulating to help them correct their mistakes as they write.

What is Dick Mallory? (If the question were, "What does Dick Mallory do?" it would be more difficult to answer.)
Where is his office?
Does he live in the city?
Where does he live?

What is his life tied to whether he is at home or at the office?

What does he represent?

SUBSTITUTION

The students might take the paragraph written in the preceding exercise and substitute the italicized parts with information about a friend or relative, or each might rewrite it about himself. In either case they would have to supply a great deal and, without help, would probably make many mistakes. A group paragraph could be developed on the chalkboard and left there for the students' guidance.

Dick Mallory is a *book publisher.* His office is on the *fourteenth floor* of *a sky scraper* in the center of *New York City.* He does not live in *the city.* He lives in a *white house* in *a suburb.* Whether he is at home or in *the city* his life is tied to machines. He represents modern man in the machine age.

The resulting paragraph might read:

John Gonzalez is a lawyer. His office is on the tenth floor of an office building in the center of Manila. He does not live in the office building. He lives in a big house in Forbes Park. Whether he is at home or in his office his life is tied to machines. He represents modern man in the machine age.

FILLING BLANKS—Paragraph 12, p. 39.

The teacher copies sentences such as those below on the chalkboard. The students read the sentences aloud several times. Then the teacher erases the italicized words, and the students copy the sentences supplying the words from memory.

Although Dick is used to the *noise* at his *office,* he still looks *forward* to the *end* of the day when he can *return* to his *house* in the *quiet* suburb. For relaxation he may *mow* the *lawn* or repair a *piece* of furniture.

Drill-type writing exercises are deceptively simple looking, but they are not easy for beginning students regardless of age and academic background in their own language. Obviously, students who can do independent writing without making the errors typical of speakers of their native language are beyond the stage at which drill-type writing is profitable for them, and they are ready to be taught written English with the methods and materials appropriate for native English-speaking students of comparable age and academic background.

A Classroom Technique for Teaching Vocabulary

Adrian Palmer

The primary purpose of this paper is to present a method for conducting a vocabulary class. This method will, in addition to helping the students learn vocabulary, also help them develop their reading comprehension, aural comprehension, and fluency in asking and answering questions.[1]

Students who can profit from this technique are those who have learned how to produce and answer questions, since their oral performance in class often consists of questioning and answering. I shall classify questions in this paper as yes-no questions, questions using question words, and alternative choice questions.

The technique proposed here is characterized by three stages. The first two stages which are not repeated after they have been completed prepare the students for the third stage. After this stage is reached, it is continued throughout the course. In Stage One the teacher demonstrates a particular method of teaching vocabulary and reading comprehension consisting of a question-answer dialogue. Stage Two is a trial and error period during which the teacher acts as a prompter and assists the students in forming the same types of questions which he demonstrated in Stage One. In Stage Three the teacher allows the students to carry on the entire question-answer dialogue on their own, acting only as a monitor to correct student errors.

The amount of time devoted to Stages One and Two should be judged by the teacher. I suggest, however, that Stages One and Two be completed as quickly as possible, with five classroom hours per stage being sufficient for a class of up to ten students. The remainder of the course should be spent in Stage Three.

All three stages involve questions and answers about the contents of the reading passage which lead the students to an understanding of the meanings of the vocabulary under study. The students reply in chorus with short answers. In Stage Two the teacher helps individual students ask the questions and requires answers in complete sentences by the other students. In Stage Three the role of the teacher is reduced to that of a monitor who intercedes only when mistakes are made in the question-answer dialogue between the students.

To clarify the use of this classroom technique I will present a series of questions about a single sentence which might be encountered in a reading selection. I will then explain in detail the operation of each stage in the teacher's technique, and comment upon observed students' reactions. Finally I will discuss problems which might be encountered in applying this technique and suggest some possible modifications.

"On the morning of May 20, 1927,

Mr. Palmer is a Teaching Fellow and Research Assistant in Testing at the English Language Institute of the University of Michigan.

[1] I would like to thank Dr. Ruth Hok and Mr. John Upshur for their comments in the course of writing this paper.

Charles A. Lindbergh took off from a muddy airfield in New York and headed for Paris." [2]

QUESTIONS:

(1) Who took off for Paris?
(2) When did Lindbergh take off?
(3) How did he travel—by boat?
(4) When a plane takes off, does it rise or fall?
(5) Where did Lindbergh take off from?
(6) Where was the airfield located?
(7) Was the airfield made of cement or dirt?
(8) Was the dirt wet or dry?
(9) Where was Lindbergh going?
(lo) Does the paragraph say that he arrived later in Paris?

Stage One

On the day before the reading passage is to be taught in class the teacher reads it aloud to the students. They are told to look it over again at home. The next day the teacher reads the first paragraph aloud. Then he reads the first sentence again to anticipate pronunciation problems and focus attention on a single sentence. He then proceeds to ask a series of questions (above) which lead the students to an understanding of the meanings of words and their grammatical relationships. These questions require only short answers such as "Lindbergh" (1), or "May 20, 1927" (2). The students keep their books open so that they can locate the answers. Upon completion of the questions on the first sentence the teacher

---

2 James V. Thompson, "Wings Across the Atlantic," *American English Reader,* ed. Grant Taylor (New York: Saxon Press, 1960) , pp. 218-223.

proceeds to the second sentence, and so on, until the reading selection is completed.

A large number of questions can be asked about this rather simple sentence. Some questions help the students arrive at meanings of words such as *muddy* and *take off.* The technique is to use alternative choice questions (4, 7, 8) which will lead them to the correct meaning of the words. If some students choose the wrong answer, they are usually corrected immediately by their classmates and change their answers to the correct ones. If the students do not agree, then the teacher must explain or illustrate the meaning of the word and retest for comprehension.

Other questions (questions with question words: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 9) help the students establish the time, place and manner of the action in the sentence. These questions are similar to the questions asked in reading comprehension tests, and their value should be obvious. The final question (yes-no type) is a bit more difficult in that it asks the students to distinguish between stated information and information which would be known from another source. This type of question forces the students to read carefully and analytically.

From classroom experience I have found that group answers at this stage are more stimulating than individual responses since group interaction leads the students to the correct answers without constant teacher correction. It also requires each student to participate fully in answering each question.

Minimal advance student preparation is necessary at this stage since

books are kept open, and the questions and group answers in themselves teach the students the meanings of the vocabulary words. For this purpose the alternative choice questions are especially useful.

How does the class react to this teaching method? First and most important, the students do not get bored, for they are constantly being challenged to give answers, and the questions can be asked quickly to keep their attention. Second, the answers required are within their grammatical ability (being short answers), so the students do not become frustrated. Third, they are learning the vocabulary in context and do not generally need to write out definitions for words in order to remember the meaning. Fourth, they are exposed to common mistakes made by their classmates and learn from hearing the corrections and reasons for the corrections, both of which they often supply themselves.

At the completion of Stage One the students have seen how to ask questions about sentences and have been given practice in reading comprehension and vocabulary building. The teacher has acted as a model and demonstrated what the students will themselves be required to do in Stage Two.

Stage Two

Stage Two requires the first shift from the teacher as questioner to the student as questioner. The entire selection is read aloud by the teacher the day before it is to be studied in class. Each student is asked to prepare intensively at home one paragraph in the story so that he can ask questions about each sentence as the

teacher did in Stage One. He should also look up unfamiliar words in a dictionary and be prepared to explain the meanings of any of the words in his paragraph if he is asked to do so by the other students.

The following day the teacher reads the first paragraph aloud, then repeats the first sentence. The student-questioner then asks his questions. At first the student will have some difficulty in asking questions as the teacher did. To assist him the teacher can write a list of question words on the blackboard before class and prompt the student when he has difficulty. Also in Stage Two a shift is made from short answers by the class as a whole to complete sentence answers by the individual students. The student questioner asks one question of each student, going around the class until he has completed his questions about his paragraph.

In summary, the following are the seven steps to be followed in Stage Two:

(1) The teacher reads the paragraph aloud, then repeats the first sentence (students' books open).

(2) The student-questioner asks as many questions as he can about that sentence with prompting from the teacher for assistance in selecting an appropriate question type to use. The student-questioner asks his classmates for answers, one question to each student.

(3) Each class member answers the question put to him with a complete answer.

(4) If the answer is incorrect, the student-questioner corrects it,

or the teacher does it if the student-questioner does not realize the mistake.

(5) After the student-questioner has completed his questions about the first sentence, the class can ask him about specific words they do not understand.

(6) The teacher adds anything he feels has been missed, then reads the second sentence, and so on, until the paragraph has been completed.

(7) This cycle is repeated with another student-questioner and the second paragraph.

In one class in which this technique was used, several things became clear. The intensive drill in question formation led to a marked improvement in the students' confidence and accuracy in the formation of questions. It appeared as if the transition from pattern practice drills to creative use of the grammatical patterns had been accomplished. It was also noticed that the students made more use of teaching vocabulary by explanation than of the use of alternative choice questions, which were evidently the most difficult to construct.

Stage Three

Stage Three involves further reduction of the role of the teacher from a prompter to a monitor. He can vary the order of calling on students if their attention lags, clarify and assist in the definition of difficult words, and assist in the explanation of more complicated grammatical constructions.

Special problems are sometimes associated with Stages Two and Three. The first is selecting a text which the students can control so that they gain in confidence and feel a sense of accomplishment. The second is keeping the students from asking too many questions about simple sentences or vocabulary items. Prior underlining of words which the teacher considers important will restrict this tendency. The third is getting the students to ask alternative choice questions. The students can be furnished in advance with a text in which the important vocabulary words have been numbered. He is also given two opposition words for each vocabulary item numbered in the text. He then uses these opposition words to ask alternative choice questions about the numbered vocabulary items.

If the drills are too easy for an advanced class, they can be made more challenging by requiring the class to answer all questions with their books closed, relying only upon their memory of the sentence as read aloud by the teacher. This eliminates practice in scanning, but it increases drill in aural comprehension.

In summary, this classroom technique offers a solution to some of the problems associated with vocabulary teaching while also permitting intensive drill in the areas of reading comprehension, aural comprehension, question formation and answering, and the creative use of language.

Review

Allen, Harold B., ed. *Teaching English as a Second Language.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965. 406 pp.

The Foreword of Harold Allen's latest collection of readings in the field of applied linguistics and language teaching states succinctly: "This collection has one ultimate purpose: to help everyone now teaching or preparing to teach English to those for whom English is not the first language." This worthy purpose is well carried out by the organization and content of the book. Forty-five authors—all well known in the field of linguistics as applied to language teaching—are represented here. Their articles, appearing originally in not always easily obtainable journals devoted to linguistics, psychology, and education, are collected here in one convenient volume. They include contributions from Australia, England, the United States, Canada, and the Philippines—places where the teaching of English as a second or foreign language has given rise to substantial professional writing. The emphasis in some is theoretical, in others completely practical. The beginning teacher will find much to help him, and the experienced teacher will again meet writing that has influenced him and discover more that will challenge him.

The volume is organized into nine subject areas, each introduced with an overview that invites the reader to find answers to the many questions that beset him. The divisions suggest the thorough coverage: Theories and Approaches; Teaching English Speech; Teaching English Structures; Teaching English Vocabulary; Teaching English Usage and Composition; Teaching the Printed Word; Reading and Literature; Methods and Techniques; Teaching with Audio Visual Aids; and Testing.

The organization makes the book a useful text in a class in methodology, and it has been so used by this reviewer. In the first section articles by Wallace E. Lambert—"Physical Approaches to the Study of Language"—and by Kenneth Pike—"Nucleation"—make demands on the reader without experience in linguistics; other articles of a more general nature by Moulton, Marckwardt, Prator, Fries, and Anthony are helpful in bringing the new teacher into the current situation in language and linguistics: the changing emphasis on grammatical analysis (tagmemics and transformation) and the onward development of language teaching (with an increasing recognition of the role of communication). Abercrombie discusses the social basis of language, and he brings into focus and dispels some of the myths cherished by laymen. Several of these articles first appeared in 1957, and it is interesting to see what a difference this decade has brought to the profession. In 1957, empirical evidence and reliance on error counts were just giving way to more exact measurements and comparisons of the languages to be taught.

The sections that follow address themselves to specific problems in teaching the English language. There is no description of the phonology of

English *per se* in the Teaching English Speech section, nor are there any lesson plans to follow. But Nida points out the necessity of listening to and learning to hear the significant sounds of the new language; Haden explains the use of phonetic alphabets in language teaching; and Bolinger discusses intonation contours that probably do not operate as grammar signals. Careful studies on the interference of the first language at the phonological level are introduced in the overview with these words:

> Modern linguists accept the uniqueness of a given language. The fact, however, does not, according to Haugen, preclude recognition of the overlapping phonemes, not only between dialect groups but also between language groups. Haugen's point is then developed *in extenso* by Weinreich. These two can do much to prevent identification of the foreign speaker as one having a 'defective speech' and hence a candidate for 'remedial speech' in a speech clinic.

(If administrators and speech departments would ponder that last sentence, much misdirected energy might be avoided.)

Echoes of the meeting between linguists and language teachers at Ann Arbor in July 1957 are found at the end of Virginia French Allen's useful presentation of the necessary tailoring of language to the learner's needs in preparing reading material for him. Specific drills to ensure control of grammatical relationships are spelled out by Harold King, while farther on in the book, Lois Robinson demonstrates techniques for controlling the written language. Earl Stevick's by now famous contribution to the better use of classroom time, "Technemes and the Rhythm of Class Activity," is to be found in the Methods and Techniques section. In this section, also, Sibayan reminds us that pattern practice need not consist of meaningless repetition.

Australia offers a practical study in contrasts between Spanish and English phonology, and some grammatical signals—again in terms helpful to the teacher just beginning to look at language from a structural standpoint and just beginning to understand the need for contrastive descriptions.

The testing section presents useful information about breaking down language testing into manageable parts so that the examiner will not be confounded by too many kinds of performance in one test. In the same section, however, John Carroll points out that some times an "integrative test" is needed when students are from many different language backgrounds and the need is to find out how the student is getting along in the language. Here total comprehension of sentences keyed to pictures is advocated. Paterno, on the other hand, carefully classifies and catalogues, with examples, the many possible and desirable divisions of language testing.

Teaching English as a Second Language covers the representative writing through 1965 of professionals in this rapidly growing profession. A companion volume has been promised, and so rapid is the proliferation of publication in this field, sequels could well continue to appear year after year.

This text is useful to many teachers in many ways. It has proved its worth

as a text in classes of methodology in English as a second language. With a companion course in general linguistics and texts in English phonology and syntax, *Teaching English as a Second Language* can furnish breadth and perspective, and can help the teacher see this profession in all its scope.

LOIS MCINTOSH
University of California
Los Angeles

Announcements

The Committee on Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages of the National Council of Teachers of English (Betty Wallace Robinett, Chairman) will present a program at the annual NCTE Convention to be held in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, November 28–30, 1968. Professor Charles T. Scott, University of Wisconsin, will chair the program on Friday, November 29, which has as its subject "Teaching English as a Second Language to the Disadvantaged."

The 1969 TESOL Convention will be held in Chicago at the Pick-Congress Hotel, March 5–8. Mre. Evelyn F. Carlson, Associate Superintendent, Chicago Board of Education, is Local Chairman. William E. Norris, TESOL Second Vice President, is the Convention Chairman.

Publications Received

Audio-Lingual English (Semi-Self Instructional Laboratory Course) Demonstration Kit #1. New York: Collier-Macmillan International, 1967.

Bulletin of the Survey of Language Use and Language Teaching in Eastern Africa, I, 3 (May, 1968). Nairobi, Kenya.

CEA Critic, XXX, 6 (March, 1968), 7 (April, 1968), 8 (May, 1968).

English as a Second Language Newsletter, I, 4 (May, 1968). San Diego, California: ESL Demonstration Center.

ERIC, *Clearinghouse for Linguistics Bulletin* No. 3 (March, 1968) and No. 4 (May, 1968). Washington, D. C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

The Journal of the Association of English Teachers, V, 3 (December, 1967) and VI, 1 (April, 1968). Asunción, Paraguay.

Language Learning, XVIII, 1 and 2 (June, 1968).

Language Research in Progress, 6 (April, 1968). Washington, D. C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Language Sciences, Number 1 (May, 1968). Indiana University, Research Center for the Language Sciences.

TEFL: A Bulletin for the Teaching of English as a Foreign Language. Beirut, Lebanon: Center for English Language Research and Teaching at the American University. II, 2 (March, 1968) .

Wise, Sheldon, ed. *Spoken English for Turks,* Book Fifteen (Lessons 71-75), Book Sixteen (Lessons 76-80). Istanbul: Robert College, 1967.

Thomas, Hadley A. *Innovations in Indian Education.* Tuba City, Arizona: Tuba City Elementary School, 1968.

Thomas, Hadley A. *The Teacher Aide Program.* Tuba City, Arizona: Tuba City Elementary School, 1968.

Workpapers in English as a Second Language (April, 1968). University of California, Los Angeles.