

TESOL QUARTERLY

Volume 2
December, 1968**Number 4**

Table of Contents

To print, select PDF page
nos. in parentheses

The Three Dimensions of Grammar for Teaching English as a Foreign Language <i>Timothy Light</i>	219	(3-15)
Structural Ambiguity in the Noun Phrase . <i>Norman C. Stageberg</i>	232	(16-23)
Toward a Thumb-Nail Test of English Competence <i>Virginia French Allen</i>	240	(24-26)
The Semantic Role of Sentence Connectors in Extra-Sentence Logical Relationships . . . <i>Nancy Arapoff</i>	243	(27-36)
Controlled Writing: A Transformational Approach . . <i>Janet Ross</i>	253	(37-45)
Questions and Directed Discourse <i>Andrew MacLeish</i>	262	(46-51)
One Method for Producing Automatic Control of English Phonology and Structure . . <i>Marie Esman Barker</i>	268	(52-57)
Reading and the Oral Approach at the Secondary Level <i>Ralph F. Robinett</i>	274	(58-63)
TESOL at the '5 & 10' <i>Barbara F. Matthies</i>	280	(64-68)
On-the-Job Training <i>Carson W. Martin</i>	285	(69-71)
Organization and Administration of ESL Programs in the Public Schools . . . <i>Thomas A. MacCalla</i>	288	(72-76)
Some Effects of Bilingualism on Certain Clinical Speech Procedures . <i>Elaine P. Hannah and Robert S. Brooks</i>	293	(77-87)
Recent Research in TESOL <i>Bernard Spolsky</i>	304	(88-91)
Review		
Doty and Ross: Language and Life in the U.S.A. (Valdes)	308	
ERIC-TESOL Documents	310	
Publications Received	317	

TESOL QUARTERLY

A Journal for Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages

TESOL OFFICERS 1968-69

President

Paul W. Bell
Dade County Schools
Miami, Florida

First Vice President

David P. Harris
Georgetown University

Second Vice President

William Norris
University of Pittsburgh

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The officers and

Edward M. Anthony
University of Pittsburgh

Virginia French Allen
Temple University

Julia M. Burks
U.S. Information Agency

Kenneth Croft
San Francisco State College

Mary Finocchiaro
Hunter College
New York, New York

Harry Freeman
San Francisco State College

Tom R. Hopkins
U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs

Betty W. Robinett
University of Minnesota

Pauline Rojas
Miami, Florida

Rudolph C. Troike
University of Texas

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

James E. Alatis
Georgetown University

EDITOR

Betty Wallace Robinett
University of Minnesota

EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD

Virginia French Allen
Temple University

Marie Esman Barker
University of Texas
El Paso, Texas

Eugène J. Brière
University of Southern California

J. C. Catford
University of Michigan

Mary Finocchiaro
Hunter College
New York, New York

Maurice Imhoof
Ball State University
Muncie, Indiana

A. Iris Mulvaney
Tucson Public Schools
Tucson, Arizona

Bernard Spolsky
University of New Mexico

Hadley Thomas
Tuba City Public Schools
Tuba City, Arizona

Membership in TESOL (\$6.00) includes a subscription to the journal.
TESOL QUARTERLY is published in March, June, September, and December.
Business correspondence should be addressed to James E. Alatis, Institute of Languages and Linguistics,
Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.

Copyright © 1969

Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages

The Three Dimensions of Grammar for Teaching English as a Foreign Language¹

Timothy Light

By any account, the present scene in grammar is confusing to the teacher who wishes to help students learn the functional use of the English language. Premises, vocabulary, and methodology differ so much among the several schools of linguistic grammarians, that the full-time teacher is often overwhelmed at the thought of mastering the proper background tools for his work. At least for the writer (and, he suspects, for many others as well), the solution to the grammatical quandry has been a resort to a *mélange* of whatever snatches he understood of any modern grammars he happened recently to have read, supplemented by large doses of Latinate school grammar to fill the large gaps between those snatches. This is indeed a very slipshod approach, and it appears that there ought to be a better way.

At the same time, there is a distinct lacuna in *methods* for teaching grammar beyond the beginning level. We all know what to do with the basic sentence types when we are teaching students who know little or no English. But when we have successfully taught those sentence types, where do we go then? If we continue with the drill methodology of the beginning level, what sort of drills do we use? Do we revert to the analytical mode of teaching espoused by the school grammars? If so, what is our pedagogical view of the students' mental operations? In the writer's opinion, these questions about instruction at the post-beginning levels of language attainment are more far-reaching than hitherto has been recognized. We can easily demonstrate our efficiency with beginning students. But beyond the beginning level our returns diminish rapidly, and we find that with complex segments of language, students often make the same kind of errors that we have successfully foreseen and prevented in their use of simple and basic language.

Obviously, there is no certain solution to the problem presented by post-beginning students of English grammar. But it seems reasonable that we should bring the current plethora of grammatical studies to bear on the teaching of grammar in a manner that will at once avoid much of the technical confusion that faces active teachers and make pedagogy in grammar at all levels of language attainment a workable proposition. The present

Mr. Light is Lecturer in English, New Asia College, The Chinese University of Hong Kong.

¹ This paper was originally presented at the Leverhulme Conference on English as a University Subject in the Western Pacific Area, the University of Hong Kong, December 1966. The writer wishes to thank Professors Robert L. Allen and Betty Wallace Robinett, who read the original version of this paper and whose comments were very helpful in the rewriting of it.

essay is a modest attempt to do just that. To make this attempt, we must first (Section I) re-examine the fundamental question of the role of linguistic studies in language teaching, for confusion on this point is a major source of our confusion in grammar. Following that we will examine (Section II) the notion of grammar itself and current schools of grammarians in the light of a conceptual framework that is pedagogically based rather than linguistically based. Finally (Section III), we will look into the teaching of grammar at different levels of language attainment. The last section will be the most tenuous. For one of the conclusions that we will reach is that, while we can label the general ranges of grammar that should be taught at the respective levels of language attainment, it is possible to be precise on methodology for teaching that grammar only with the beginning level. In the third section, therefore, we will discuss brief guidelines for further enquiry into the higher levels of language attainment.

I. The Role of Descriptive Linguistics in the Teaching of Grammar²

Neither historically nor theoretically is there any *necessary connection* between descriptive linguistics and language teaching. Descriptive linguistics is primarily a pure science. It is scientific because it treats the systematic study of all pertinent data available at the time of study. It is scientific because the linguistic researcher, like all other scientists, establishes a closed system. The linguist assumes that his corpus represents all the material that there is, and he draws his rules for the behavior of the material on the basis of that corpus. This limiting definition of material is necessary to all sciences because no systematic statements can ever be made if the material about which they are to be made is believed infinite. "Systematic" is a key word for linguistics because fundamental to any science is the belief that the data studied show regular patterns of recurrence. Science is the business of discovering laws. Experience that does not regularly recur cannot be analyzed into laws. Important to the scientific character of linguistics is the requirement that the data studied by any linguist must be available to any other linguist for restudy and checking. Science is not the imposition of one man's laws on data, but the discovery of patterns visible in a given body of material in a published, readily scrutable manner.

Thus descriptive linguistics is interested in the objective analysis of *what is there* in given material observed under given conditions. The language teacher, however, is interested in helping a learner master enough of a given target language to enable that learner to communicate what he wants to say in that language. To select what segments of the target language he will concentrate on and the sequence in which he will introduce them, the

² The writer wishes to thank Professor Peter Strevens for his help with this section. When the paper was first read, Professor Strevens noted that the writer had blurred the distinction between language teacher and linguist so much as to make them seem the same.

teacher does not turn to a corpus but instead depends on criteria that are something like these: *system* where grading of the material is possible; *usefulness* where the learner has specific aims for his desired command of the language; *teachability* where, for example, the teacher thinks that items *a*, *b*, and *c* can be taught but that *d* cannot (at least not to *these students at this time*) and is therefore excluded.

To those overburdened with scientific Puritanism, these criteria may seem too subjective to be appropriate for a subject so systematic as language. But the major point here is that the language teacher and the linguist are really worlds apart when it comes to selecting material. The teacher must be subjective. If he endeavors to be otherwise, guilt over not being so will become his only reward. A minor point here is that one of the great discoveries of scientific linguistics is that some facets of language are much more regular in recurrence than others. Thus the nature of language itself prevents total dependence on systematic criteria for selecting materials. Moreover, in grammar particularly, there are large areas that have yet to be analyzed in a way that is useful to language teachers. The teacher cannot wait for analyses before he teaches constructions that his students need to learn.

The language teacher differs from the linguist also in that the teacher (and his students) are interested in what segments of the language mean and how to master their meanings, while the linguist is interested first in what the language *does* and *how* it means. The teacher can often make use of the linguist's discoveries, but only when those discoveries concern operations and structures that produce what the teacher believes his students need to learn to say. Similarly, in the sequencing of materials, the teacher is interested in a teaching order that makes pedagogical and communicative sense, but the linguist is concerned with establishing a general-to-particular hierarchy (and sometimes the reverse) that reflects an internally coherent system. From the view of the internal system of linguistics, the teacher's choice of materials and sequence may seem chaotic. From the teacher's point of view, the linguist's order is hopelessly rigid and often unteachable.

The use that the teacher can make of linguistics is thus rather limited. But if taken within its limitations, linguistics can be terribly important to language teaching. The teacher can first appropriate from linguistics its generally systematic point of view. This does not mean wholesale borrowing of the linguist's analyses of language. As we have just seen, that sort of borrowing will not help. But the linguist's assumption that the recurrent features of language are systematic must also be the teacher's attitude. For without this point of view, the teacher will choose his materials and teach them as a mass of scattered and totally unrelated items, and, of course, these items will be thereby rendered impossible to learn.

Secondly, the teacher can borrow from linguistics separate discoveries *where these prove useful for teaching according to the teacher's own criteria*

for selection. It thus does the teacher no good to make an existential commitment to one or another school of linguistics, and the claims that whole programs of teachings should be based upon one school of linguistic studies me a hindrance to good teaching. For an *a priori* choice of a holistic method of analysis puts the teacher among the linguists and robs him of the freedom that he must have to select materials and teach them according to educational criteria.

It is well to note that this is not quite the same as the often reiterated formula: the teacher gets his materials from linguistics and his methods from the social sciences and pedagogical theory. The teacher gets the analysis of *some* of his materials from linguistic studies. But he chooses his materials from many sources according to what he thinks his students need to learn.

In sum, the job of the teacher and the job of the linguist are essentially separate, and for good teaching they must remain so. But at the present this bifurcation of function immediately presents a major problem when it comes to the teaching of grammar. Linguistic studies of grammar are, in fact, often separated into mutually exclusive schools of devotion. How can we appropriate their conclusions for teaching without getting tangled up in their fearsome technical vocabularies and methodologies, and their claims to exclusiveness? The writer would like to offer a tentative answer to this question. The answer is stated as a metaphor which is pedagogically based. The purpose of this metaphor is to arrange the elements of English grammar and the concentrations of modern grammar analyses in a way that will be useful for teaching. This metaphor is not intended to be linguistically valid. It therefore blurs distinctions that theoretical grammarians consider important, a sin for which the writer begs forgiveness in the hope that the arrangement will prove useful to teacher. The metaphor is stated thus:

According to the major concentrations of current grammatical study, there are three dimensions of English grammar: the horizontal dimension; the vertical dimension; the serial dimension.

In the next section we will examine this metaphor, and in the final section we will consider its usefulness for teaching.

II. The Three Dimensions of Grammar

The three-dimensional metaphor that has just been introduced is based on the format of the printed page. The horizontal dimension concerns sentences that are best understood for analysis as linear units extending laterally across the page. The vertical dimension concerns sentences which cannot be analyzed unless they are broken up visibly and the parts are "brought down" the page in a schematic diagram. The serial dimension does not deal with syntax proper (as do the horizontal and vertical dimensions) but with intra- and extra-sentence elements of language whose relations in the stream of writing extend between sentences, between paragraphs, and indeed throughout whole pieces. We shall take up each of the dimensions in detail.

The Horizontal Dimension of Grammar. Here we treat sentences that can be classed immediately into types because of limited numbers of components and because analogies from sentence to sentence are clear even to the untrained observer. Such sentences have been most fully analyzed by the structural grammarians. Their work has come into English language teaching through the pattern approach. Because the pattern approach is the best known contribution of linguistics to the teaching of grammar, a single example will suffice to highlight why patterns or sentence types are ranged in the horizontal dimension. Here is the first pattern sentence from the University of Michigan's *English Sentence Patterns*:³

The lesson IS interesting.
--

This sentence is short. It contains only four components—determiner, noun, verb, adjectival. To analyze it we need only separate these components, label them, and demonstrate that they exist in the same order in thousands of other sentences that can easily be found or made up. We can also easily demonstrate that more words could be added and the essential components would remain the same. Moreover, because we are dealing with words and word classes in contiguity in the normal written word order, we can make our analysis as detailed or as general as we wish without disturbing that word order. The first sentence of *English Sentence Patterns* is divided in a manner which emphasizes the salient points for instruction in the lesson from which it is taken. A detailed immediate constituent analysis, however, would provide for the reduction of the sentence to words, morphemes, and eventually phonemes, all without disturbing or transforming the normal linear or horizontal order of the elements.

The simplicity and universality of an analysis that reduces all sentences is very appealing. But it has limited usefulness in teaching; for long and complex sentences—while theoretically amenable to the same sort of analysis as the shorter and more typical sentences—are rendered pedagogically meaningless when arranged as patterns or reduced to immediate constituents. The fact is, I think, reflected in the vast differences among the structuralists in their attempts to embrace all the sentences that come into their ken. Thus Fries has twelve patterns, Roberts seven, Hornby thirty-two (plus sub divisions).⁴ What happens when we try to analyze a long and

³ Charles C. Fries, Robert Lado, et al., *English Sentence Patterns* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1957), p. 1.

⁴ Charles C. Fries, *The Structure of English* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1952); Paul Roberts, *Understanding English* (New York: Harper and Row, 1958); A. S. Hornby, *A Guide to Patterns and Usage in English*, (London: Oxford University Press, 1954).

The term "transformational" is used because "transformational" rules are applied to the basic sentences to change them into an infinity of derivations of undetermined complexity. The emphasis placed by the transformationalists on the generation of new sentences is crucial for teachers because it provides for moving from the production of the simple to the production of the complex. The structural approach does not make the same provision, and thus leaves students and teachers in mental chaos when explanations of grammatical depth and embedding structures are required. Transformational grammar also provides for the graphic analysis of the complexities that it has created with its transformations. This analysis is carried out through the application of the familiar "tree" diagrams. Unlike the pattern description of complex sentences which essentially leaves analysis of operations unspoken and assumed, the tree diagrams are communicable and thus can be effective in teaching.

Transformational grammar is currently the most popular linguistic sort of grammar. Indeed, from the standpoint of teaching, transformational grammar is probably overexposed in books and journals of applied linguistics. An example of how transformations work is, therefore, unnecessary here, and we can turn to the oddly named *tagmemic* grammar, where an exemplary diagram may be necessary.⁶ A tagmeme is the correlation between positions in sentences and the constructions that fill them. Given the concept of tagmemes as their basis, the tagmemicists have no patterns or kernel sentences. Instead they use the positions that are possible in all sentences whether any given position occurs in a given sentence or not, and then investigate the conditions under which given constructions will fit into given positions. The simplified example of a tagmemic analysis of one sentence given in the Appendix will illustrate this. We can see that this approach is analytical rather than generative, but it can be very useful as a teaching tool. By refraining from set patterns, the tagmemic analysis directly solves the problem of the pattern approach. Any sentence, no matter how long or complex, can be analyzed without undue strain on credulity. By separating constructions from positions in the sentence, the tagmemic approach provides a tool with which to explain specific relations between complex sentence components and simpler sentences. In the tagmemic system, complex sentences can always be broken down to, or built up from, primary elements. Because the primary elements are not themselves fore-ordained, the analysis that one makes does not force sentences into molds that seem inappropriate or that are mere categorizations of a closed list of terms which obscure functions and relationships.

⁶ The example of a tagmemic analysis given in the Appendix is a simplified application of Robert L. Allen's Sector Analysis made by the present writer. Interested readers can find an informative and brief introduction to this analysis in Allen's book, *The Verb System of Present-Day American English* (The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1966). A general introduction to tagmemics can be found in Benjamin Elson and Velma Pickett, *An Introduction to Morphology and Syntax* (Santa Ana, California: Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1964).

Obviously, the transformational and the tagmemic approaches will have different sorts of usefulness in the classroom. One distinction between them is that the transformational approach can usually be relied on for the teaching of new types of sentence, while the tagmemic approach can be used more for the explanation of errors. Another distinction is that tagmemics is more helpful with relative clauses, while transformation is more helpful with the passive. But the *difference* in use is unimportant. As in all things, different teachers approach similar problems differently, and they probably should with grammatical analyses, too. The crucial point is the recognition that the teaching analysis of complex syntax is essentially different from that of simple syntax, and transformational and tagmemic grammarians have given us the tools for the analysis of the complex syntax.

The Serial Dimension of Grammar. There are aspects of grammar or paragrammar that do not appropriately belong in the study of syntax (the treatment of sentences) because they represent extra-sentence relationships that no-intra-sentence analysis can fully elucidate. Verb timing, pronouns (and other substitution words), determiners, and paragraphing are among these aspects of grammar. Verb-timing depends upon context, time words, and the interweaving relationships of verbal inflections through sentences, paragraphs, and indeed whole pieces of writing. Substitution words and their antecedents are specified by context and by preceding and succeeding sentences. Determiners are similarly, but probably more complexly, related. Paragraphs, insofar as they are systematic, are the result of many elements, including those just named as well as the extra-syntactical order of succeeding sentences.

None of these items can be analyzed, explained, or taught according to the syntactical schemes listed under the horizontal and vertical dimensions, for each of those schemes assumes an intra-sentence framework that distorts the actual operations of the serial elements. This dimension is termed "serial" because the relations that exist between inter- and extra-sentence elements are ranged up and down the printed page. It is often the case that the first such element to appear sets the pattern for all similar ones that follow (i.e., antecedent and pronouns). But this is not always the case, and thus the fact that these elements occur in series rather than in a specific hierarchical order is their most distinctive feature.

Though scholars of several of the vertical or horizontal persuasions of grammar have attempted to analyze these elements according to given particular syntactical commitments, there are no set schools of grammar at this level. This lack makes explanation of the phenomenon of seriality more tenuous than that of verticality or horizontality. At the same time, the absence of schools of thought makes this level rather more attractive to the creativeness of the working teacher, for there are in this dimension many items necessary for teaching that still require analysis for pedagogical purposes. Happily, the working teacher need not commit himself to a particular school of grammar before he can assist in the analysis of such items.

III. The Three Dimensions of Grammar and Teaching

Arising from the differences between the task of the linguist and that of the language teacher, and from the foregoing account of grammar are certain general points to be made about the pedagogical use of any grammar. For the sake of brevity, they will be stated as principles:

1. With any over-arching system of grammar, the teacher should try to master the approach and the mental framework that the system provides but *not the general analysis itself*. It is not helpful at all for the teacher to follow the linguist and subsume every grammatical phenomenon to a single analysis because (as I have tried to show above) each analysis has its particular sphere of usefulness for teaching outside of which its relevance rapidly diminishes.
2. In teaching, the paraphernalia of grammatical analyses should at most be sparingly used. Language students need to learn a command of the target language at hand; language students have no need to learn to distinguish transforms from tagmemes from patterns.
3. The three-dimensional metaphor given here may be kept in mind when preparing to teach because it provides a framework for the arrangement of grammatical problems. But this metaphor must be used flexibly. It is designed as a corrective to dogmatism. It is not intended to become another dogmatism.

Given these rather agnostic principles, we must go on to see how the three dimensions of grammar can be used in the teaching of English as a second language.

The horizontal dimension of grammar is that which is taught most thoroughly at the beginning level. Only sentences which can be treated as basic units can be learned at this level. Until a learner has mastered a goodly number of basic sentence units, he cannot go on to the complexities of sentence expansion and multilevel analysis. Happily for the English-teaching profession, pattern analysis has provided this dimension of grammar and this level of teaching with a tool that precisely fits the needs of beginning students. Equally fortunate, the pattern-oriented writers allied themselves early on with a behavioral theory of learning and a drill-based methodology that are exactly suited to the appropriation of observable units of behavior which must be mastered before they can be analyzed or understood. The alliance between pattern grammar and behavioral learning is suitable because until one reaches a certain point in learning a language, one's learning is nothing other than acquired observable and inflexible behavior. It is only when one has learned enough of a target language for one to reflect in that language that it is possible for one actively to comprehend and produce new items in the language, and to participate in the minimal sorts of analysis of the language necessary to one's further learning of that language. The pattern analysis and its attendant methodology provide for that first stage of learning.

This is not to say, of course, that grammar at the beginning level of instruction should be limited only to what has been included in the horizontal

dimension. We cannot, for example, even begin without verb timing, and it would be foolish to suppose that because the serial elements of grammar are not suitably explained in a pattern analysis, they must be excluded from the area of teaching where the pattern analysis is most appropriate. At the same time, however, it is vital to realize that if many tenses are introduced through patterns, a confusion will be taught that later on will be almost impossible to clear up by further teaching. As even the simplest analysis of a pattern-based grammar will show, the implication of teaching verb timing through patterns is that intra-sentence time relationships are the clue to the proper timing of English verbs. This false impression, which is necessarily generated by the pattern approach, is one source for the many errors that teachers find in the use of verb timings that are not dependent on a time word in the same sentence as the verb itself.

What needs to be done at the beginning level is to restrict the appearances of the serial elements of grammar to those clear uses in which the relevant indicators are all to be found within one sentence. If this restriction is maintained, the grammar that is presented will remain a pattern grammar *in form*. And that is essential for beginning level students whose knowledge of the language is too tenuous for the introduction of the sort of ambiguity which seriality implies.

The delay in introducing serial elements *per se* should be maintained until the student is no longer a beginner. Then gradually the various uses of verb timing, determiners, pronouns, etc., should be taught. At the same time, of course, modification and predication will become expanded so that vertical grammar must be introduced as well. This means that the teaching of grammar may be done at proximate times in radically different ways, or at least according to very different conceptualizations. Because this may seem too much for students, teachers might be tempted to gloss over the differences between the elements of grammar and teach disparate items according to the same format (as indeed the stricter of the extant pattern grammars already do). But the confusion which results from such a practice is just the problem that occasioned this paper, and therefore the writer urges a classroom honesty about those distinctions which are inherent in the language and which must be recognized by those hoping to learn the language. Naturally, I am not suggesting here that class time should be spent on detailed analyses of a *mélange* of major and minor points. The fallacy of that approach has already been dealt with above. But what the teacher can do is to introduce the necessary grammatical distinctions as functions of the easiest learning of the grammar. Thus the seriality implicit in contextual verb timing should be taught as the mode of learning for tense relationships. Prior mention should be taught as a mode of learning for articles and pronouns. Uniqueness should be taught as a mode of learning for certain aspects of all the serial elements. And so on. These forms of seriality do not pertain to linear patterns and vertical constructions, and so they should be kept separate from the non-serial elements even if a modicum

of classroom time hitherto spent on other activities has to be expended to maintain the distinctions well.

The horizontal dimension of grammar still has some use at the later levels. Patterns should no longer be the center of the grammar but a supplement to what is central. The expressions that can be taught as patterns beyond the beginning level are important; but unlike the basic patterns, they are not related to thousands of other possible sentences of the same mold. As students progress, the sort of expressions that are best taught as patterns become highly infrequent types until they finally merge into idioms, which are nothing more than unique patterns.

There are no sharp distinctions between the grammar that should be taught at the intermediate level and that at the advanced level, for the problems pertinent to the learning of grammar remain essentially the same from the early intermediate level to the end of learning. Probably the greater complexity of conceptual learning must take place at the intermediate level, for it is there that most constructions and serial usages must be introduced in order for students to have some basis for further learning. At the advanced level there will probably be a greater number of discreet items to be learned, since when we reach categories that have only a few members (or perhaps only one) —which is what we find in unusual usages, idioms, archaisms, and borrowings—mass rote memory is a surer learning tool than analysis. Perhaps the greatest distinction between grammar at the intermediate level and grammar at the advanced level is that with the former, teaching is based largely on what the student has never heard of (though he is linguistically prepared for what he must learn), while with the latter teaching is largely based on the student's current performance, and he can help the teacher select what requires teaching.

Up to this point we have dealt with the ranges of grammar, and an attempt has been made to indicate what range of grammar should be taught at what time. As stated at the beginning, no such attempt can be made for methodology and psychology, for it is not at all clear how grammar should be taught beyond the beginning level. For the present paper, two simple notions on the subject can be stated. First, the teacher of intermediate and advanced students must have a more complex notion of his students' psychology than that allowed for by the behavioral modes adapted for their own use by the pattern grammarians. If one assumes no learning other than what one sees in visible behavior and if one does not assume in one's students a mental process similar to what one senses one's own to be (even if that sense is in fact an illusion), one will be unable to teach any grammar that is grammatically inappropriate to a pattern analysis.

Second, the teacher of intermediate and advanced students must find drills that are more complex than the substitution single-transform type so common to the pattern texts. Those drills depend upon a simple analogy of one step. When we get to the dimensions of grammar where each new item is a complex of many types of analogic movement merging into a con-

struction, the drills that over-simplify do not teach what is to be learned, but instead create the false impression that what is to be learned has already been mastered. The word “drill” is, of course, used herein its broadest sense; for drills that are appropriate to the vertical and serial dimensions may, in fact, look like anything but what we are used to calling drills. It is, for example, conceivable that with the more complex grammar, learning exercises should begin with semantic rather than grammatical comprehension. It is equally conceivable that drills with the complex grammar should *begin* with verbal performance in a real situation rather than lead up to that stage. It is further conceivable that drills with complex grammar might in fact be dialogues or structured conversations—not as examples of the matter being drilled (as is the case when using dialogues and conversations in teaching patterns), but as the actual drill itself. At this stage, it is impossible to predict what will be found useful in drilling the serial and vertical grammar at the intermediate and advanced levels. It can only be urged that the need for discoveries in these areas should be widely recognized.

It may seem outrageous to have proposed using different grammars and even different psychologies and methodologies for teaching the same student at different levels. But the time is hardly ripe for wholesale allegiance to absolute schemata; and if the scientific spirit has taught us anything, it should have taught us the value of working hypotheses and instrumental definitions. What has been given above is an instrumental definition of grammar based on the assumption that each of the contending schools of grammar represents for teaching a working hypothesis which has its own sphere of usefulness. The writer hopes that this instrumental definition itself will have some timely usefulness for teachers.

APPENDIX

An Example of a Tagmemic Analysis

(A simplified version of Robert L. Allen's Sector Analysis)

Sentence: The expanding college offered places to most of the students who applied for entrance.

Sentence Positions:

	<i>subject</i>	
	the expanding college	
	<i>verb</i>	<i>object</i>
	offered places to most of the students who applied for	<i>complement</i>
	entrance	

Constructions filling Positions:

Subject:

(construction is cluster) the expanding college

(construction is predicated) expanding college (= college is expanding)

Predicate:

verb:

(verb + carrier) offered (= offer + did)

(construction is cluster) offer

object:

(construction is cluster) places (= place + plural)

(construction is cluster) place

complement:

(construction is prepositional phrase)

to most of the students who applied for entrance

(construction is cluster)

most of the students who applied for entrance

(construction is prepositional phrase)

of the students who applied for entrance

(construction is cluster)

the students who applied for entrance

(construction is cluster)

students who applied for entrance

(construction is clause)

who applied for entrance (= he applied for entrance)

(construction is sentence)

he applied for entrance

(Analysis carries on in the same manner)

Structural Ambiguity in the Noun Phrase*

Norman C. Stageberg

The term ambiguity refers to the multiple meaning of a given utterance. Most commonly this is a double meaning, as in this sign on an Iowa dancehall:

1. clean and decent dancing every night except Monday.

There are two kinds of ambiguity that must be distinguished, lexical and structural. In lexical ambiguity the double meaning derives from the meanings of the words themselves. Here is an example from a piece of advice to newlyweds:

2. When she washes the dishes, he should wash the dishes with her.
When she mops up the floor, he should mop up the floor with her.

Structural ambiguity, on the other hand, stems from the grammar of English, frequently from the arrangement of words and structures or from the grammatical classification of words. The next example shows a structural ambiguity caused by the arrangement:

3. At the commencement exercise, the Johnsons watched their grandson cross the platform proudly.

The arrangement permits *proudly* to modify either *watched* or *cross*. Structural ambiguity resulting from grammatical classification is illustrated in this sentence:

4. Twenty faculty members have earned degrees. Here *have earned* can be classified as either auxiliary + verb or as verb + adjectival; thus two readings are produced.

In what follows, I am going to limit the treatment of structural ambiguity in the noun phrase to the written language, for the dangers of ambiguity are much greater in writing than in speaking. In speaking, vocal signals such as stress, pitch, and juncture give very effective control over meaning, as an English professor once forgot when he announced to his Chaucer class:

5. Tomorrow we are going to examine the Wife of Bath's Tále.

But in writing there is no living voice to control the meaning signals, and the writer must depend on the written form alone—arrangement, word choice, word form, punctuation, spelling, and capitalization—to keep the reader on the rails. These are slender means and, as we shall soon see, the opportunities for ambiguity in the written language are rife.

Now, let us go to work on the noun phrase. The noun phrase consists of a noun head and its modifiers, fore and aft, and we shall examine a number of ambigual grammatical structures containing prenominal or postnominal modifiers. There are over fifty of these ambigual structures in the noun phrase, so we shall be able to consider only a sampling.

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

Mr. Stageberg, Professor of English and Director of English as a Foreign Language at the University of Northern Iowa, Cedar Falls, is the author of *An Introductory English Grammar* (Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967) and co-editor of *Introductory Readings on Language* (Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966).

First, however, it must be emphasized that each of these structures is the habitat of a POTENTIAL ambiguity. In some cases the structure will house an ambiguity whenever the collocation of meaning permits. As illustration, we can cite two examples for the structure labeled adjective + noun possessive + noun head:

6a. May I see a woolen ladies' sweater?

b. May I see a bulky ladies' sweater?

The first is clear. The second is ambiguous because the meaning of *bulky* is compatible with those of both *ladies' and sweater*.

In other cases, the ambiguity will occur only under specific grammatical restrictions. As an example, let us look at the noun + noun head structure. Here, precisely which combinations of two nouns will be predictably ambiguous? One such combination is illustrated by

7. woman murderer.

The restrictions here are simple. The first of two adjoining nouns may have a subject relationship to the verb base of the second noun, as in *student complaint* (A student complains). Or it may have an object relationship, as in *package delivery* (Someone delivers packages). When either relationship can be understood in a given instance, as in *woman murderer*, we have an ambiguity. Examples:

8. The girl kidnapper has not been heard from.

9. Its purpose was to help police identification.

Other two-noun ambiguities depend on different restrictions.

Prenominal Modifiers

Turning now to specific noun-phrase structures, we shall begin with four different grammatical situations, each consisting of a single modifier before the noun head.

Situation 1: Noun + noun head

In spoken English, the meaning of a noun modifying another noun may depend on the stress. For example, a *récord sale*, with stronger stress on the first noun, means a "sale of records." This form is often considered a compound noun. But if the stronger stress is placed on the second noun—a *record sále*—the words mean a "sale which breaks a record." In written English, without the distinguishing stresses, such structures are ambiguous when the meanings permit. Here are two examples:

10. rubber knife

11. cement platform

Another ambiguity in the noun + noun-head situation is introduced by a modification tendency in English. When a noun modifies a noun head, it tends to have the singular form when the meaning is plural, as in a *car manufacturer*, that is, a "manufacturer of cars." Thus, the next example is ambiguous:

12. A student protest was disturbing the Dean.

This could be the protest of one student or of many students.

Situation 2: Adjective + noun

The adjective -t noun-head structure usually has a stress pattern of secondary-primary, as in a *lêarned mán*. But this structure can also take a primary-third stress pattern, as in a *lêarned jòurnal*. In writing, ambiguity will occur when this adjective + noun-head structure can be read with either stress pattern. Examples:

13. legal advice

14. petty officer

Another kind of ambiguity within the adjective + noun-head class is exemplified by

15. an enormous eater,

which can mean “an eater who is enormous” or “an eater who eats enormously.” The noun is agentive, with an intransitive verb as a base. Examples:

16. beautiful singer

17. heavy smoker

Situation 3: “Any” + noun-head

Any before a noun-head can be the source of some subtle ambiguities. Let us consider two of them:

18. They don't admit any students.

If the primary stress is on *any* or *students*, with a fall in pitch to low level and a fading terminal after *students*, the meaning is “They don't admit students.” But if the primary stress is on *any*, and if *students* has pitch level 2 followed by a rising terminal, the meaning is that the students are selected and some are admitted. Another case is seen in

19. Do you think that any car is better than the one you bought?

Here *any car* may mean “all other cars” or it may mean “any one particular car.”

Situation 4: Noun or adjective + noun head

Here, in spoken English, a secondary stress on the first item signals that it is an adjective, as in a *nòvel còurse*. But if the stress pattern is primary-third, as in a *nòvel còurse*, the first item is a noun, and the phrase means “a course in the novel.” This type of ambiguity has a high frequency. Examples:

20. conservative club

21. old-fashioned glasses

22. Professor MacLeish boasts that he can always find the liquor bottle, no matter where his wife hides it. He has a fifth sense.

Next, we shall look at potentially ambiguous situations consisting of two modifiers before the noun head. Each of these poses the same problem of interpretation: Does the first item modify the second one or the third one?

Situation 5: Possessive of noun or pronoun + noun possessive + noun head

Here the first possessive can modify either the noun possessive or the noun head. Example:

23. He looked professional in his chef's hat.

Whose hat? His? Or his chef's?

Situation 6: Adjective + noun + noun head

This is one of the most productive patterns of all, and the ambiguity is often present in both written and spoken English.

- 24. fresh flower perfumes
- 25. controversial speakers committee
- 26. heavy hog production
- 27. *Modern Language Teaching* (book title)
- 28. American Dialect Society

Situation 7: **Adjective + noun possessive + noun head**

This is the same as the preceding situation, except that the noun is in the possessive form. It is also quite common.

- 29. an old professor's wife
- 30. a dull boy's knife

Situation 8: **Noun + noun possessive + noun head**

Like the three preceding situations, the question here is what the first word modifies.

- 31. dormitory men's room
- 32. Iowa farmer's wife

Situation 9: **"More" or "most" + adjective + noun head**

- 33. We need more humane officers

In speaking, the two meanings in Situation 9 are kept apart by the suprasegmentals. When *more* modifies *humane officers*, meaning "a greater number of," it has secondary stress and considerable length: *môre + humâne officers*. But when it modifies only the adjective *humane*, it has third stress and is noticeably shorter: *mòre humane officers*. This structure occurs rather often. It will be ambiguous except when one of these grammatical restrictions obtains:

- a. The adjective is incomparable, e.g., *more dental care*.
- b. The adjective is one that normally takes *-er, -est*, e.g., *more slow trains*.
- c. The noun is a singular count noun, e.g., *more interesting hat*.

Situation 10: **Participle, present or past + noun or noun possessive + noun head**

This pattern combines four different possibilities, as shown in these four examples:

- 34. growing boy problem
- 35. running child's nose
- 36. painted ladies' room
- 37. Three petrified forest rangers shifted (Headline from an Arizona paper)

In the next group of ambigial prenominal situations, we find three modifiers before the noun head. Here the chances of ambiguity are increased, and it is not uncommon to find three readings for this general pattern.

Situation 11: **Adjective + noun+ noun + noun head**

- 38. new faculty orientation meeting

What is new here? The faculty, the orientation, or the meeting? Similarly,

- 39. big executive stomach ulcer
- 40. Australian Language Research Center

These are dizzying structures. And when the first noun is in the possessive form, the question of meaning is exactly the same:

- 41. old-fashioned teachers' convention hotel

That is, we may be talking about old-fashioned teachers, or an old-fashioned convention, or an old-fashioned hotel.

Situation 12: **Noun + noun+ noun + noun head**

This pattern represents the kind of noun pile-up that is frequent in newspaper headlines and in administration prose.

- 42. summer faculty research appointments
- 43. college building aid bill

Situation 13: **Adjective + noun + past participle + noun head**

- 44. solid brass covered bucket
- 45. soft wool insulated bag

This situation often gives us three readings. The second case, for instance, can mean: (1) Bag insulated with soft wool; (2) Soft bag that is made of wool and is insulated; (3) Soft bag insulated with wool.

Situation 14: **Appositive within a series of nouns**

If it is unclear whether or not a word in a series of nouns is an appositive—or which word is the appositive—the series will be ambiguous. Because of these difficulties, the next example has four readings:

- 46. At her bedside were her husband, Capt. Horace Brown, a physician, and two nurses.

In noun phrases, the presence of a coordinating conjunction, usually *and*, between two modifiers or between two noun heads, can cause ambiguity. In the next situation it is two modifiers that are connected by *and*:

Situation 15: **Adjective + noun + “and” + noun + noun head**

- 47. Wirte for free tape recorder and tape catalogue.
- And here are two noun heads joined by *and*:

Situation 16: **Noun + noun head + “and” + noun head**

- 48. fellow teachers and administrators
- 49. city streets and highways

Postnominal Modifiers

Now we turn to a few of the ambiguities among the postnominal modifiers. In our English system of modification, it is mainly word-group modifiers that follow the noun head. The types that we shall deal with are these: prepositional phrase, relative clause, participial phrase (present and past), appositive, modified adjective, and adverbial. When two such modifiers occur, there is the danger that the second one may refer to something else as well as to the noun head. The first case is a standard arrangement in English, and students frequently run afoul of it:

Situation 17: **Noun head + prepositional phrase + relative clause**

- 50. The life of a movie star that the public sees.
-

Situation 18: Noun head + relative clause + prepositional phrase

This pattern of modifiers is just the reverse of the normal order, which we saw in the preceding situation, and offers a great likelihood of ambiguity. The possibilities are that the prepositional phrase may modify something in the relative clause, or the noun head, or something preceding the noun head, usually the verb.

51. I was talking about the books I had read in the library.

This could mean “was talking in the library,” “books in the library,” or “had read in the library.”

Situation 19: Noun head + prepositional phrase + prepositional phrase

Here the second prepositional phrase might be thought to modify the object of the preposition in the first phrase instead of the noun head.

52. That review of a book by Simpson is very enlightening.

Situation 20: Noun head + prepositional phrase + adverbial of time or place

53. the party after the game yesterday

54. the bottle on the table there

Situation 21: Noun head + relative clause + appositive

55. The man who shot grandfather, a poacher, was brought to court.

Situation 22: Noun head + infinitive phrase + prepositional phrase

56. attempt to break strike by Negroes

Situation 23: Noun head + participial phrase + relative clause

57. There is also a theater located near the business district which is crowded every night.

With the postnominals, as was the case with the prenominals, a coordinating conjunction between two noun heads can create confusion. The following pattern will illustrate:

Situation 24: Noun (head) + “and” + noun head + prepositional phrase

58. excellent introductory text and captions in English, French, and German.

The question here is whether the prepositional phrase modifies only *captions* or both *text* and *captions*.

Situation 25: Noun head in object-of-verb position + present participle + anything grammatical

This situation can embody an especially delicate ambiguity that can best be approached by example:

59. They found the boy studying in the library.

The slight differences between two interpretations are suggested by these translations: (1) They found the boy to be studying in the library; (2) They found the boy who was studying in the library. Another example may be helpful to firm up this type of ambiguity:

60. She heard the man delivering her message.

The two meanings are: (1) She heard the man deliver her message; (2) She heard the man who was delivering her message. Whether or not this situation is ambiguous depends largely on the type of verb preceding the object.

All the foregoing grammatical situations in the noun phrase that are potentially ambiguous are illustrative of ambiguity resulting from arrangement or pattern. Let us now look at a few cases that result from grammatical classification.

Situation 26: **Noun derived from verb**

61. Mother's appearance troubled the girl.

The dual meaning of *appearance* comes from the two classifications of the verb which forms its base, *appear*. One meaning derives from the intransitive verb *appear*, as in "It troubled the girl that Mother appeared suddenly." The second meaning derives from the linking verb *appear*, as in "The girl was troubled because Mother appeared untidy."

Situation 27: **Mass or count noun**

Whether a word is interpreted as a mass or count noun often makes only a slight difference in meaning. In

62. He bought the beer,

there are the meanings of "a single beer" or "beer for the crowd." The difference is a matter of only a few dollars. The difference is even slighter in

63. Let's enjoy a little impropriety.

Here we may have either the adjective *little* + the count noun *impropriety* or the determiner a *little* + the mass noun *impropriety*. In either case you will probably get into trouble.

Situation 28: **"Both"**

The word *both* can be a predeterminer or a function noun or the first member of a pair of correlative. When its classification is uncertain, we have an ambiguity.

64. Both the boys and George joined the Peace Corps.

With *both* as a predeterminer, there were three who joined—George and both the boys. But with *both* as a correlative of *and*, the number who joined is indefinite—both George and the boys. The next example shows *both* in another combination of meanings:

65. They were both excited and happy.

Both as a function noun produces the reading "Both were excited and happy." But it may also be a correlative—" . . . both excited and happy."

Situation 29: **Genitive-subjective or objective**

When a genitive—the 's, the *of* type, or the pronominal form—modifies a noun of action, it is notionally the subject or object of the verbal base of the noun. The genitive noun is usually human. For instance, in "The boy's jump saved his life," *boy* is felt as the subject of *jump*. But in "The police provided for Richard's protection," Richard is the object of verbal base *protect*. In cases where the reader cannot tell whether the genitive is subjective or objective, the structure is ambiguous.

66. Few names are mentioned in discussions of students.

67. His punishment was severe.

68. Dr. McCoy's examination was a long one.

Situation 30: **“One of” + plural noun**

69. I cannot find one of my books.

This example comes from Joseph Priestley, 1762. When the primary stress is on *books*, the meaning is that one book cannot be found. When it is on *one*, the sentence indicates that no books can be found.

Situation 31: **“Or”**

The use of the conjunction *or*—within the noun phrase or connecting noun phrases—can occasion two sorts of ambiguity.

a. When it stands between two alternatives in a question, it can mean a choice of one or the other, or it can merely elicit a yes-or-no answer.

70. Does she prefer the blue or the green dress?

In speech a 2 3 1 ↓ intonation (fall in pitch at end) indicates choice, and a 2 3 3 ↑ intonation (rise in pitch at end) calls for a yes-or-no answer. The following example was on a form that Alabama voters had to sign:

71. Will you give aid and comfort to the enemies of the United States or of the government of the State of Alabama? (Some Negroes answered “Alabama.”)

b. Another use of *or* is to introduce an equivalent expression, as in “He is studying morphology, or the formation of words.” When *or* precedes a term that might be read either as an alternative or as an equivalent, ambiguity is possible.

72. For many purposes they used obsidian or volcanic rock.

Here, unless one knows what obsidian is, he is unsure whether they used one or the other, or whether *volcanic rock* merely explains *obsidian*. If writers punctuated the equivalent *or* with commas and left the choice *or* unpunctuated, there would be no trouble. But the fact is that often they do not use punctuation with either, as shown by this example from an eminent Harvard linguist:

73. Proper names have little or no meaning in the connotative or intensive sense, but merely point.

In this sentence neither *or* is punctuated. The first is a choice *or*, but the second has two readings, unless one knows the author’s meaning of *connotative* and *intensive*.

The preceding thirty-one grammatical situations show some of the combinations of modifiers that make for ambiguity in the noun phrase. And in other areas of English grammar as well, there are many structures of *double entendre*. Now we must ask the question: What does this information mean to the TESOL teacher? I will offer an answer in the most general terms. The TESOL teacher, during the stage of composition emphasis, can first direct attention to those structures that are most frequently a source of ambiguity in writing: for example, numbers 1, 4, 6, 7, 9, 15, 16, 17 in this paper. Then he can devise graduated exercises, first to detect ambiguities, and then to remove them by any of the methods commonly used. Such rewriting practice is an excellent discipline in precision and clearness of statement.

Toward a Thumb-Nail Test of English Competence

Virginia French Allen

- A. Please _____ it here.
- B. That is an _____
- C. They were not very _____

Will a student readily think of words that could belong in these sentence slots, if English is not his native language? Might a foreign student's sense of grammaticality be measured through such an exercise, one that requires some active *producing* rather than merely choosing among alternatives offered by a test writer? If so, how might a student's performance of such a task correlate with his reading and writing skills?

As a start toward answering these questions, the members of an EFL class at Temple University were asked to copy the above sentences from the chalkboard, filling each blank with any word they thought might belong there. The task proved elementary as far as sentences A, B and C were concerned: acceptable ways of filling the blanks were proposed by each of the fourteen students present, all of whom had met Temple's admission standards. But some of the next fifteen sentences produced more significant results.

1. Where did they _____?
2. Don't _____ him.
3. They didn't _____ it.
4. Why are you _____ ing?
5. We _____ed it very much.
6. It _____s too much.
7. This is a _____
8. These are _____s.
9. Which is the one with the _____?
10. Was he very _____?
11. Here is a _____ one.
12. He is _____er than she is.
13. You are the _____est.
14. They are more _____ than we are.
15. This is the most _____ of them all.

Mrs. Allen is Professor of English Education at Temple University in Philadelphia, where she is preparing teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (and non-standard dialects). For many years she was associated with Columbia University's Teachers College. She has also worked with teachers in Hawaii, Puerto Rico and the Southwest, as well as in several countries overseas. Her publications include *People in Livingston* (Crowell, 1953), *People in Fact and Fiction* (Crowell, 1957), and *Reader's Digest Readings*.

Among the fourteen Temple students who tried filling these blanks, three whose general proficiency in English is particularly limited supplied unacceptable inserts for sentence 4 (Why are you—ing? Two of the three made the sentence read: *Why are you doing?* while the third ignored the *-ing* and wrote *Why are you angry?*

Sentence 5 (We _____ed it very much) also appeared to have possibilities for distinguishing between levels of capacity—or levels of preparation—in English. One of the poorer students wrote *We eated it very much*; another wrote *We studied it very much* (thus raising questions of deep- vs-surface structure).

Sentence 9 (Which is the one with the _____?) elicited the most thought-provoking responses. Two of the slower students gave up on it completely, leaving the blank unfilled. On the other hand, five of the best students were inspired to provide multiple-word inserts, creating these phrases: *with the red blouse*, *with the red lace*, *with the blue dress*, *with the big mouth*, and *with the red mark on it*. Could this suggest that a sentence like 9 might serve as a gauge of general competence in English?

Whether or not the answer is yes, the exercise has already provided an interesting and perhaps useful by-product. Because the students had been urged to complete each sentence as quickly as possible, without stopping to think, their responses showed which verbs, nouns, and adjectives came most swiftly to their minds. People who write example sentences for grammar texts might be interested in this top-of-the-mind vocabulary, since these are words which have apparently been *learned* (in contrast to having merely been *taught*).

The verb list, with few exceptions, reads like something out of Thorndike: *beat, bother, bring, call, come, cost, cry, do, eat, enjoy, finish, forget, go, hit, hurt, jump, learn, leave, like, live, look, love, make, place, put, rain, run, seem, start, study, take, tell, touch, trust, want, worry, write*.

The classroom setting for the blank-filling exercise is reflected in the list of nouns: *apple, alphabet, blouse, book, boy, camera, cover, desk, doctor, dress, eat, egg, glass, hat, lace, knife, mark, mouth, opinion, orange, paper, pen, pencil, surprise, tail, toy*.

The adjectives used for filling the blanks amount to a rather more interesting assortment, which reveals an unexpected range and variety: *angry, beautiful, big, blue, bright, busy, clever, expensive, funloving, good, happy, homesick, industrious, important, intelligent, interested, interesting, lonely, modern, old, new, nice, perfect, polite, pretty, red, rich, ripe, sad, sharp, short, sick, smart, strong, tall, tired, warlike, yellow*.

It might be worthwhile to try this exercise with larger groups in different age brackets and at different instructional levels, so as to find out which nouns, verbs, and adjectives one might expect most EFL students to know. The main objective, though, would be to learn whether a blank-filling exercise of this sort could serve to measure general English competence—as an emergency yardstick, at least.

As a matter of fact, whatever its potential utility for testing purposes, such an exercise is worth using in class. As an introduction to a review of English grammar, it offers a simple way of clarifying basic grammatical concepts. The distinction between content words and function words quickly becomes clear when the teacher can say: "The words you students put into those sentences are often called *content* words; the other words in the sentences are called *function* words. Let's look at the chalkboard copy of the sentences and see what these function words are. . . ."

Just as simply, the three "major parts of speech" can be defined by saying: "Any word that could belong in Sentence A (or in sentences 1 through 6) is a verb. Let's notice what signals showed you a verb should go there. . . . Words that could belong in Sentence B (or in sentences 7 through 9) are nouns. Let's see what signals the need for a noun in each of these sentences. . . . And, finally, adjectives are words that could belong in the blank in Sentence 3 (or in sentences 10 through 15). What do these sentences show us about adjectives?"

Thus the students, too, have something to gain when the teacher borrows this device from the linguist's repertoire. It is an exercise that can *teach* as well as *test*.

The Semantic Role of Sentence Connectors in Extra-Sentence Logical Relationship*

Nancy Arapoff

Sentence connectors—words or phrases like HOWEVER, ON THE OTHER HAND, TO BE SURE—deserve much more study than they have previously been given, especially by those of us interested in teaching written English. For one thing, these expressions occur frequently in writing. From a word count made by Ernest Horn some years back, I calculate that roughly 50 of the 1000 most commonly used words in written English are sentence connectors. And this count includes single words only, excluding common idioms like OF COURSE, IN ADDITION, and AS A MATTER OF FACT which may well have as high a frequency as OTHERWISE, THUS, or THEREFORE. Just the fact that such words occur frequently makes them worth studying.

More important, however, is the fact that sentence connectors serve a significant semantic function in written English, a function which has been misinterpreted and thus underestimated by the few grammarians who have attempted to describe it. In all of the grammar books I have seen which make an attempt to deal with the semantics of such words and phrases as HOWEVER, ON THE OTHER HAND, or FOR EXAMPLE, the underlying assumption has been that the two sentences which are to be connected by these words already have one particular logical relationship by virtue of occurring next to one another—"concessive," "contrastive," "illustrative/" or whatever—which it is the writer's task to recognize so that he can insert an "appropriate" expression between the two sentences in order to emphasize or clarify this relationship. In other words, sentence connectors have been viewed as having no meaning of their own, their usage predetermined by the two sentences they are to connect.

But such is not usually the case. As a matter of fact, the opposite is more often true: sentence connectors frequently determine what the logical relationship between two sentences will be; while one connector may create one set of suppositions about the truth or nature of the two sentences it connects, another connector will create quite a different set of suppositions about the same two sentences. This means, then, that two sentences will have different semantic interpretations according to the sentence connector used to connect them.

The purpose of this paper will be to show how certain sentence connectors can be categorized according to the type of logical relationships they are associated with, and to describe these relationships by means of what I shall call "supposition rules."

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

Mrs. Arapoff, Instructor in the English Language Institute, University of Hawaii, is the author of a textbook series to be published in 1970 by Holt, Rinehart and Winston entitled *Read, Understand, Write*. She has published previously in *TESOL Quarterly*, I, 2 (June, 1967).

Criteria of Sentence Connectors

The term “sentence connector” as it is used in this paper needs definition, for this expression is by no means a widely-agreed-upon term used to describe a particular form class. In fact, the expressions I shall here call “sentence connectors” might be called elsewhere anything from “prepositional phrases” to “absolute constructions.” The following three criteria—two of them grammatical and one of them semantic—determine membership in the form class known as “sentence connector” for the purposes of this paper:

1. The expression, whether a word or a phrase, must be capable of occurring at the *end* of a simple sentence or independent clause (some, of course, occur at the beginning or in the middle of a sentence).
2. The expression must occur within the second of the two sentences it connects.
3. The expression must connect the two sentences semantically in such a way that a coherent logical relationship is revealed.

As can be seen, the two grammatical criteria eliminate many words which function as connectors: namely, subordinators like BECAUSE and ALTHOUGH, and conjunctions like BUT and SO. The semantic criterion eliminates such expressions as SO MUCH FOR THAT, AS A RULE, CONSIDER NOW, IN CONCLUSION, which *are* connectors in a semantic sense, but which function, not as revealers of a logical relationship, but as indicators of transition from one subject to another. They often occur at the beginning of a paragraph and have no logical relationship with the sentence preceding them.

Logical Relationships

Sentence connectors can be grouped into five binary categories according to the type of logical relationship they indicate. Below are a few examples of each type:

Inferential

	+
therefore	however
hence	still
thus	notwithstanding
because of this	nevertheless
as a result (consequence)	in spite of this
under the circumstances	nonetheless
accordingly	despite this
consequently	though
for this reason	anyway
in light of this	anyhow
in such instances	for all that
in consideration of this	regardless

	Comparative	
+		-
similarly		on the other hand
in like manner		in contrast
correspondingly		on the . . . side
in turn		dissimilarly
likewise		in opposition to this
in the same way		on the contrary
	Additive	
+		-
also		even so
too		of course
furthermore		to be sure
in addition		maybe
besides		perhaps
moreover		granted
either		in practice
	Intensifying	
+		-
indeed		at least
in fact		at any rate
as a matter of fact		rather
actually		in any case
in truth		to some extent
	Exemplifying	
+		-
for example		otherwise
for instance		
as an example		
that is		
in other words		
in particular		
in this instance		
for one thing		

This analysis so far looks much like that of the traditional rhetoricians; what they call “concessive” is here called “minus inferential,” what they call “contrastive” is here called “minus comparative,” etc. My analysis makes more distinctions than those made by others perhaps, but the *approach* has been the same: to indicate the kinds of meaning relationships certain sentence connectors are associated with.

If sentence connectors carry no meaning, this is about as far as an analysis need go. One would need only to “discover” the meaning relationship between two sentences and assign an appropriate connector to the pair. For example, given the two sentences **It rained** and **The yard got**

flooded, the writer would have only to look for the “intrinsic” logical relationship between the sentence—minus inferential, plus comparative, or whatever—and insert the “proper” connector. The only problem with this is that, while most writers would probably rule out using sentence connectors from *some* of the above groups to connect these two sentences, they could quite validly use expressions from *more than one* of them. For example, they would probably *not* write:

- It rained. HOWEVER the yard got flooded.**
- or: **It rained. SIMILARLY the yard got flooded.**
- or: **It rained. IN CONTRAST the yard got flooded.**
- or: **It rained. GRANTED the yard got flooded.**
- or: **It rained. OTHERWISE the yard got flooded.**

This means, then, that this particular pair of sentences does have meaning elements which preclude the use of certain sentence connectors. At the same time the use of the following connectors is not precluded:

- It rained. THEREFORE the yard got flooded.**
- and: **It rained. ALSO the yard got flooded.**
- and: **It rained. INDEED the yard got flooded.**
- and: **It rained. AT LEAST the yard got flooded.**
- and: **It rained. FOR EXAMPLE the yard got flooded.**

This means one of two things: either that the five “allowable” pairs of sentences above are synonymous, or that the sentence connectors between each pair give them different meanings.

If sentence connectors carry no meaning, serving only to point out or emphasize the meaning relationship inherent within the sentences themselves, then the five pairs of sentences must be synonymous since they are *identical* except for the supposedly meaningless connectors.

However, while a native speaker would probably perceive little or no difference between the sentences **It rained; THEREFORE the yard got flooded**, and **It rained; HENCE the yard got flooded**, he *would* perceive a difference between the five pairs of “correct” sentences above. He would perceive the first one as being what I have chosen to call “plus inferential,” the second as being “plus additive,” and so forth. Because the five pairs of sentences are identical except for the connectors, then, these expressions must themselves either have distinctive meanings which a native speaker perceives or act upon the meanings of the sentences they connect.

It seems obvious that the latter is the case. The expressions **THEREFORE** and **AT LEAST** by themselves have no perceptible denotations, though like any words they have various connotations. But when **THEREFORE** and **AT LEAST** are placed within the second of the two sentences **It rained** and **The yard got flooded** they act upon the meanings of these sentences, leading the reader to suppose certain things about them. **THEREFORE** will elicit a different set of suppositions than **AT LEAST** will, and, in order to understand the two sentences—in order to know what they

mean, when they are connected by **THEREFORE** and what they mean when they are connected by **AT LEAST**—one must know what suppositions these particular connectors elicit.

Supposition Rules

The following formulas, which I shall call “supposition rules,”¹ describe what happens semantically when two sentences are connected by the words or phrases listed above.

Inferential Supposition Rules

All inferential relationships consist of a statement of fact or opinion—a premise—and a statement drawn or inferred from it—a conclusion. But the *conclusions* in this category are of three types: deduction (symbolized by d), generalization (g), and effect (e).

$$\text{Rule 1: } S_1 + [+ \text{ Inf. } + \text{ d}] + S_2 \left\{ \begin{array}{l} -S_1 \text{ is true} \\ -\text{Most past cases identical to } S_1 \text{ have been} \\ \quad \text{accompanied by } S_2 \\ -S_1 \text{ is sufficient evidence to conclude that} \\ \quad S_2 \text{ is valid in this particular case} \end{array} \right.$$

Sample sentence: **Bill has a PhD; THEREFORE he is intelligent.**

Discussion: This rule describes the suppositions which occur when two sentences are connected so as to form a deductive type of plus inferential relationship. First, one supposes that the premise (S_1) is true—a known fact: Bill does indeed have a PhD. Second, one supposes that most past cases identical to S_1 (in which someone has had a PhD) have been accompanied by S_2 (by that person's being intelligent). And finally one supposes (because of the first two suppositions) that this particular case of S_1 is sufficient evidence to validly state the conclusion (S_2): Bill really is intelligent.

$$\text{Rule 2: } S_1 + [+ \text{ Inf. } + \text{ g}] + S_2 \left\{ \begin{array}{l} -S_1 \text{ is true} \\ -S_1 \text{ is typical} \\ -S_1 \text{ is sufficient evidence to conclude that} \\ \quad \text{the more general } S_2 \text{ is valid} \end{array} \right.$$

¹ I am indebted to Charles Fillmore of Ohio State University for the concept of supposition rules. In a then-unpublished paper entitled “Deictic Categories in the Semantics of ‘Come’” (given at the winter meeting of the Linguistic Society of America in 1965 and later published in revised form in *Foundations of Language*, Vol. 2, No. 3, 1966) Fillmore showed that the use of words like “go” and “come” in a sentence leads one to suppose certain things about the location of the speaker and/or hearer at the time of the action or utterance. He then showed that these suppositions could be described systematically. I have modelled my rules after those in Fillmore's unpublished paper rather than those in the later, published version.

Sample sentence: **Bill's mother and sister are reckless drivers; THEREFORE most women are reckless drivers.**

Discussion: This rule describes the suppositions involved in a generalization. One first supposes, as with deduction, that the premise (S_1) is true—in this case one accepts that it is an established opinion (rather than a known fact) that Bill's mother and sister are reckless drivers. Next, one makes the assumption (whether logically sound or not) that S_1 is but one typical example of many similar ones in which women are reckless drivers. Finally, one supposes, given the other two suppositions, that S_2 is a valid conclusion—that most women are reckless drivers.

$$\begin{array}{l}
 \text{Rule 3: } S_1 + [+ \text{ Inf. } + e] + S_2 \left\{ \begin{array}{l}
 \begin{array}{l}
 \text{—}S_1 \text{ is true} \\
 \text{—}S_2 \text{ is true}
 \end{array} \\
 \text{—a situation like that described in } S_1 \text{ has} \\
 \text{repeatedly preceded a situation like that} \\
 \text{described in } S_2 \\
 \text{—situations like } S_1 \text{ cause situations like } S_2 \\
 \text{—this particular case of } S_1 \text{ caused this} \\
 \text{particular case of } S_2
 \end{array}
 \right.
 \end{array}$$

Sample Sentence: **It rained; THEREFORE the yard got flooded.**

Discussion: Cause-effect inferences differ from deductions and generalizations in that both the premise and the conclusion $\text{—}S_1$ and S_2 —are assumed to be true, to be known facts or established opinions. Next, one supposes that a situation like that described in S_1 —raining—has had a past history of occurring just before a situation like that described in S_2 —yard-flooding. The next supposition is that situations like S_1 cause those like S_2 ; that rain results in yard-flooding. The last supposition is that, in this particular case, S_1 caused S_2 ; that this incidence of rain caused this incidence of yard-flooding.

$$\text{Rule 4: } S_1 + [- \text{ Inf. } + \left. \begin{array}{l} d \\ g \\ e \end{array} \right\} + S_2 \left\{ \begin{array}{l}
 \text{—}S_1 \text{ is true} \\
 \text{—}S_2 \text{ is true} \\
 \text{—expectation } [-S_2]
 \end{array}
 \right.$$

Sample sentences: 1) **Bill has a PhD; HOWEVER he is not intelligent.** 2) **Bill's mother and sister are reckless drivers; HOWEVER most women are not reckless drivers.** 3) **It rained; HOWEVER the yard did not get flooded.**

Discussion: In all three types of *minus* inferential relationships, the first two suppositions are that S_1 and S_2 are true. The third supposition is that one would expect the *opposite* situation described in S_2 to be true judging from the evidence given in S_1 ; i.e., that because Bill has a PhD he should be intelligent (though he isn't), that because Bill's mother and sister are bad

Sample sentences: (1) **Bill has a Ph.D.; ALSO he is intelligent.** (2) (There was nothing to do that night.) **The game was called off; ALSO the theater was closed.**

Discussion: In a plus additive relationship both sentences are assumed to be true. When the NP of the second sentence is identical to that of the first sentence, as in the first example above, where BILL and HE are the same person, one supposes that the VP in the second sentence merely adds to our knowledge about Bill: not only does he have a Ph.D., but also he is intelligent. But when the two NP's are different, as in the second example—GAME and THEATER—one then supposes that the two sentences are both specific examples which "belong to" a more general sentence; e.g., there was nothing to do that night.

Rule 2: $S_1 + [- \text{Add.}] + S_2$ $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} -S_2 \text{ is true} \\ -S_1 \text{ is a generalization which is true in most cases, but not in the case of } S_2 \end{array} \right.$

Sample sentence: **People with Ph.D's are intelligent; TO BE SURE Bill isn't.**

Discussion: In minus additive relationships, one makes his first supposition about the second sentence: that it is true; that it is a known fact or established opinion that Bill isn't intelligent. One then supposes that the first sentence is true in general—people with Ph.D's are *usually* intelligent—but obviously not true in the case of S_2 .

Intensifying Supposition Rules

Rule 1: $S_1 + [+ \text{Int.}] + S_2$ $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} -S_2 \text{ is true} \\ -S_1 \text{ is true, but not as specific as } S_2 \\ -S_2 \text{ is more exact than } S_1 \end{array} \right.$

Sample sentence: **Bill's mother and sister are reckless drivers; AS A MATTER OF FACT they're the worst I've ever seen.**

Discussion: In a plus intensifying, relationship, one first supposes that the second sentence is true—a known fact or established opinion. He then supposes that S_1 is also true, but that it is not as specific as S_2 : while it is true that Bill's mother and sister are reckless drivers, they are, more specifically, the worst he has ever seen. This supposition leads to the final one, that S_2 is a more exact statement than S_1 .

Rule 2: $S_1 + [- \text{Int.}] + S_2$ $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} -S_2 \text{ is true} \\ \left\{ \begin{array}{l} S_1 \text{ is too specific to be true} \\ S_1 \text{ is not known to be true, but can be considered a possible cause} \end{array} \right. \end{array} \right.$

Sample sentences: 1) **Bill is intelligent; AT LEAST he is fairly intelligent.**
2) **It rained; AT LEAST the yard got flooded.**

Discussion: With minus intensifying relationships the second sentence, again, is considered to be the true one—that Bill really is fairly intelligent, or that the yard really did get flooded. Next, in some cases (as in the first sample) the first sentence is considered to be too specific to be true—Bill isn't, strictly speaking, "intelligent," but only "fairly intelligent." Or (as in the case with the second sample sentence) the first sentence is considered to be a possible cause (since incidents like that described in S_1 often precede incidents like that described in S_2 and are thus assumed to be causal), and therefore possibly true, though not known to be. That is, one assumes that the yard really did get flooded, and thinks it altogether possible that the rain caused that flooding, though he isn't sure this is the case.

Exemplifying Supposition Rules

Rule 1: $S_1 + [+ \text{Exemp.}] + S_2$ $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} -S_2 \text{ is true} \\ -S_2 \text{ is a specific example giving sufficient evidence to assume the validity of the more general } S_1 \end{array} \right.$

Sample sentence: **Bill's mother and sister are reckless drivers; FOR EXAMPLE they drive too fast.**

Discussion: A plus exemplifying relationship is similar to a plus generalization in that one sentence states evidence which validates the facts contained in another sentence. However, in an exemplifying relationship, it is the *second* sentence rather than the first which is assumed to be the factual one, and this specific statement—e.g., that Bill's mother and sister drive too fast—then leads to the supposition that the more general statement (that they are reckless drivers) is valid though not *known* to be true.

Rule 2: $\infty S_1 + [- \text{Exemp.}] + \beta S_2$ $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} -S_2 = [- S_2] \\ -[- S_2] \text{ is true} \\ -[- S_2] \text{ is a specific example giving sufficient evidence to assume the validity of the more general } S_1 \end{array} \right.$

Sample sentence: **Bill's mother and sister are reckless drivers; OTHERWISE they wouldn't drive so fast.**

Discussion: Here, the ∞ means positive or negative, and the β means that if S_1 is positive, then S_2 is negative, and vice versa. Once more, one first makes assumptions about the second of the two sentences: that what S_2 says is the opposite of what is really true. In other words, the statement that Bill's mother and sister wouldn't drive so fast is the opposite of what really happens: they *do* drive fast. The assumption that they do drive fast, then, leads one to suppose that S_1 is valid if not known to be true; to suppose that

the specific example of their driving fast validates the more general statement that they are reckless drivers.

Conclusion

The purpose of this paper has been twofold: to list the kinds of logical relations-tips that various groups of sentence connectors are associated with, and to describe these relationships in terms of supposition rules. I have made no attempt to distinguish between words like **THEREFORE** and **HENCE**; they are treated as synonyms in this study although they doubtless have slight differences in usage and meaning. Nor have I made the assertion that it is always the sentence connectors rather than the sentences themselves which determine logical relationships. The fact that **HOWEVER** occurs in minus comparative and in minus additive as well as in minus inferential relationships would disprove such a blanket assertion. Also, the fact that **It rained; THEREFORE the yard got flooded** is interpreted by a native speaker as a cause-effect statement rather than as a deduction or a generalization is evidence that the sentences themselves do have something to do with how they are understood.

At the same time, the fact that **It rained; AT LEAST the yard got flooded** is able also to occur definitely indicates that sentence connectors *do* influence the meanings of the sentences they connect. I hope that this concept will prove useful to other teachers of writing, as it has to me.

Controlled Writing: A Transformational Approach*

Janet Ross

Acquiring skill in composition involves acquiring control over rhetorical devices—setting up a central idea, maintaining this idea throughout the composition, presenting the material in orderly sequence, and so on. Basic to composition skill is control of sentence structure and accuracy in mechanics so that the student writes correctly the first time and does not practice errors. Control over sentence structure can be exercised by a number of different devices, most of which involve imitation of some kind. We often say that speech should precede composition, that a student should not write patterns that he has not first heard and then practiced orally. But there is a difference in the structures used in speech and in writing. Written patterns are more compactly structured. We might equally well say that the student should not be expected to write grammatical patterns that he has not read. The person who writes well is usually the one who has read widely and who has heard good oral reading. Though he may not imitate in his writing all of the layers of structure used in any one sentence he has read, he observes through reading what the patterns of the language are. By conscious manipulation of these patterns in writing, he can develop control over their use. One approach to doing this is through an application of transformational grammar, not because transformational grammar presents rules but because it provides a systematic method of constructing sentences.

I have heard English teachers reject transformational grammar as the learning of formulae and the construction of “branching tree” diagrams, activities which would seem to have little carry-over to composition either for the native student or the student of English as a second language. But one aspect of transformational grammar is its analysis of a sentence as consisting of a kernel or basic sentence pattern—the “bare” sentence that I learned about in traditional grammar in the seventh grade—the elements of which can be rearranged or into which other kernel patterns can be inserted by a “transform” process to produce the most complex of sentence structure patterns. The person for whom English is the first language may use forms, particularly in speech, that are not acceptable to the educated because that is what he has heard: *We was* or *He done it*. In his writing he may produce dangling modifiers or otherwise poorly constructed sentences through lack of skill. But unlike the person who may speak as a first language one that is put together in a way very different from English, he does not violate the basic system. For example, the native speaker of English would not say, “All gone milk,” or write, as one of my foreign students recently did, “The French little pretty girl sang a song.” He chooses the correct pattern not

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

Miss Ross, Associate Professor of English and Coordinator of English for Foreign Students at Ball State University, is the author with Gladys Doty of *Writing English* (Harper-Row, 1965) and *Language and Life in the U.S.A.*, 2nd edition (Harper-Row, 1968), which is reviewed in this issue.

because he has learned a rule but because through using the language all his life he has developed a feeling for the system by which it operates. However, by identifying the kernel sentence patterns of English and deliberately practicing the variety of ways in which they can be combined and rearranged the native speaker can perhaps learn something about variety and style. By this same method the student of English as a second language can develop a greater feeling for the orderly patterning of the language and for its basic structure system. Not only does transformational grammar offer a method of sentence building, it also provides a device for identifying faulty transforms or sentence constructions. Furthermore, it may be used to develop an understanding of how structures which seem similar on the surface as in the sentences "*Grading papers can be a nuisance*" and "*Crying babies can be a nuisance*" are actually quite different structures with quite different meanings. It is a method that many of us have used in part in our teachings without the label "transformational" or without systematizing it.

Before setting forth in detail a procedure for approaching the teaching of composition through sentence building by transforms, a review in more detail of some of the processes of transformational grammar might be in order. The system as set forth by Owen Thomas¹ identifies four kernel patterns as follows, as distinguished by the verb:

	1	2	3	4	
Pattern 1	N	V	(Adv)	Intransitive verb
Pattern 2	N	V	N	(Adv)	Transitive verb
Pattern 3	N	V	{Adj} {N}	(Adv)	Linking verb
Pattern 4	N	be	Adj {N} {Adv}	(Adv)	

These patterns consist of four positions: subject, verb, complement, and adverb. After most verbs the fourth or adverb position is optional. The four positions can be rearranged in certain ways, sometimes with the use of structure words such as negatives, auxiliaries, or prepositions. Questions, negative patterns, sentences beginning with *there is* are examples of rearrangement transforms, as is the subject-verb inversion in a sentence like *Sitting beside the road was a little green man from Mars*. A somewhat more complicated rearrangement transform is the passive. Students can be shown that a pattern 2 sentence (the transitive verb pattern) like *Carpenters built the house* can be rearranged to *The house was built by carpenters*. However, this cannot be done with pattern 1 sentences like *John arrived* or *The accident happened*.

Another type of transform results from the combination of two or more patterns. Simple examples that a child uses in his writing in the early years

¹ Owen Thomas, *Transformational Grammar and the Teacher of English* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1965).

of school are the compound sentence with patterns joined by *and* or *but* and the adverbial clause introduced by a subordinated word like *if*, *because*, *although*, or *when*. More difficult is the relative clause used adjectivally. A student, native or foreign, may write *I met a fellow in the Student Center* or *He gave me some directions* and fail to see the possibility of substituting *who* for the subject in the second sentence and combining them to produce *I met a fellow in the Student Center WHO gave me some directions*. A relative clause in which *whom* or *that* substitutes for the object poses a greater problem because both rearrangement and combination are involved. If in the combination one pattern is embedded in the other rather than added to the end as in the sentence above, there is still another difficulty. Doubtless we have all encountered the pattern that foreign students often produce: *A fellow WHOM I MET HIM IN THE STUDENT CENTER gave me some directions*. One familiar with the structure of the language can see that the problem is that the embedded clause contains two complements—him in the normal complement position and *whom*, which substitutes for it, at the beginning of the pattern. An embedding transform is described by transformationalists as consisting of a kernel that forms a matrix and other kernels called constituents that are inserted into it with changes necessary for the combination. A relative clause transform with *whom* or *that* serving as direct object might be shown as a combination of two patterns as follows:

A fellow gave me some directions. (Matrix)

I met the fellow in the Student Center. (Constituent)
 { whom }

Whom is substituted for *the fellow* in the constituent sentence and moved to the beginning of the sentence. Then the entire sentence is embedded in the matrix to produce *A fellow WHOM I MET IN THE STUDENT CENTER gave me some directions*.

It is this combining process that gives variety and complexity to English sentence structure. The process involves more than simple coordination and subordination, however. To classify sentences as simple, compound, or complex does not describe the vast complexity of English sentence structure. English is a language that makes much use of the nominal—any structure in a noun position in a sentence. A noun and its modifiers, a noun clause, a verbal construction, a prepositional phrase—all of these may function as nominals. And these may all be built up by transforms that embed one kernel pattern in another. Some of the noun-plus-modifier patterns are variants of the relative clause transform. Thus the sentences *The children shouted to each other* (Matrix) and *The children played outside the house* (Constituent) can be combined to *The children WHO PLAYED OUTSIDE THE HOUSE shouted to each other* or *The children PLAYING OUTSIDE THE HOUSE shouted to each other*.

The noun clause or prepositional phrase in the noun position involves a somewhat different transform process. A student might write *John played the piano. This surprised me*. The transformational grammarian would set

the sentence up to be combined in this fashion: SOMETHING *surprised me* (Matrix) and *John played the piano* (Constituent). The resulting combination, with the constituent substituting for SOMETHING, could be any one of the following: *JOHN'S PIANO PLAYING surprised me*, *FOR JOHN TO PLAY THE PIANO surprised me*, *JOHN'S PLAYING THE PIANO surprised me*, or *THAT JOHN PLAYED THE PIANO surprised me*. Putting the last sentence into the passive we get: *I am surprised THAT JOHN PLAYED THE PIANO* or *I am surprised BY JOHNS PIANO PLAYING*. By using the second sentence of our original pair as the matrix, we get: *TO MY SURPRISE, John played the piano* or *SURPRISINGLY, John played the piano*.

The sentence adverbial *TO MY SURPRISE* and *SURPRISINGLY* in the above sentences obviously convey quite a different meaning in relationship to the rest of the sentence from that indicated by the adverb *SURPRISINGLY* in the kernel sentence *John played the piano SURPRISINGLY*. This example shows yet another use of transformational grammar—to gain an understanding of meanings of grammatical structures and perhaps show this understanding in more precise writing. Through transformational grammar also, it has been suggested, we can analyze the difference in structures that seem the same on the surface but which have a different underlying deep structure in that they derive from different sentence-combining transforms. Let us return to the pair of sentences *GRADING PAPERS can be a nuisance* and *CRYING BABIES can be a nuisance*. The first sentence results from a combination of *SOMETHING can be a nuisance* (Matrix) and *I grade papers* (Constituent); but the second results from *SOMETHING can be a nuisance* (Matrix) and *Babies cry* (Constituent).

Let us take another example. The sentences *He wanted the guest to leave* and *He wanted the milk to drink* seem superficially the same. Yet the first may be produced from a combination of *He wanted something* and *The guest left*, and the second from *He wanted the milk for something* (for some purpose) and *He drank the milk*.

The errors that users of English as a second language make in their writing come in part from lack of control over the transform patterns of English. We are all familiar with errors in rearrangement like: *What means this word?* or *An accident was happened*. More difficult are the sentence-combining transforms. If we are to teach systematically how these transforms operate, where should we begin? Part of the answer depends on the degree of correspondence between the structures of English and those of the native language of the learner. The ability to write sentences in which ideas that might have been expressed in a number of simple statements have been combined is the mark of a mature writer of his native language, and some guidance may be found in structures written by native users of English at various stages of their maturing process. A significant study was conducted by Professor Kellogg Hunt of Florida State University, who examined samples of the writing of native American school children at the fourth, eighth, and twelfth

grade levels and compared the transforms they used with those found in prose selections written by mature writers in *Harpers* and the *Atlantic*.² He found that the coordination pattern is used, in fact overused, by the fourth graders. The use of subordination increases with maturity, but more significant is the type of subordination. Adverbial clauses were used quite frequently by the fourth graders, but the use of relative clauses modifying nouns more than doubled during the eight-year span. There was also an increase in the higher grades in the use of verbals both as nominals and as modifiers, and in the use of noun clauses. The most significant difference between the writing of the skillful adults and of the school children, even the twelfth graders, was not in subordination or even in use of relative clauses to subordinate in the length of the clauses. This length is obtained through using a wider variety of nominals and through depth of modification—the combining of a number of ideas into one nominal that a person with less facility in writing expresses in a number of simpler sentences. In other words, the skillful writer makes more use of transforms, particularly nominal-producing transforms. Professor Hunt concludes that if one wishes to teach students to write like superior adults one should teach them to combine ideas, to pack more into a clause. This means combining more and more sentences through a transform process.

With students of English as a second language one might begin with short, simple sentences. That is, for a few lessons have the students express their ideas in sentences that are little more than kernel patterns so that they develop a feeling for the elements that must be present in what is properly written as a sentence. A method of slot substitution might be useful here, and the resulting sentences combined into a meaningful paragraph. For example, students could be given the four patterns set forth earlier in this discussion to which could be added the variations with the indirect object, the objective complement, and the *there is* transform. Then they could be asked to write an account of a personal experience in which they use each pattern at least once. Suggestions for assignments are an account of a dinner party, the receiving of a gift or letter, the election of the officer of a club. A sample passage could be provided, and the students could be asked to identify the patterns in the passages they have written. At this stage there could be a review of verb forms by turning passages in the present tense into the past or present perfect. Examples should be given to show when these forms are appropriately used. For example, students could write short paragraphs in the present tense telling what they do every day, or do habitually in school. Then they could turn these into the present perfect by relating what they have done since morning or since the school year began. Drill on use of verb forms could recur throughout the period of instruction.

From writing simple kernel patterns students could move to combination by coordination or subordination with an adverb clause. A composition topic

² Kellogg Hunt, *Grammatical Structures Written at Three Grade Levels*. (Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1965).

could be assigned that calls for expressing relationships with subordinators: a time relationship with *when, after, before, since*; a cause-effect relationship with *because*; or one of possibility or contingency with *if* or *although*. At the same time, in their reading students can look for the base pattern or matrix in the sentences and spot the subordinators or connecting words which join another pattern to it. They need to see that two patterns must be present in a sentence when a pattern is introduced by a subordinating word and that connecting words cannot introduce both kernels, so that they will *not* write, as did a student from Iran who recently applied for admission to our school: *ALTHOUGH I have not passed the English test BUT I hope you will admit me.*

From these combinations one can move to those that seem to be more frequent sources of error. The passive does not seem to pose a problem for the native American school child but it often does for users of English as a second language, as seen by the frequency of sentences in their writing like *An accident was happened* or *John was arrived*. The equivalent of these is possible, of course, in some languages, as for example in French. The active to passive transform can be drilled on, and students can be given sentences some of which can be turned into the passive and some not. Selections illustrating the use of the passive should be provided and students could be asked to turn the sentences in a paragraph into the passive when appropriate or to write a paragraph calling for the use of the passive: Describe the progress that *has been made* toward a given goal such as getting a school diploma. (How many courses *have been completed*? How many compositions *have been written*?) Or what work *has been done* in planning a project such as a class party? (How many invitations *have been sent out*? How many acceptances *have been received*? What food *has been prepared*?)

Facility in the use of relative clauses, we have noted, seems to grow with maturity, and clauses with *whom* or *that* as direct objects seem to be particularly difficult. Students can be given pairs of sentences to combine first by substituting *who* or *that* for the subject of the second one and then by substituting *whom* for the object, as in the examples given earlier. An easy introduction to this combination is to make the subject of the second sentence identical with the object of the first, as in the previously illustrated pair: *I met a student in the Student Center* (Matrix) and *He gave me some information* (Constituent).

The use of noun clauses as objects of verbs as in sentences beginning: *He said that . . .* are not difficult for native users of English. Such constructions appear commonly in the sentences written by fourth graders that Professor Hunt studied. Foreign students, however, often have difficulty with the tenses in this structure and in reported questions. As an exercise they can be given a series of questions such as: *What did you do yesterday? Where did you go? Whom did you see there?* and then asked to write a paragraph reporting *My teacher asked me what I did yesterday. He asked*

me where I went, etc. An additional paragraph might report *I told him that I had gone to the football game, and so on.*

Verbals and noun clauses as subjects were structures that Professor Hunt found were used much more frequently by professional writers than by students, even at the twelfth grade level. Their use seems to be the mark of a mature writer, and thus they might be taught late. One method is through the sentence-combining transform with SOMETHING illustrated earlier in the sentences: SOMETHING *surprised me* and *John played the piano.*

A structure that seems particularly difficult is the verbal as modifier at the beginning of the sentence: *Walking down the street, I saw many interesting sights.* In the hands of unskillful writers, both native and foreign, we of course get *Walking down the street, many interesting sights were seen.* If students approach this structure by writing the sentences *I walked down the street* and *I saw many interesting sights* and then try to combine them, the problem is that the first sentence, though it is the one that would normally be written first, is the constituent rather than the matrix in the transform. In drills perhaps the matrix should be consistently presented first regardless of which sentence would be written first if the ideas are expressed in two sentences. The identity of the subjects of the two sentences should also be pointed out. Care must be exercised to avoid the structure *Seeing many interesting sights, I walked down the street.*

While during the period of instruction there should be frequent review of transforms already drilled on, the procedure can be much the same throughout: (1) a systematic presentation one by one of the rearranging and kernel-combining transforms, first by combining pairs of sentences and then by writing compositions designed to call for the combined structures; and (2) when faulty sentences are produced, the use of the transform process to show students where they have gone astray. Along with this writing practice there should be reading material in which the structures that the students are to build are used. Sometimes material will have to be specifically written to show this, but material in other books that the students are reading can also be used. As students become proficient in combining pairs of sentences, more sentences can be added so that they can combine something like the following:

The term came into prominence in 1957.	Matrix
AT THAT TIME Noam Chomsky published <i>Syntactic Structures</i> .	
This book presents a brief and somewhat technical discussion of the original form of the theory.	
Noam Chomsky is a professor of linguistics at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.	

with the resulting:

The term came into prominence in 1957 when Noam Chomsky, a professor of linguistics at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, published *Syntactic Structures*, which presents a brief and somewhat technical discussion of the original form of the theory.”

¹ Thomas, p. 1.

From time to time, as needed for understanding, transforms can be used to illustrate differences in the deep structures that underlie surface structures that might mistakenly be thought similar.

Appended to this article is an exercise calling for sentence-combining transforms, with some student results. While the exercise was designed as the culmination of a lesson on relative clauses, it provides opportunity for constructing other nominals as well. Some of the results show what happens when instructions are not followed or when the situation is not closely structured. Result A was written by a student from Thailand who, instead of using relative clauses, experimented with verbals. Part of his trouble comes from putting into coordinate positions ideas that are not coordinate, as in sentences 2 and 3. Result B, written by a teacher of English in a high school in Okinawa, is more successful, but he has some of the same trouble as student A in his sentence 2. In sentence 3 he has trouble with the order of the modifiers, particularly with the prepositional phrase at the end. Result C was written by a student born in Austria whose parents generally spoke Ukrainian at home. In some cases she uses verbals rather than relative clauses as modifiers of nouns, but puts them in the relative clause position with satisfactory results.

The use of transformational grammar to teach composition is only one method. Slot substitution, questions and answers, or paraphrasing a model are also useful. My plea, however, is for composition instruction that is structured in some way, a method pointed toward the problems characteristic of foreign students, one that will emphasize prevention rather than correction of errors.

* * * * *

EXERCISE IN COMBINING SENTENCE PATTERNS

Included clauses help indicate the precise relationship between ideas. In order to make the following selection less wordy, express in one sentence the ideas between the bars. You will probably use included clauses to do this.

At the Airport

/ At the airport I always like to conjecture about the people. I see many people at the airport. / That lady is a grandmother. She is standing beside a jewelry counter. She is meeting a plane. Her daughter and two small grandchildren are on the plane. / That couple are newly married. I can tell this by their blissful faces. They are weighing in their luggage. They are buying their tickets. They are going on their honeymoon. / That man seems nervous. He is behind them. He constantly checks his watch. He keeps listening intently to the loudspeaker. The loudspeaker announces the flights. / Perhaps he has missed an important appointment. He is trying to get to his destination. He will leave on the next plane. That man is a business executive. He is wearing a dark suit. / Perhaps he is making a trip to Washington, D.C. He wants to talk to senators. The senators can initiate legislation. The legislation will help his business. /

STUDENT RESULTS**In the Airport**

STUDENT A.

(1) Seeing many people at the airport, I always like to conjecture about the people. (2) Standing beside a jewelry counter, meeting a plane, her daughter and small grandchildren being on the plane is a grandmother. (3) That couple, weighing in their luggage, buying their tickets, going on their honeymoon are newly married because I can tell this by their blissful faces. (4) That man seems nervous being behind them, constantly checking his watch and listening intently to the loudspeaker who announces the flights. (5) A businessman who is wearing a dark suit has missed an important appointment, trying to get to his destination and will leave on the next plane. (6) Perhaps he is making a trip to Washington, D.C. wanting to talk to senators who can initiate legislation that will help his business.

At the Airport

STUDENT B.

(1) At the airport I always like to conjecture about the people whom I see there. (2) That lady who is standing beside a jewelry counter and who is meeting a plane is a grandmother whose daughter and two grandchildren are on the plane. (3) I can tell that that couple who are weighing their luggage, are buying their tickets and are going on their honeymoon are newly married by their blissful faces. (4) That man who is behind them seems nervous because he constantly checks his watch and keeps listening intently to the loudspeaker which announces the flights. (5) Perhaps that man, a business executive wearing a dark suit who is trying to get to his destination and will leave on the next plane has missed an important appointment. (6) Perhaps he is making a trip to Washington, D. C., and he wants to talk to senators who initiate legislation which will help his business.

At the Airport

STUDENT C.

(1) I always like to conjecture about the many people I see at the airport. (2) That lady, standing by a jewelry counter, is a grandmother meeting a plane on which are her daughter and two grandchildren. (3) That couple weighing in their luggage and buying their tickets, by their blissful faces are newly married and are going on their honeymoon.

(4) That man behind them, constantly checking his watch and listening intently to the loudspeaker that announces the flights, seems nervous. (5) That man, wearing a dark suit and trying to get to his destination is a business executive, who perhaps has missed an important appointment and will leave on the next plane.

(6) Perhaps he is making a trip to Washington, D.C. where he wants to, talk to senators who can initiate legislation that will help his business.

Questions and Directed Discourse *

Andrew MacLeish

As a goal of repetition drills is the reasonably acceptable reproduction of sounds and intonation in imitation of a model, and as the goal of pattern practice is the unconscious and habitual realization of structures in those sounds, then the goal of what we call directed discourse is the use of those phonologically correct, habitual responses in something approximating a realistic speech situation. The distinction made here between pattern practice and directed discourse is a somewhat arbitrary one. In certain instances, question and answer drills using a target structure are so like pattern practice that all sense of social exchange is subordinated to the sheer production of the structure being drilled. The question elicits a pattern rather than a response in a pattern. But, we are by no means suggesting that simple question and answer drills must always follow pattern practice. The distinction is based on whether we strongly emphasize the realism of the frame and response as a social act with all its overtones, or whether we emphasize the production of the pattern for its own sake.

Neither repetition nor pattern practice bears much resemblance to an actual social exchange between two native speakers. Those who speak to us do not utter frames and cues any more than we respond merely by making structural changes on what they say to us. Consequently, after a particular pattern has been drilled until it has become a habitual response to various other patterns, the instructor must create a situation at least approximating a realistic context in which the learner can use those patterns in a model of social communication. What we frequently forget is that discourse must be directed, that there should be no lessening of the instructor's control over the learner's response. In general, the learner's utterances should be as predictable as they were in repetition drills and pattern practice.

In constructing exercises of this kind, we apply the same criteria in estimating their potential difficulty that we use to analyze pattern drills: how many changes must the student make on the frame in constructing his answer? To what extent must he delete, replace, expand, and transpose? The responses can vary from the extremely simple, in which all the segments of the expected response are contained in the same order in the question:

MacLeish didn't say very much, did he? No, MacLeish didn't say very much.

to the extremely difficult sort of question which gives no clue as to either the structure expected in the answer or, unlike the question above, to the content of the answer:

How did you like his paper? I thought it was a bomb.

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

Mr. MacLeish, Associate Professor of English and Linguistics at the University of Minnesota, is the author of *The Pronunciation of English in Sabah* (Peace Corps, 1967) and has published previously in *TESOL Quarterly* (March, 1968).

We have, then, an almost exactly analogous situation to pattern practice. Questions can be made as structurally difficult or easy as we desire by varying the kind of question we ask. But unlike pattern practice, we have an added difficulty, for we must also be sure the student has the information necessary to respond in some realistic manner. Nothing destroys the rhythm of a drill more than to have a student stop and try to make up an answer when he is already having problems with the structure.

We will not discuss in detail the range of changes that can be made on the frame when it serves as a stimulus for a realistic, socially meaningful response. The same criteria that apply in ordering the relative difficulties of different kinds of pattern practices obtain just as strictly in ordering directed discourse. The instructor must consider his questions and expected answers to determine the problems involved in pronoun shifts:

Did you call me? Yes, I called you.

in elliptical answers:

Did you call me? Yes, I did.

in replacement of WH-words:

Who went to the game? Ted went to the game.

The instructor must also consider his questions and answers to determine the problems involved in WH-word replacement plus subsequent transpositions:

Who did you call? I called Don.

in replacement of verb phrases:

Do you think he'll go? I think so.

in replacement of lexical items:

Is he running? No, he's walking.

in transpositions of verbs and subjects:

Is he there? Yes, he's there.

Can he go? Yes, he can (go).

and in many other possible changes.

Actually, we have four problems. First, we must consider this problem of structural comparison between question and answer. Second, we must control the nature and content of the answer: positive or negative in the case of yes/no questions, lexical information in the case of WH-questions. Third, we should try to make the drill as realistic, as natural, as possible rather than let it become a series of disconnected questions and answers. And fourth, the questions and answers themselves must be colloquial and realistic, yet—in the beginning at any rate—short and simple.

To control the first variable, structural comparison between question and answer, the instructor can draw on the many varieties of questions we use in every-day English. Let's examine a series of questions which gradually moves the student away from depending on the structure of the question in his answer. We do not suggest that we could use all of these in any one

class hour. We merely list, in some coherent order, some of the possible question forms in English:

- | | |
|--|--------------------------------|
| (1) It was cold, wasn't it? | Yes, it was cold. |
| (2) Was it cold? | Yes, it was cold. |
| (3) Was it warm or cold? | It was cold. |
| (4) Wasn't it cold? | Yes, it was cold. |
| (5) What was it, warm or cold? | It was cold. |
| (6) What was it? | It was cold. |
| (7) Was it cold because . . . ? | Yes, it was cold because . . . |
| (8) Was it cold because . . . or because . . . ? | It was cold because . . . |
| (9) Why was it cold? | It was cold because . . . |

Once again, our point is not that this entire series should be used, but that the wide variety of questions with greater and lesser structural and lexical similarity to the answers they elicit can be sequenced according to their relative difficulty.

Our second consideration, how to control the nature and content of the answer, depends on the kind of question we ask and the source of the answer's content. If we ask a yes/no question, we can direct the student before the drill to answer in a set way if we want consistently structured answers, which we certainly do in the early stages of any drill. We can also depend on the student's knowledge to determine his yes or no answer, though the moment we allow the student an option in his answer we put on him the burden of making a decision which may cause hesitation and slow down the drill. Presumably, if we point to a horse and ask him if it is a dog, he will answer no, If we ask him whether he likes to eat octopus, he'll answer yes or no. If we ask him what he likes, we will get long pauses that we can avoid by offering him choices. It cannot be over-emphasized that requiring a student to choose his answer too early in a drill will result in hesitation, mistakes, and confusion.

Either/or questions, on the other hand, contain in themselves the information needed for answers in questions involving *who, what, when, where*, etc. If the correct answer is not absolutely clear, the instructor should direct the student to select one of the alternatives. The second of the two alternatives will usually be retained better than the first, so in introductory drills of this type, this second alternative might be made the consistent choice.

Either/or questions can be asked by themselves:

Do you like to study or play soccer? I like to play soccer.

or appended to a WH-question:

Which do you like to do, study or play soccer? I like to play soccer.

WH-questions without either/or alternatives offer somewhat more difficulty for the instructor in providing the student with some content for his answer. There are two possibilities. The instructor can either rely on the student's background to provide the information:

What are you studying this year?

or he can base the question on a paragraph, dialogue, or story the student reads before the exercise begins. Because allowing the student a choice too early introduces uncertainties, perhaps the ideal solution is to write a dialogue that precedes the repetition drills so that they are interesting enough to provide a source for further questions.¹

We have previously described a valuable combination of yes/no, either/or, and WH-questions. These three kinds of questions are asked about the obvious, overt content of the material read in the paragraph or dialogue, about its implied content, and about the student's own life. Thus the questions can range from the rather simple:

Was the boy sick? Yes, he was sick.

to the fairly difficult:

When was the last time he was sick?

When we add all the different possible question forms described above, we have a wide inventory of potential questions which can be graded for difficulty and adapted to any class level.

More importantly, perhaps, the instructor can adapt his questions to the abilities of individual students. Nothing is more embarrassing or discouraging to a slow student than to ask him a question he can't answer; nothing is less interesting or challenging to a good student than to ask him an overly simple question which does not challenge him. The ability to adapt a question to the particular abilities of a student will do much to avoid unnecessary mistakes, frustration, and discouragement.

We must be careful, however, if we do vary our questions, to assure ourselves that we are eliciting in the answer the structure being taught. A question such as

What do you like to do? hunt (cue)

could be answered in a number of different grammatical structures, all correct:

I like to hunt.

I like to go hunting.

I like hunting.

We can, of course, require the student to use a particular grammatical pattern in his answer, but we can also provide a model statement before the question:

I like to hunt. What do you like to do?

or

I like to go hunting. And you?

Whatever alternative we choose—to direct the student to answer in a particular pattern, to depend on the question for the structure of the answer, or to provide a model response before we ask the question—we must assure ourselves that we are controlling the structures being used no less carefully than we did in repetition drills and pattern practice.

¹For an example of this procedure see my "Adapting and Composing Reading Texts," *TESOL Quarterly* (March 1968), 48-49.

Eventually, the instructor must practice relatively free conversation; he must allow the student to practice true creativity in language learning, but such a final activity must be prepared for by carefully controlled, graded, and ordered drills which lead, not push, the student toward extemporaneous speech.

Up to this point we have discussed directed discourse entirely in terms of how drills are to be analyzed and ordered. We might now discuss briefly some of the specific variations on the format of directed discourse exercises, variations that will make them natural. One drawback in the form of the question and answer exercises illustrated above is the artificiality of the instructor's asking all the questions and the student's supplying all the answers. An alternative routine is to ask Student A a question:

Instructor: **What day was the day before yesterday?**

Student A: **The day before yesterday was Wednesday.**

and then A either repeats the same question to another student or he changes the question according to a cue given by the instructor:

Student A: **The day before yesterday was Wednesday.**

Instructor: **Year**

Student A (to Student B): **What year was the year before last?**

Student B: **The year before last was 1966.**

Instructor: **Month**

Student B (to Student C): **What was the month before last?**

Student C: **The month before last was January.**

and so forth.

In this last set of frames and responses we can see that, just as in pattern practice, the form of the cue could require a change in the tense of the answer:

Instructor: **Month after next**

Student C: **What month will the month after next be?**

Though the possibilities here are somewhat more limited, many of the changes we have discussed elsewhere for pattern practice² can be introduced in directed discourse as well. One drawback to introducing cues into directed discourse, however, is that it does detract from the sense of actual social interchange, no matter how slightly.

Another potential false note in directed discourse is the artificiality of a one-question-one-answer exchange. A more realistic format is to set up a series of three or four questions involving the same structure, but related in a natural, colloquial way. With a series of questions, we can either use the same structure throughout for the question:

All of your friends study English, don't they?

Some of them are in this class, aren't they?

² A. MacLeish, "Composing Pattern Practice Drills," *On Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages*, Series III, ed. Betty W. Robinett (Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University, 1967), pp. 141-148.

Most of them study hard, don't they?

Most of them walk to school, don't they?

or we can vary the form of the question:

All of your friends study English, don't they?

Are some of them in this class?

Are most of them studying English or Malay?

How do most of them get to school?

Yet another problem is the student's never asking questions on his own. An exercise which can correct this is for the instructor to make a statement and have the student ask a prestructured question about it:

I don't like to read. Why don't you like to read?

He can also make statements in response to statements:

I'm sick today.

I'm sick too.

I'm reading today.

I'm reading too.

Thus the instructor should be able to construct a great variety of drills in the form of questions to statements, statements to questions, statements to statements, and presumably, questions to questions, statements to commands, questions to commands, etc. And just as with questions and answers, so can we structure any of these other combinations to lead the student away from dependence on the structure of the frame in constructing his own response.

In closing, let us emphasize that a complete sequence of drills reducing every lesson to its minimal steps is impractical for the average class that must cover a specified amount of material in a very limited length of time. Given unlimited patience, time, and ingenuity, all of these principles could be profitably applied. Applying them all in every lesson would be beyond our abilities. But even when time is a limiting factor and compromises must be made, the instructor should still know how to construct and organize those drills he does have time to use in the most efficient and effective form possible. He should know how to focus his drills on a particular part of a particular problem, making his exercises as simple and consistent as possible in the introductory steps, and then gradually making them more demanding as the pattern becomes part of the student's habitual response.

One Method for Producing Automatic Control of English Phonology and Structure

Marie Esman Barker

The bilingual Mexican-American child represents one of the most vexing educational problems in Texas and other states in the Southwest. He represents problems that are only superficially similar to those posed by bilingual school children in the immigrant centers of the United States—European and Cuban immigrants, for example. He is unlike the European in that generally his ancestors lived in the area long before it was settled by the English-speaking society; he is unlike the European in that he has generally resisted total assimilation but, like the Puerto Rican, maintains a strong traditional pride in his cultural and linguistic heritage, however meager his knowledge of them might be. He is unlike the Cuban immigrants in that his parents usually are unskilled or semi-skilled laborers and farmers, with limited education and low socio-economic status.

While this Southwestern bilingual child, who enters school with little or no knowledge of English and the culture it represents, poses a problem to his educators, conversely he offers a vast national resource of incalculable value. Recent findings of linguists and social scientists point to educational research and experimentation as the key to untapping these resources heretofore untouched by American education, which tends to assume a rather rigid uniformity of background.

With the recognition by educators that the same opportunities do not necessarily result from the same education for all, and with the availability of federal assistance programs, the El Paso Public Schools have taken a first step. Under Title III-ESEA, an experimental program in bilingual education was initiated in the summer of 1966. Its chief goal is to generate methods and techniques to be applied to the bilingual schooling of Mexican-American children who are illiterate and insecure in both English and Spanish. Whereas in the project there are also provisions for teacher training in English and Spanish, as well as remedial English language instruction for out-of-school Neighborhood Youth Corps, this paper will focus only on the English and Spanish language instruction offered in the experimental grade one classes.

All English language activities in the program radiate from the linguistic content of the *Miami Linguistic Readers* (Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1965). Oral skills are learned in part through the sections in the Miami series designed to teach spoken language, and in part from the tapes developed and prepared by the staff at the El Paso Language Center. Our main interest in this paper is a description of these tapes and their use in producing automatic control of grammatical structures and phonology.

Mrs. Barker is an instructor at the University of Texas, El Paso. She has promoted bilingual education through her previous work with the El Paso Public Schools and through the Southwest Council for Bilingual Education, which she founded and for which she is now serving as Chairman of the Board of Directors.

The tapes, totalling sixty, were developed to fill two needs: (1) to avoid excessive drill on structures and sounds in the same situational context, and (2) to guarantee a minimum uniform dose of properly modeled oral language for every child.

Structural and phonological points in the order found in the Miami series were incorporated in drills revolving around an entirely new set of situations which also stress children's interests, ranging from the traditional fairy stories to their ever expanding world— *The Three Bears*, *Little Red Riding Hood*, the southwestern rodeo and livestock shows, jet airplanes, kites, community helpers, and so forth.

Let's examine some samples of the drill material presented in pre-lab, drilled in the lab, and reinforced in the post-lab.

Experimental Tape 11, *The Dogs*, drills and reinforces language patterns and sounds found on pages 25-26 in *Biff and Tiff (Miami Linguistic Readers)*: (noun) + 's + (adjective); reviews (noun) + has + (noun) and The + (noun) + 's name is. . . . the sounds /sp/ initial, /i/ and /iy/, /n/ and /z/ final. These are presented in a song:

Sparky's little and long,
Speedy's big and strong.
Spider's fluffy and full of fleas,
Spooky has funny hair on his knees.

Simple repetition drills are used to teach the patterns. Directed dialogue is also used:

1. The dog's name is Sparky.
Call Sparky three times like this:
Sparky, Sparky, Sparky!
2. The dog's name is Speedy.
Call Speedy.

The last drill is a visual cue question-answer exercise with reinforcement:

Now, look at the picture and answer each question correctly:

1. What's the dog's name? (Sparky visual)

Very good. The dog's name is Sparky.

2. What's the dog's name? (Speedy visual)

That's right. The dog's name is Speedy.

Experimental Tape 17, *Big Bear*, drills and reinforces pages 34-35 in *Biff and Tiff*. The sounds are /i/, /m/ final, /v/ final, and /g/ final.

The structures are: *I'm* + (adjective); *I'm a* + (noun); *Are you* + (adjective); *Is* (noun) + (adjective); *I'm a* (noun); *Yes, he is*; and *No*,

he isn't. It includes, in addition to review drills, either/or choices and the use of *he*. The patterns on this tape are also introduced in song form:

I'm a big bear,
 I'm big and strong.
 I'm a big bear,
 I'm big and brown.
 I'm a big bear,
 I'm big and brown,
 And I live in a house in the woods.

The song is taught with gestures to show size and place. Simple repetition and visual cue question-answer drills are used:

Now, you are Big Bear. Answer these questions:

1. What's your name? (Big Bear visual)

You're right if you said, "My name's Big Bear."

2. Are you big or little? (Size gesture)

You're right if you said, "I'm big."

3. Are you red or brown? (Brown visual)

You're right if you said, "I'm brown."

The last step on this tape is a question-answer drill with no reinforcement.

As the project progressed and interest in the familiar moved to interest in fairyland, the degree of sophistication became greater. For instance, in Experimental Tape 24, *Little Red Riding Hood*, which reinforces *Kid Kit*, there is an exposition of the basic dialogue in Spanish and English. The basic dialogue is used to introduce these structures: *What + be + (noun/pronoun) + (-ing verb)* and *(noun/pronoun) + be + (ing verb) + (noun phrase)*.

The dialogue involves Little Red Riding Hood and her mother:

LRRH: What're you doing, mother?
 M: I'm filling a Christmas basket.
 LRRH: Is it for grandmother?
 M: Yes, she's sick.

Repetition drills and pronunciation exercises lead to item substitution drills:

Listen and repeat the first sentence:

1. What're you doing?
- _____

Now listen for a new word and put that word in the sentence:

2. drinking

What're you **drinking**?

3. playing

what're you **playing**?

4. thinking

What're you **thinking**?

Another item substitution drill:

Repeat, please:

1. what're **you** doing?

Now, put this new word in that sentence:

2. Tiff

what's **Tiff** doing?

3. Mother

what's **mother** doing?

4. You

What're **you** doing?

These are a build-up to replacement drills:

1. What're **you** doing?

2. Tiff

What's **Tiff** doing?

3. Drinking?

what's **Tiff** drinking?

4. Little Red Riding Hood

What's Little Red Riding Hood drinking?

5. Playing

What's Little Red Riding Hood **playing**?

The next type of drill on this tape is a cued question-answer drill:

1. Tiff's drinking milk.

2. What's Tiff drinking?

1. Little Red Riding Hood's thinking about Christmas.
 2. What's Little Red Riding Hood thinking about?
-

A question-answer drill, without reinforcement, is last on this tape:

Let's see if you can answer these questions by yourself.

1. What's Tiff drinking?
-
2. What's Little Red Riding Hood thinking about?
-
3. What're you filling?
-

Experimental Tape 24 was the first tape to include a variety of repetition, item substitution, replacement, and question-answer drills. It is the prototype of all tapes that have followed.

And, so far, what have the results of the use of these tapes been? From all indications, the tapes are very effective and are helping produce automatic control of grammatical structures in the language of the grade one Mexican-American bilingual child.

But the best language instruction is useless if the child feels he must reject it. If he senses it as a threat, he will feel the need to resist it because he associates using standard American English with homogenization—a state in which everything in his life becomes Anglicized and in which there is no room for his Mexican customs, background, and traditions. His strong traditional pride in his cultural and linguistic heritage makes it mandatory that he resist. This is one of the two premises that make the study and use of the Spanish language in the bilingual classroom a logical conclusion.

The other premise, most directly relevant, is the evidence contributed by experts on the use of vernacular language in education at a meeting in Paris in 1951 under the sponsorship of UNESCO. Of twenty conclusions listed in their report, let me quote directly the first two:

1. The mother tongue is a person's natural means of self-expression and one of his first needs is to develop his power of self-expression to the full.
2. Every pupil should begin his formal education in his mother tongue.¹

The El Paso project devotes two-thirds of the school day to English instruction and one-third to Spanish. The children study science and social studies from texts written in Spanish. The use of their mother tongue pre-

¹ "The Use of Vernacular Languages in Education: *UNESCO Monograph on Fundamental Education*, No. 8 (Paris, 1953).

vents them from falling behind in the learning of concepts in these areas. Literacy and vocabulary growth in Spanish are easily built on the oral skills the children already have. The students learn to read and write Spanish words in "Organic Spanish." Individually, each child asks the teacher to write a word he wants to know because it is psychologically meaningful to him; then the teacher helps him learn to write it. The regularity of Spanish spelling allows each child to learn the relationship between written symbol and Spanish sound inductively. Words develop into sentences and sentences into stories. Classroom results show no interference from English. This may be attributed to the two completely different approaches used to teach the two languages.

Producing truly bilingual Mexican-Americans, literate in both English and Spanish, capable of functioning comfortably as members of both societies, is the greatest challenge our Southwestern schools face today. The El Paso Bilingual Project is seeking ways of meeting that challenge.

Reading and the Oral Approach at the Secondary Level*

Ralph F. Robinett

Year after year, teachers of language-handicapped children, particularly teachers of children with a non-English-speaking background, struggled to teach language arts by teaching words. Words were the unit of learning on the oral level, and the measure of success was the size of the learner's speaking vocabulary. Words were the unit of learning on the reading level, and the measure of success was the size of the learner's sight vocabulary. Words were the unit of learning on the writing level, and the measure of success was the learner's spelling score. A few souls worried less about formal language instruction. They were sure that language would blossom in time if they exposed the learner to abundant school-oriented experiences. In either case, the process guaranteed that the students were not prepared to deal with the decoding skills in reading nor with the subject matter content of the elementary school, whether presented orally or in print. Those students durable enough to reach the secondary school were pretty well conditioned to the limitations of their elementary school success-tools, so the retardation process went on smoothly as the students were herded forward through the grades.

Like all good fairy tales, this one has its heroes as well as its villains. After World War II, our nation's effort to rebuild and develop the rest of the world carried with it the latest thinking in language teaching as well as in constructing schools and power plants. It was only a matter of time until the same thinking began to unsettle traditional modes of language teaching at home. Whether intentionally or by accident, "vocabulary" became a dirty word. Many students became proficient at responding to structural signals, even though they had little referential content to fill the slots in the substitution frames. As a student of Old English, I recall how pleased the professor was when the class responded well to his pattern practice on difficult case forms. He was less impressed when he found the only part of the next sentence we could respond to was the case ending. He concluded he might as well have used nonsense syllables.

Fortunately, in education the closing of the gap between theory and practice is a slow enough process that the "mim-mem" syndrome has done little serious damage except, perhaps, to distort the vital role of reading in

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

Mr. Robinett is Director, Bilingual Curriculum Development, Foreign Language Innovative Curricula Studies, Center for Research on Language and Language Behavior, University of Michigan. He was Director of the English Program for the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico (1959-1963) and Production Director of the *Miami Linguistic Reader* series, Dade County Public Schools, Miami, Florida. He is co-author of *English: Target 1* and *English: Target 2*; two of a three-book language series for junior high school, linguistically handicapped students (Harcourt, Brace and World 1968, 1969).

a well-balanced language arts program. Nevertheless, pattern practice, used when appropriate and with sufficient and relevant content, still holds promise of being one of the most efficient techniques for developing automatic control of language forms. Also fortunately, we have a much clearer picture now of the difference between English as a foreign language in non-English-speaking countries and the domestic needs in English as a second language. And even more recently, we began to face still another refinement in our thinking—that of teaching standard English as a second dialect, with all its pedagogical and linguistic implications.

Although recent studies of divergent dialects of English have tended to focus on speech in large urban poverty-pockets, there are inferences to be drawn from such studies and their by-products which do not limit themselves to the populations analyzed. *First*, we need to internalize the fact that a divergent dialect represents a system of its own and is not simply an accumulation of mistakes. Divergent dialects may differ from a standard dialect grammatically as well as phonologically and lexically, and in this respect may have some of the characteristics of a second language. If a teacher sets as a goal the teaching of a standard dialect as a second dialect, he must deal with many of the problems faced by the teacher of ESOL. The obvious application of ESOL techniques to oral SESD (Speakers of English as a Second Dialect) programs has been or is being made at various levels, from the pre-school through the high school and into college. There is considerable evidence to suggest that SESD programs are equally, if not more, relevant to the language-learning needs of thousands of children in the Great South-west than the ESOL programs we have promoted so enthusiastically. Above and beyond the oral language benefits of ESOL-type approaches to SESD problems, there are other potential gains worthy of note. The work of Mac-Millan in Florida, which involved a strong though loosely structured oral language program, seemed to account for a consistent and longitudinally maintained increase in reading scores.¹ The work of San-su C. Lin at Claflin College also showed reading score increases as a by-product of the oral language development.²

Second, we should capitalize on the overlap of standard and divergent dialects and not be stampeded by the differences. Although differences between a divergent dialect and a standard dialect may be so profound as to encourage some analysts to propose a special “grammar,” they are not so profound that they should encourage teachers to form a foreign language frame of reference. The student feels alien enough as it is. The overlap in standard and non-standard systems is surely as great or greater than the divergence. Any analyst who behaves as though it weren't is potentially

¹ An unpublished study carried out under the direction of Howard MacMillan in the Dade County Public Schools, Miami, Florida (1962-1965).

² San-su C. Lin, *Pattern Practice in the Teaching of Standard English to Students with a Non-Standard Dialect*, (Bureau of publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1965).

fostering language arts programs which waste the learner's time and alienate him still further from the teacher and the instructional goals of the school. In applying ESOL techniques to SED programs, over-structuring is a constant danger. For example, to maintain a rigid order of listening-speaking, reading-writing for language arts at the secondary level is to deny the linguistic resources the learner brings to the treatment of target features. Tight structuring under these conditions is of doubtful merit for many students in domestic ESOL programs and is unrealistic if not undesirable for students in programs in standard English as a second dialect. On the other hand, a linguistically loosely structured activity, such as motivated silent or oral reading, affords an important medium for guaranteeing the students common experiences on which to base controlled language practice. The differences between the non-standard and standard are, after all, finite in number, and lend themselves to sequencing as targets of direct and systematic instruction. Such instruction need not and should not deprive the learner of the opportunity to use the overlapping portion of his linguistic repertoire to full advantage.

Third, we should keep in mind that "standard English," like "general American," is an abstraction of limited value. The linguistic atlases show that what is called "standard English" in itself represents a range of dialects which are at least in part geographically determined. This suggests that the final selection of target features in a program of standard English as a second dialect should be locally determined. A group of high school teachers in one community who decide to focus on the usage *on King Street* as a priority target should come to that conclusion independently of their counterparts in an area where *in King Street* is the dominant sequence. Often the decision as to whether a teacher thinks a form is correct or incorrect is secondary to the decision as to what he thinks is most important to do with the time he has.

A group of Michigan teachers might also have an attitude toward the *pin-pen* problem that is different from the attitude of teachers in the cracker belt of Florida. Even though the two groups of teachers might come to the same conclusion, they should do so with full knowledge of whatever linguistic "facts" are available about their respective communities.

Fourth, our attempts to deal with target forms should not be isolated from the learner's communication needs in other parts of the curriculum. The "distance" of the divergent dialect from some standard dialect varies considerably from student to student in the same classroom. Even in large schools which divide and subdivide student populations into sections and tracks, the teacher will still find a range of differences wide enough to require individualization. Under these conditions, attempts in an SED or an ESOL program to give directed language practice within a referential framework, which in itself is not intellectually stimulating and which has little curricular relevancy, limit the severely linguistically handicapped learner to meaningless or frivolous language manipulation. They also rob everyone in the class of

the opportunity to respond to challenges of substance which concern them during the rest of the school day.

Language arts teachers, including high school English teachers, have been too willing to accept failure with ESOL and SEDS populations. Yet, to suggest that a teacher view the aforementioned inferences as solutions to the teaching of reading is to be superficial. Teachers are already plagued by platitudes and admonitions of the provide-an-oral-background type. What are, then, some practical applications for the innovative teacher?

First, the teacher could take an honest look at his students. What is their linguistic "status"? With the resources currently available, the teacher doesn't have to wait for a linguist to come and study his particular population. If he knows or suspects that non-standard forms in his classroom stem from interference from Spanish, he can make his own informal survey using an inventory he extracts and adapts from contrastive analyses such as those provided by the Puerto Rican Study in New York,³ by that published by the Australian Commonwealth Office of Education,⁴ and the work of Stockwell, Bowen, and Martin.⁵ If he knows or suspects that non-standard forms stem from interference from any of several divergent dialects, he can again make his own survey using an inventory he extracts and adapts from studies such as those made by McDavid, Stewart, and others, as well as from local Pachuco studies.⁶ The teacher can know precisely what his linguistic problems are. In our own work, we limit our primary concern to features that have grammatical significance, but we have included as well some with only social significance.

Second, the teacher could take an honest look at his objectives. Are they so vague that he can never know if he has accomplished them or not? Are they traditional or self-imposed requirements designed for a different population? If the teacher's objectives are inconsistent with the ESOL and SEDS students' immediate communication needs in the curriculum, the net result of efforts based on these objectives is little more than frustration for both the student and the teacher. On the other hand, the teacher might gear his objectives to keep the student segregated from the mainstream curriculum, and the result would be equally unsatisfactory. The language arts teacher

³ Board of Education of the City of New York, *Teaching English to Puerto Rican Pupils in the Secondary School*, Language Guide Series, 1957.

⁴ "Some Likely Areas of Difficulty for Spanish Students of English," reprinted in Harold B. Allen, ed., *Teaching English as a Second Language* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965) pp. 135-153.

⁵ R. P. Stockwell, J. Donald Bowen, John W. Martin, *The Grammatical Structures of English and Spanish* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1965); Robert P. Stockwell and J. Donald Bowen, *The Sounds of English and Spanish* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1965).

⁶ Raven McDavid, "A Checklist of Significant Features for Discriminating Sound Dialects," in Alva B. Davis, *A Manual of Social Dialects*, Illinois Institute of Technology (in preparation); William Stewart, *Non-Standard Speech and the Teaching of English* (Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1964); George C. Barker, *Pachuco: An American-Spanish Argot and Its Social Functions in Tucson, Arizona*, University of Arizona Bulletin, Social Science Bulletin No. 18, Vol. XXI, No. 1 (January, 1950).

can establish target priorities from his informal survey, thus identifying a minimum number of linguistic behaviors which he can aspire to modify as a result of systematic instruction. Hopefully, he can interest his colleagues in making the effort longitudinal.

Third, the teacher could take an honest look at the distribution of his and the students' time. Does the placement of effort reflect the priorities which have been established? If the English class is heavily reading-oriented, the teacher can increase the time for oral language development based on reading. If the reading is heavily literature-oriented, the teacher can increase the time for subject matter reading and vocabulary development. If the reading is predominantly silent reading, the teacher can increase the time for oral reading to reinforce the learner's grasp of the structural units and specifically the sequence signals which unite extended passages.

Fourth, the teacher could take an honest look at the basic types of activities he uses to approach the content of his course. Do the teacher's activities reflect an understanding of the interdependence in the language arts? Does he use all of the language arts to get at his instructional goals? As a minimum, the teacher of an ESOL or SED program should provide four types of listening-speaking experiences.⁷

	to motivate the students
	to provide common experiences
Guided Discussion	to develop grammatical generalizations
	to integrate reading with experiences
	to provide unstructured language practice
	to develop new language habits
Pattern Practice	to provide structured language practice
	to reinforce understanding of content
	to provide structured language practice
Oral Exercises	to provide for rereading
	to provide for vocabulary building
	to provide for creative use of language
Oral Composition	to provide for free use of target features
	to reinforce organizational skills
He should provide abundant oral as well as silent reading.	
	to provide common experiences
Oral Reading	to focus attention on linguistic content
	to focus attention on referential content
	to provide common experiences
Silent Reading	to develop comprehension skills
	to develop interpretation skills

⁷ Paul W. Bell and Ralph F. Robinett, English: *Target 1*, Teachers Edition (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1968).

And he should provide writing experiences which include:

Written Exercises	to reinforce oral language learning
	to provide basis for grammatical analysis
	to provide for vocabulary building
	to provide practice on mechanics of writing
Written Composition	to check reading comprehension
	to provide for creative use of writing
	to provide for free use of target features
	to reinforce organizational skills
	to provide integrated use of writing skills

For the teachers of most secondary ESOL and SED programs there need be no rigid sequence to these basic types of activities. Certainly they do not have to follow the pattern of a baby learning at his mother's knee. The different activities often can be woven throughout the reading lessons which, whether literature- or subject-matter-oriented, provide a referential baseline from which the other language arts activities generate.

And last, the teacher could take an honest look at his planning. Does he spend as much time "setting up" the referential content as he does "setting up" the linguistic features he hopes to elicit? Does he use appropriate social studies and science concepts as he projects language reinforcement? It's no secret that the linguistically handicapped student is often the student who is behind in other areas of the curriculum. If we English teachers do not incorporate the substance of the content areas into our planning, we can never hope to give the learner the boost he needs to put him into the main-stream where he belongs.

Tesol at the '5 & 10'

Barbara F. Matthies

The suggestion to consult the local dime store for TESOL materials might seem unprofessional, at the very least. Yet such sources should not be overlooked in an effort to supplement often dry and unimaginative drill work with some varied and lively alternatives. (Note the word *supplement*. I am not advocating abandonment of materials carefully prepared according to principles of language learning; I am suggesting that both student and teacher might find the variety of the off-beat occasionally refreshing.)

Not all of the supplementary materials I will discuss here are available from a dime store, but they are inexpensive and easily accessible in the average community. All of them have been used, with varying degrees of success, as noted below, in ESL programs at Iowa State University where the foreign students come from nearly every area of the world and are generally of college age or older.

Woolworth's and the Vocabulary Class

Working crossword puzzles is a good method of developing vocabulary and spelling skill, yet the idea of completing a puzzle in a foreign language is often enough to discourage most people from making the attempt. Besides, in bringing such an exercise into the language classroom, the teacher is confronted with the problem of content control.

English Language Services has published a book of graded crossword puzzles for students of English.¹ But I discovered an even more interesting set of crossword puzzle books in the dime store. They are published by Treasure Books, a division of Grosset and Dunlap, Inc.,² and combine reading, spelling, and vocabulary-building skills. Each puzzle is preceded by a one- or two-page essay from which most of the puzzle's answers are taken. Thus, the student must read and understand the essay before he can solve the puzzle.

Recalling Kenneth Croft's statement that sixth-graders are familiar with most of the clichés of their culture,³ I thought that these puzzle books,

Miss Matthies is Instructor in English and Director of English for Foreign Students, Iowa State University of Science and Technology, Ames, Iowa.

¹ Walter Powell Allen, *Easy Crossword Puzzles for People Learning English* (Washington: English Language Services, 1956).

² The two most fruitful sources in this series are B. A. Heimbinder, *Great Americans Crossword Puzzles Grades 4 and 5* (New York: Treasure Books, 1966). # 3517
_____, *Great Inventions Crossword Puzzles Grades 4 and 5* (New York: Treasure Books, 1966). #3518

Also useful, but more advanced in vocabulary are Charles Preston, *Famous People Crossword Puzzles Grade 5* (New York: Treasure Books, 1963). # 3506

_____, *Famous People Crossword Puzzles Grades 5 and 6* (New York: Treasure Books, 1964). #3512

³ Kenneth Croft, "Some Implications of the Phrase 'As Everybody Knows,'" *TESOL Newsletter*, I, 1 and 2 (January/March, 1968), 23.

which are aimed at fourth- to sixth-graders, might also play a part in the general acculturation program of our intensive summer course. And our students were indeed surprised to learn of the accomplishments of George Washington Carver and Booker T. Washington as well as the more familiar names in American history. The articles on great inventions presented elementary technical terms and reinforced their acquisition by use in the accompanying puzzles.

More subtle vocabulary items were taught also. For example, in the puzzle following the article on Robert Fulton, the inventor of the steamboat, one of the clues is "The 6 Across appeared smoke. (CHENGBIL)." "The 6 Across:" an earlier clue, is the steamboat *Clermont*. If the student refers to the paragraph about that boat, he will read that it looked like "some prehistoric monster belching black smoke from its stack." If he prefers to guess the answer rather than re-read the article, he could unscramble the clue *CHENGBIL* to read "belching."

Following the pattern of these books, an enterprising teacher could construct essays and puzzles on practically any subject he wished. However, be warned that such a project demands considerable time. Our staff found that these books provided interesting material for their intermediate and advanced students, and even some of the beginners completed the puzzles successfully. They were presented more as after-hours projects for enjoyment rather than specific assignments, but the students eagerly compared answers or asked teachers for help, indicating interest in a "painless" vocabulary builder.

Simon and Garfunkle in the Language Lab

Current popular songs are not all as noisy and useless as one might think. As a matter of fact, they can be used to perk up a hum-drum session in the language laboratory. Played at the end of the hour and recorded by the students on their tapes, the songs can reinforce certain grammatical structures, stress a point of pronunciation, or even build vocabulary. Our staff has recently taken advantage of the talents of the Beatles, Simon and Garfunkel, and lesser names of the Broadway musicals for these lofty purposes.

As an example, at the end of a set of drills on comparative forms, the students heard "Anything You Can Do, I Can Do Better" from *Annie Get Your Gun*. They were given copies of the lyrics and told to count the comparative constructions (twenty-three in all) as they listened to the recording. Of course, they paid more attention to the humor than the grammar, but the point was made that we actually use these structures in everyday situations outside of grammar class. Students sometimes fail to get that message, it seems.

For a lesson on the future tense, I used "By the Time I Get to Phoenix," a current favorite that provides several examples of that tense. It also contains idioms about time: *by the time*, *time and time (again)*, *so many times*. In this case, I gave the students copies of the lyrics with certain words

(usually functors or pronouns) omitted and told them to fill in the blanks. This has proved to be good ear training. If they don't catch everything the first time through, they can replay their tapes and try again.

The teacher will have to "screen" his recordings carefully to select those which are truly comprehensible over the throbbing rhythm sections. Language laboratory facilities are not noted for their high fidelity, so a clear, simple arrangement is best. I have found that the Ray Conniff singers provide good selections. Some folk singers are also good. The one big problem is writing down the lyrics. If song books are not available, you will simply have to listen to parts of the recording over and over, copying down a few words each time. Then you must decide which words are clearly recognizable and can be omitted in the student's copy. The whole process takes about a half hour per song, but it is worth the effort.

The students seem to derive tremendous satisfaction from recognizing these words. At the same time, they enjoy learning popular songs, and some have even reported gleefully that they recognized one of "our songs" on the radio. For the teacher, it is a strange experience to look out over a lab full of foot-tapping students and hear an occasional outburst of song from an earphone-bedecked student. Some of the most reticent can be seen cavorting after class to the rhythms of "Georgy Girl" or a hit by the Supremes. Even the more professional types have been caught humming.

Comprehensible News Coverage

Beginning and intermediate level ESL students often complain that they cannot keep abreast of current events because radio and television reporting and newspaper styles are incomprehensible. We therefore considered adopting some publication on the order of *My Weekly Reader* or *Current Events*, both used in public schools, for our reading classes. However, the former was too juvenile and the latter was often too advanced in structure and vocabulary.

Then a happy alternative came to my attention, a weekly paper entitled *News for You* published by Laubach Literacy, Inc.⁴ Its intended audience is semi-literate U.S. adults and ESL students. The newspaper appears weekly, except the last two weeks in December, in two editions—B which is roughly at the intermediate level, and A for beginners. Both editions contain the same articles, but the structures and vocabulary are much more limited in Edition A.

The first page reviews world and U.S. news with typical headlines and pictures. Editorials, letters, and background features occupy the second page. The third page, least suited to our purposes, has an advice column and features on health and family budget problems. These are obviously aimed at the inner city homemaker. However, from time to time there are also short travel or historical pieces called "Americana" which our students enjoy.

4 Laubach Literacy, Inc., Box 131, Syracuse, New York, 13210.

The fourth page profiles an individual U.S. citizen who has contributed in some way to his community, briefly reviews a television show of interest, and presents a short news quiz.

All in all, the paper is interesting to the students, especially since it costs only five cents per week, and sometimes its articles can touch off discussions of political and economic problems both here and abroad. Its one main drawback is that it contains nothing controversial and is content merely to report the facts. So if it is used in the classroom, the teacher will have to bring in additional background materials on a topic. But as a means of keeping the students in touch with general world and national developments and of improving their reading comprehension, this newspaper has definite advantages over standard reading texts. It can probably best be used in combination with a reader on U.S. history and culture.

Mail-Order Americana

While the idea is not original with me, I found a variety of uses for one of the large mail-order catalogs with a class of foreign wives. After discussing my plans to use it as my only textbook, I persuaded the manager of the local mail-order house to provide a free copy for each student. He assumed that, after becoming familiar with his merchandise, my students would probably patronize his company. I don't know that this in fact happened, but it was a good piece of public relations.

The catalog furnished nearly inexhaustible material for lessons on counting, alphabetizing, measuring in inches and pounds, and even writing business letters. Each week I selected ten items from the index and asked the students to write a brief explanation of where and how they would use each item. In this way they increased their vocabulary and often became acquainted with ways of doing things that were much different from the customs in their homelands.

As I said, this class consisted entirely of women and met only one evening a week. Under other circumstances, the catalogs would have much more limited value, but they could still prove useful for teaching some of the concepts I have outlined above.

Beware the Innocent "Educational" Film

At the end of this discussion of outside materials for ESL classes, I want to mention 16mm instructional films. Admittedly, they cannot be found in your local dime store, but many can be borrowed at reasonable rates from public libraries, schools, churches, and universities.

There is one cardinal rule to follow when selecting films to show foreign students: *Screen them first with the specific audience in mind.* It has been our unfortunate experience that films on seemingly innocuous subjects such as a region of the United States, etiquette, or family life can be mercilessly chauvinistic or hopelessly juvenile when viewed through the foreign student's

eyes. In other words, the same problems we had found with news reporting turned up in instructional films too.

The problem seems to be to match a comprehensible script with objective content. If the vocabulary is low, the content tends to be simplistic and juvenile. If the content is interesting to our students, the narration is often rapid and somewhat technical. If I could make one plea in my students' behalf, it would be for a series of films on contemporary U.S. culture and attitudes that they could understand verbally and that would not try to proselytize them to the American way of life.

Such a series, as I envision it, would include films on the U.S. educational system, college life, family life and the roles of men and women in it, economic and educational class distinctions, the problems of the cities in general terms, the role of volunteer organizations in American life, simple etiquette, the concepts of "formal" and "informal" in the United States, etc. I have heard others in the TESOL field express the crying need for such a series, and yet I am surprised to find that absolutely nothing is available.

The film on vocabulary from the MLA series designed for language teachers⁵ has proved popular with my ESL students. We also had some success with filmstrips on current events. The script appears on the screen and various members of the class can take turns reading it aloud. They can also stop the presentation at any point for questions and discussion. But again, none of these is aimed at the specific audience we have, and they assume certain background knowledge which foreign students lack or about which they have formed faulty conceptions.

For the above reasons, our experiences in using films to teach about U.S. culture have been quite unsatisfactory, and I would warn against trying to put together such a program from resources currently available. The results can be disastrous in terms of student dissatisfaction and even rebellion.

While certainly not condemning present TESOL texts, I do not see any argument against introducing occasional variety into the classroom. Such materials as I have discussed can revive flagging enthusiasm of students and teacher alike without losing sight of language-learning goals. Used judiciously, these materials take very little out of the budget and add a great deal of interest to the classes.

⁵ "Words and Their Meanings" from the film series *Principles and Methods of Teaching a Second Language* prepared by the Modern Language Association and the Center for Applied Linguistics, available from Teaching Film Custodians, Inc., 25 West, 43rd Street, New York, New York, 10036.

On-the-Job Training*

Carson W. Martin

The Ontario Citizenship Branch for which I work aims to encourage by all reasonable means the integration of the newcomer to Canada, and more specifically Ontario, into the life of the community. Training of immigrants in English has, in the nature of things, become perhaps the most important part of our work. Most of the formal language teaching is done by regular educational institutions while we supply materials in the form of texts and tests. But there are many people, we find, who cannot be reached through conventional channels, and it is on these people that the Citizenship Branch concentrates. One of the areas in which we have found a real response is that of classes conducted on the job. Projects of this type we have called rather clumsily "Mohammed Going to the Mountain Projects" because these were situations in which the teacher took the lesson to the student rather than wait for the student to come to the lesson.

To illustrate what we do in this field I will give three actual examples and then try to draw a few general conclusions from them which might prove applicable elsewhere.

The owner of a large suburban motor hotel had a rather large number of non-English-speaking employees and said that he would be glad to provide a classroom and allow the employees time off from work if we would arrange for them to get instruction in English. One of our experienced teachers went for an hour a day to this hotel and held classes. The success of this particular effort is shown by the fact that in a few weeks some of the employees had learned enough English to go downtown and get a better job. This was a little disappointing to the employer; but he accepted the fact gracefully, feeling that the project had, on the whole, been successful.

Case number 2 concerns a German manufacturing company making burglar alarms and vaults. The normal language of communication in this firm was German; i.e., the management and foremen were German. The interesting thing about this project was that the request for instruction in English came from the workers themselves, below the foreman level. These workers were mostly German, but there was a fairly large number of Spanish, Portuguese, and Greeks as well. In this case the management and foremen did not encourage English classes but did at least give a rather grudging consent to their operation. One reason the management objected to the idea of English classes was that they had found in the past that as soon as the employees could communicate they would tend to demand more money for their work; however, the classes were started. One of the first things the

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

Mr. Martin, Language and Citizenship Training Advisor, Department of the Provincial Secretary and Citizenship, Ontario, has worked exclusively since 1960 as teacher and advisor to teachers of English to New Canadians. He is the author of a course in English for adult students of English as a second language published by the Department of the Provincial Secretary and Citizenship.

teacher found was that there had been a high sickness and accident rate in this plant, so he set about teaching the men things which might help to reduce this rate. He began his classes with coffee and cookies when the men came off shift. This tended to put the men at ease after a period of pressure, while shunting trains in the yard outside the classroom provided a contrast in the atmosphere. The teacher soon found that the men were voluntarily setting up the equipment for him every day, and the classroom soon became an accepted part of the whole environment. Even men who didn't attend the English classes used the teacher as a source for anything they wanted to be able to say in English. He became a living reference book on English usage for the whole plant, and after a time even the attitude of the management began to soften.

Case number 3 has to do with a steel company in which the management of the company and the head of the local union got together on a plan. (The union head was himself a recent immigrant, but a very articulate one.) The management was going to supply the classroom and allow the workers some time off with pay to attend the English classes. The union was to be responsible for the attendance of the men.

Our teacher started his classes this time with quite a bit of fanfare and official attention, including television coverage. But when the excitement had died down, the teacher confided in me that he had a number of problems:

1. He had to establish the conduct required in a classroom, which was different from what was normal in the factory.
2. He had to work hard to get the confidence of the men. He even went out and worked in the factory for two days to find out the real needs of the men. The management didn't like this at first; but when they learned its real purpose, they relented.
3. He found that the choral work normally advocated did not work with this group; he grouped them according to nationality and had a leader for each group—the one who spoke the best—who became responsible for the actions of his group. Thus an automatic system of communication was available between the different groups.
4. He had a small group of slow learners. These he took aside from the rest of the class and worked with separately. It was this very group which made such progress in a few months that they asked for some kind of test.

This particular teacher involved himself completely with his students—he invited them to his home, and they took turns visiting each others' homes, thus involving the families. The wives no longer coaxed their husbands to miss the classes to come home. The teacher took them hunting and fishing, and even took part in a grape-crushing festival. These were all learning situations and could be classified as the "Experience Approach." During some evenings in the teacher's home they listened to tapes that had been made the previous day.

A very special instance of involvement came about when there had been a fight within the union, and the teacher, as the only independent observer, was called into court by the judge to testify. The judge classified the controversy as an "ethnic motivated" fight and dismissed the case. This almost established our teacher as a sort of local ombudsman. These classes held between shifts became so popular they soon asked for Saturday sessions where the different classes could combine and compare their progress.

These are three specific examples of on-the-job training, but there are many variations of this kind of program. We have teachers in mental hospitals, in the workmen's compensation section of the general hospital as well as in the large rehabilitation center. Under the same heading we might even include the programs for mothers of pre-school children, where in the same building mothers learn English in classes while their children are learning English through games.

What useful pedagogical conclusions might we draw from experiences with this type of class? The most important conclusion I shall illustrate through a story.

An executive with more ideas and enthusiasm than experience installed a new and elaborate system in his company and then went abroad, confident that things would pretty much run by themselves. Upon his return from a two-month vacation he asked how the system was working. "Splendid," replied the manager. "And how is business?" asked the executive. "Oh, we had to give that up to keep the system going," said the manager.

Exactly the same kind of thing can happen in an educational situation: the bookkeeping or the system can become more important than anything else. In these on-the-job classes this sort of development would be fatal. Here we have learned that the system can be relatively unimportant; flexibility in approach is the important thing. There are many valid reasons for people not being able to attend classes at the conventional time or in the conventional place, and we should not assume that these people are lost simply because they do not appear voluntarily in our classes. A more pragmatic, flexible, or quite unorthodox approach is called for to meet the needs of many possible students; and meeting the various needs of our students, is, after all, our job. We must also learn to be satisfied with something much less than perfection in the results of our teaching and perhaps judge our success almost entirely in terms of how a student's particular language needs are satisfied—and that means how he sees these needs and not how we see them.

Organization and Administration of ESL Programs in the Public Schools*

Thomas A. MacCalla

Second-language-learning programs, all curriculum innovations for that matter, need to be people-centered, sequential, cooperatively developed, implemented, improved, and supported from the school site to the largest possible audience. We know that the most important item in our inventory is an awareness of what is involved in the teaching-learning process, but we must now reassess our educational purpose.

To attain any degree of success in our pursuits, we must see to it that what we do transcends any given discipline. We need to reconsider approaches to our instructional aims and to examine the value of a language-centered curriculum. In short, we need to provide children with magnetic opportunities for developing in them the abilities to inquire, to solve problems, to see the relatedness of knowledge and the interdependence of people, and to make value analyses. We must recognize that children need to discover for themselves through guided educational experiences the basic concepts and skills they will need to make a better life for themselves in a country that is now seventy-five percent urban and in a world where urbanization is an international watchword.

Amidst the reverberations of social unrest and the clamor for curriculum relevance and instructional improvement, we have to marshal our professional resources and act decisively. We need to translate what we already know, feel, and continually discover about the many dimensions of language into widespread, coordinated classroom practice. Finally, we need to communicate the importance of language in the educational process and to demonstrate that our primary responsibility is assessing the many factors that condition the language-learning process so that we may develop the best approaches for achieving our desired objectives.

In terms of organizing and administering ESL programs in the public schools, I would like to offer a few approaches to the challenge we face in our multiethnic urban centers. We need to develop strategies for action and give priority to administrative commitment, school-community involvement, in-service education, and curriculum change. We must also bear in mind that what we may say about ESL programs, or any other label one may wish to apply to the teaching of a second language, applies to all language development and learning in general. If the will to begin is present, we can make

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

Mr. MacCalla is Assistant Superintendent of the Oakland Public Schools in California and the newly appointed Director of Urban Education Programs. He is also Professor of Education at the United States International University, San Diego, California.

significant strides without resting our case on inadequate funds. Granting that money will continue to be a critical determinant of instructional improvement, we need to focus on the potential of district-wide inservice education activities and to recognize that the educational enterprise is a community investment.

Since the end of World War II, the public schools in Oakland, California, have made an attempt to meet the language-learning needs of many non-English-speaking immigrant families coming into the city. Although the programs offered through the district's adult education department and in a centrally located international student program at the junior high school level were effective, they did not account for the overall problem of language learning in a multiethnic, multilingual urban environment.

Today we are trying to come to grips with the needs of a school population whose minority group members constitute the majority (53% Negro, 8% Spanish Surname, 6% Oriental, and 2% Indian and other non-white). Despite serious budget limitations, the Oakland Public Schools singled out human relations and the teaching-learning of ESL and dialect differences as vital areas for district-wide study. Through its Division of Urban Educational Services, the administration authorized a committee of teachers, community representatives, principals and supervisors to explore the many problems related to second-language learning and dialect differences, and to determine implications for general language-learning practices. Presently, the twenty-member committee and outside consultants in language and linguistics are examining the language-learning needs in the district, reviewing available materials and methods, and assisting in the framing of a comprehensive instruction and inservice education program. The overall objectives of the joint school-community effort are (1) to establish an awareness of some of the socio-psycholinguistic determinants of second-language learning and bicultural patterns, especially in an urban setting; (2) to establish language-learning experiences for students, preschool through adult education, with consideration given to program entry points, proficiency levels, and instructional follow-through in the elementary and secondary schools; and (3) to provide a program that will compensate for cultural and linguistic interference in the language-learning process, and a program that will help those who are not native speakers of English and those with English dialect variance.

The group is endeavoring to build upon the work initiated during a summer district workshop and to encourage staff participation through graduate and salary credit incentives and by demonstrating the value of the coordinated effort. Parenthetically, I would like to add that part of the present undertaking includes a supportive language-learning workshop for approximately eighty teachers and administrators, preschool through adult education. Plans also call for the development of a video-tape series and an instructional guide on the organization and implementation of an ESL program that will have far-reaching implications for curriculum change.

The following six steps briefly outline a model for reaching these objectives:

Step One:

1. To describe systematically present programs
 - a. Classes offered for each age group, by frequency, time allotment, etc.
 - b. Basic materials used
 - c. Supplementary materials
 - d. Methodology
 - e. Special training completed by the teachers of these classes
 - f. Housing of classes
 - g. Available equipment and resources
2. To consider scheduling patterns and the relatedness of the instruction to the total curriculum
3. To evaluate the program in order to determine specific needs in each of the above areas

Step Two:

1. To provide an orientation of administrative and instructional staff at various levels to the scope and purpose of the committee's charge
2. To provide community orientation and parent participation for program development and support

Step Three:

1. To describe specific language problems
2. To determine where in the curriculum each of the problems is to be met
3. To determine appropriateness of existing materials and to create new materials for meeting the specific language problems
4. To determine methodology for meeting needs at each of the instructional levels and for developing an articulated and sequential ESL program
5. To provide a program overview and practical district guide for ESL and language learning, with suggested materials and methodology, and district strategy for implementation

Step Four:

1. To determine the nature of needed inservice training for each of the instructional levels
2. To establish inservice training in terms of workshops, demonstration classes, and human relations-curriculum experiences
3. To establish workshops for administrators on language-learning problems, materials, and methodology

Step Five:

1. To establish ungraded classes, of short duration, within each instructional level so that specific language problems can be met with emphasis, because specific language problems are not generally characteristic of any one grade level within the elementary, the secondary, or the adult age group
 2. To use these classes for demonstration to prepare teachers who will enter the program as it increases in scope
 3. To coordinate curriculum and material development with the district's media center concept
 4. To duplicate and disseminate the list of summer institutes for ESL and for English, with emphasis on encouragement to participate in these institutes
-

Step Six:

1. To assess the availability of local and state resources, and to video-tape inservice presentations for future as well as immediate re-use
2. To video-tape all demonstrations and selected school-site activities
3. To develop a kinescope series on these ESL efforts for inservice education and widespread distribution

During the first few meetings of the committee, it was apparent that the group needed to know more about the students we are serving, their abilities, interests, and needs. We had to re-examine our instructional purpose and to develop more effective ways of organizing and administering the instructional program and of providing teachers with the necessary skills to deal with the unique demands of second-language learning.

In terms of the first step, for example, the committee is now attempting to determine (1) what we need to do for any given group at any given entry into the program, (2) how specific material is applied to each age group with which it is used, and (3) what is the coordination within the sequence or sequences. As you can see the task is an ambitious one; nonetheless, the decision to attempt it has been made.

It may be interesting to re-emphasize at this point that a review of teaching and administrative concerns clearly reveals that the problem extends beyond the ESL classroom. Questions regarding the handling of multiethnic, multilingual classroom situations, teacher-student-community attitudes and behavior, available materials, staffing patterns, curriculum flexibility, and school-site help are persistent. Actually, I do not find the concerns to be any different from those we have all been voicing for years or from those that I outlined three years ago in a review of some of the critical needs for secondary and adult ESL instruction in selected districts of Southern California, or those expressed recently by the State of California in its *Prospectus for Equitable Educational Opportunities for Spanish-Speaking Children and Mexican-Americans, A Handbook for Educators*.

Another approach to our challenge is the demonstration program concept. Through state compensatory education funds, the Oakland schools initiated a demonstration program at the junior high school level to improve the reading and language-learning skills of some 480 Spanish-speaking and Negro youngsters as a school-community effort. The project included the services of a language development specialist, an ESL specialist and bilingual assistant in human relations, increased counseling opportunities, additional reading and language teachers, parent aides, student tutors, lower class size (20:1), flexible programming, and broad community involvement in school activities. In addition, graduate students in mathematics were employed to experiment and work with under-achieving college potentials, and a special parent and adult education program during and after school hours was begun. The program also emphasized inservice education activities, the development of appropriate curriculum materials, and the use of a video-trainer system.

The demonstration program approach to the problem can be significant. As originally designed, the program was a means of getting an azimuth, profiting from experimentation, and considering beforehand the transportability of instructional features and the implications for language arts programs in the district.

I could suggest other models such as the establishment of neighborhood adult centers, after-school tutorial centers, and new career development programs. The point I wish to make, though, is that the organization and administration of ESL programs in the public schools is an integral part of the instructional program. I also wish to add that school-community partnerships are essential, program support must come from the top, and that school staffs not only need help, but they also seek help. We need to channel the potential already present in school districts and form new partnerships for educational progress. The crisis is here, and the next move is ours.

REFERENCES

- California State Department of Education, *Prospectus for Equitable Educational Opportunities for Spanish-Speaking Children*, 1967.
- Forbes, Jack D., *Mexican-Americans, A Handbook for Educators*, Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1967.
- MacCalla, Thomas A., "Some Critical Needs in Teaching English as a Second Language," *Claremont Reading Conference, 30th Yearbook*, 1966.
-

Some Effects of Bilingualism on Certain Clinical Speech Procedure

Elaine P. Hannah and Robert S. Brooks

During the past few years, the vast increase in enrollment of international students and their families in colleges throughout the United States, and the accompanying screening process related to the program for the teaching of English as a second language have forced pathologists to reexamine their previous procedures with respect to the speech deviant foreign student. Previously, the international student had been most frequently referred to the speech and hearing clinic for help with respect to his lack of facility with English. With the overwhelming growth in the number of such students needing training in contrast to therapy, and as a result of war time experiences in rapid foreign language training with emphasis on communication, the teaching of English as a second language became an area in and of itself. However, interdisciplinary programs still find a need to refer certain international students who, in addition to a second-language difficulty, have a speech disorder which interrelates with this. The present discussion is an attempt to indicate how the ramifications of such a student's bilingualism require the introduction of certain modifications in the clinic procedures ordinarily followed.

The international student with a speech deviation will frequently have passed through the basic course in English for the speaker of another language, but it is very unlikely that he has become a true bilingual and has mastered the subtle complexities of his second language to a point where these no longer interfere with immediate perception of the message on the part of his audience. He is also very likely to have only a basic vocabulary in addition to the jargon of his professional field and is apt to be searching constantly for the correct word or phrase, hoping that his audience will give him sufficient time to do so. When the individual is a stutterer, his frequently tenuous command of the rhythm pattern of the English language is considerably weakened by a series of seemingly uncontrollable repetitions, prolongations, filled and unfilled pauses, all of which make communication almost impossible. Efforts to communicate in the second language are accompanied by added feelings of inadequacy, since listener reactions frequently resemble those experienced in the first language during periods of nonfluency, but seem to be present almost continuously in the second language. Because of previous experiences, the speaker may suspect that the listener is reacting

Miss Hannah, Associate Professor and Director of the Program in Speech Pathology and Audiology, Mankato State College, Mankato, Minnesota, is the author of articles in *Language and Speech*, *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research*, and *Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders*.

Mr. Brooks, Associate Professor of Speech, Kansas State University, Manhattan Kansas, is the author of articles in *Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders* and *Journal of Auditory Research*.

to his stuttering pattern rather than to inaccuracies in English, and the deviation in speech seems of greater importance. The issue may become of vital importance when talking to authority figures such as the individual in charge of the student's graduate program or a fellow professional, rather than a layman.

Increasingly, but on a more limited scale, the speech and hearing clinic has also had to evaluate and consider for therapy the child of an international student who will be in the country for a few years, a child who may also have to attend an American school for a year or two before returning to his own country.

The ten students upon whom the present observations were made had all been diagnosed previously as stutterers and had a rhythm pattern noted as peculiar by TESL examiners who were accustomed to listening to English spoken as a second language. The two preschool children were referred by the university nursery school. All used English daily, but with varying degrees of proficiency.

I

Such observations led to the conclusion that the bilingual nature of the adult individual would influence certain modifications in both evaluation and therapy procedures. With respect to the evaluation situation, the speech pathologist must first ascertain the contribution of both the speech deviation and the level of second-language development to the pattern which is calling attention to itself. When the individual uses two languages unequally well and is a stutterer (as were the present adult cases), a number of factors will be relevant: the reaction of the individual to the speaking situation in both languages, previous experiences with speech therapy, conceptions of the nature of the problem and expectations for improvement, reactions to such a speech deviation in the varying social cultures. Specifically, the speech pathologist must determine not only how well the individual uses his two languages, but also how much nonfluency he demonstrates in both languages and under what conditions.

When the first language is one with which most individuals are relatively familiar—i.e., German, French, Spanish—reading material is readily available and scannable by the examiner, and it is relatively easy to structure an observational test situation in which the individual spontaneously discusses the nature of some stimulus material as well as reads it in his native language. If the first language is one with which the examiner is apt to be unfamiliar—i.e., Hindi, Arabic—the situation becomes somewhat more difficult, since the examiner cannot as easily identify “filler” devices and circumlocutions. However, in the university setting it is usually possible to locate a normal speaker of the language involved who can provide assistance. This person, with a reasonable amount of explanation and with some specific training, can usually listen to a tape which has been made and give a gross indication of points of nonfluency or peculiarity of rhythm and phrasing on a transcript.

This individual may also be able to supply stimulus materials (books, newspapers in the native language).

The examiner, in the meantime, may evaluate the nonverbal performance of the individual as he reads and speaks in the two languages, thereby obtaining a relatively clear indication of additional difficulties imposed upon the individual by the use of a second language and the relation of these, if any, to changes in the stuttering pattern.

In the present situation, other factors also received greater observational emphasis. As indicated by Mackey (1962), bilingualism is a matter of alternation and interference as well as degree and function. With reference to the present subjects, it was felt that the alternate use of two languages and observed transfer of vocabulary, odd syntactic ordering and changes in pronunciation, particularly where these were not the usual pattern, should be specifically noted, since these might possibly represent a form of circumlocution or avoidance of threatening speech situations on the part of the bilingual stutterer.

Also, since differing speech situations vary in the level of vocabulary and the style demanded, it was necessary for a valid evaluation to have the individual discuss social and family activities as well as his academic and professional program. Not always was it more difficult to discuss the academic situation, since vocabulary and sentence units in this area are often more practiced and more readily available for use.

Also included in the evaluation given to this type of individual was a test for perception of rapid speech. The need for such a test became apparent to the examiners when one of the subjects, about to be dismissed with a seemingly acceptable rhythm pattern and better than average expressive English, suddenly became very nonfluent when questioned by the supervisor of his clinic sessions. During a subsequent analysis of the situation, the student indicated that, while his expressive skill in the second language was ordinarily quite good and usually free of disruptive nonfluencies, he sometimes had difficulty understanding the rapid speaker of English and became tense when he began to miss elements of the material being addressed to him. At this point, he tended to become nonfluent in the second language. He also found that, as an oriental student, certain noncontrastive tones of English speakers became distracting at times. As a result of this experience, the examiners routinely asked each student to listen to the slow reading of a newspaper paragraph, summarize the content and then do the same to a taped, rapidly presented news broadcast.

Since it can be observed that the degree of nonfluency varies not only with the speaking situation but with respect to a specific individual's feelings about specific speaking situations (Sheehan, 1958) (Bloodstein, 1958), the psychological ramifications of the stuttering pattern must also be investigated. One cannot assume, however, that any generalizations previously developed in relation to the monolingual stutterer will apply. Perception of

social situations by the international student and experienced social stresses may be quite different, and the attempt to assess such background factors may be relatively difficult. Frequently, this individual is somewhat limited in the comprehension of even ordinary vocabulary, and the addition of a slight amount of professional jargon on the part of the examiner will simply add to the confusion. Only too frequently, this individual may not understand the nature of many questions and may give an answer which seems vague or is misleading. On the other hand, he may well understand but be unprepared to discuss anxiety related situations with someone who is a relative stranger and also a foreigner, someone who might not easily understand the relationships and stresses of a different cultural pattern. The examiner soon becomes aware that there are areas of tension or anxiety which may be openly discussed and other areas of anxiety about which only inferences may be made. Prominent among the latter might be the familiar pattern of the individual's society and socioeconomic expectations in relation to normal speech.

One of the ten adult students, for example, came from a country which was known to be quite underdeveloped, with a relatively small and struggling middle class. Obviously, under such conditions, preservation of this status would have to be fraught with a certain amount of tension. In addition, this individual, with a somewhat limited ability at English communication, was working daily for a supervisor with whom he could communicate only in English. The student seemed unaware that these pressures might be related to his stuttering, and found it difficult to accept the idea that his weaker knowledge of English might be a contributing factor, a more fluent facility with English apparently being a mark of prestige and an economic asset in his society.

The availability of a competent clinician proved to be a crucial consideration in the capacity of the clinic to provide some assistance. Frequently beginning graduate students in speech pathology have had only an elementary introduction to the phonetics of General American English and in working with the bilingual student are asked to bring to the clinic situation a perception for sound patterns, encountered in languages other than this. In the present situations, the clinicians were carefully selected for their ability to perceive subtle phonemic-phonetic contrasts and were then given some instruction in the phonology of languages other than General American English. This included some emphasis on identification of the elements of differing prosodic patterns.

The psychological maturity of such a clinician was also an important consideration. Since our international students frequently had the conception that there was a "cure" for stuttering and did not see the relationship between unique environment pressures and the deviation, a therapist was needed who was sufficiently knowledgeable to be able to discuss the reality of research findings in relation to possible misconceptions without alienating the client or seeming to be a rank amateur.

Not all referrals were accepted for therapy. A decision to offer a clinical program was based on a number of factors. The stuttering problem itself had to be relatively severe and also felt to be a handicap by the individual involved. In addition, to avoid merely developing an advanced TESL program, it was felt that the stuttering must be more severe in the second language, indicating some bilingual interference. However, since research with normals is indicating that nonfluency in the second language varies with the knowledge of the language, when time and the availability of a competent clinician permitted, the nonfluent bilingual student was accommodated within a dual emphasis program.

Therapy for a nonfluency problem usually takes two directions, although not always with equal emphasis and dependent upon the point of view which one holds with respect to the nature of the problem itself (Van Riper, 1963), (Shames and Sherrick, 1963), (Bluemel, 1957), (Bloodstein, 1961). Most frequently, the sessions upon which these observations were based were structured not only to effect a change in the actual rhythm pattern of the speaker, but also to realistically appraise factors within the daily situation which might be causing anxiety and thereby increasing nonfluency.

Initially, the structure of the clinic sessions somewhat resembled the format of the pattern practice drill type of program. As the student worked on imitative production of the fluent prosodic pattern being presented, he could not help practicing the correct English articulation and intonation patterns. For example, the clinician would present the stimulus sentence followed by a long pause in the taping, and the client would attempt to fill in this space with an exact repetition of the articulation and intonation pattern of the stimulus sentence. Both recordings would be scanned with the individual erasing and repeating the procedure for any response which did not closely approximate the stimulus presentation. At another point in the same stage of development, a series of language training records in the native language were obtained, and the student was required to speak the phrases along with the records as the volume was turned to increasingly lower levels, the objective at this point being to reduce the prolongations of sounds and repetitions of words and phrases as much as possible, thereby emphasizing the concept of fluent patterns of speech and building some confidence in one's ability to produce them. For the most part, progress was toward greater difficulty in terms of less structuring of therapy materials and format. Initially, almost all practice material was drawn from the context of university program and job situation since vocabulary and language structures in these areas were usually more familiar. Gradually, however, emphasis shifted to common social situations within the community. A variety of the specific procedures used during this aspect of therapy proved useful, but it was felt that an important aspect of such procedures was the clear understanding of the student as to the objectives of such procedures. Only too frequently, reports of previous experiences with therapy for stuttering indicated little

understanding of the rationale for activities, and imbued the whole process with a somewhat magical aura.

In the case of certain individuals, it became immediately apparent that any information with respect to the nature of stuttering would have to be given through the medium of rather concrete discussion, since their reading vocabulary in English was so limited and the jargon in this area so extensive. After the initial sessions with the student clinicians assigned to these individuals, it also became apparent that it would be more productive if the supervisor for the therapy sessions was to handle this aspect of the therapy process. As indicated previously, the individual frequently came to the clinic with some fairly positive ideas relative to stuttering and was generally quite resistant to any suggestions which did not directly point to a "cure." In fact, one or two students also utilized, and were loathe to discard, distraction devices of an oral prosthetic nature, devices which have long since fallen into disrepute professionally. Therefore, it was arranged that the supervisor would sit in on certain sessions and after the more structured portion of the session was concluded, a casual discussion of what is known about stuttering would usually be initiated. This involved all three participants.

The students were also required to record their most difficult experiences during daily activities and to discuss the dynamics of these with the supervisor and clinician. In this way, it was possible to ascribe very realistically to any social situation its actual ramifications. The basis for analysis usually revolved around the question of why the student had not been understood or why he had not understood in a specific situation. Through a rather close control of this aspect of therapy, the clinician was able to check on assumed rejections ascribed to the stuttering problem, subtleties within the social situation which might be misunderstood, and common vocabulary which was not correctly used or understood.

In summary, when the already complex basis for a stuttering problem is complicated by an additional interrelated second-language problem, a number of factors within the situation become obscured, and increased perceptive skill is required in order that linguistic and social factors be assigned their proper significance. Such a clinic program also requires some knowledge of social cultures other than the American in order that the clinician may fully appreciate the social situation as perceived by the client and be able to interact positively with him.

II

Although the preschool cases upon whom these observations were made had not previously experienced the simultaneous and continuous contact with two cultures which is typical of the Mexican-American, Indian, or Negro child in our society, whenever the child speaks two languages, there are unique problems to be considered. Ordinarily, one might assume that since many childhood problems associated with the simultaneous use of two languages will be resolved when the child returns to his native country, it might not

be necessary to involve the speech pathologist. It has been found by the present author, however, that one must also consider the age of the child and the length of his stay in the United States in addition to the degrees of lexical and syntactic difficulty, before automatically resolving the issue in this way. Many of the international students who come to study on our campuses do so at the Ph.D level and are apt to bring their families, since this is ordinarily at least a three-year program. If the child is quite young, the bilingual environment does not seem so strange. In fact, one fairly bright three year old of our acquaintance resolved the language issue thus: the adults spoke his first language, and the second language was for the children with whom he played. However, by four years of age, the inability to communicate clearly in the predominant environment language begins to be noted by the other children and the frustrations to be felt by the bilingual child who is, by now, circulating more widely within his environment. The problem is accentuated when the child begins school and is to remain there for a year or so before returning to his own country.

The first child upon whom observations were made was of this nature. At the time that the child was brought to the clinic for an evaluation, he was four years old, and used both his native language and English, which was the second language. The mother indicated that the family had been in the United States for approximately a year but that this term of residence and his enrollment in a nursery school had not been sufficient to make him clearly understandable by the adults and children within his environment. The mother, whose first language was English, but who spoke and used the native language of the father expertly, indicated that the English of the father still reflected second-language confusions and that he preferred to use his first language in the home. Also, the mother indicated a rather strong desire to preserve national characteristics by stating that they hoped to return to the native country before this child must enter school at the first grade level, so that he might be educated in the father's country. At the same time, she was anxious to relieve the frustrations which he was commonly experiencing during the period of their stay in this country.

A second complication was a suggested emotional relationship with the first language. For the young child, not only has this been the language to be valued and respected but also the language frequently related to the warmth and security of his early existence in a large and closely knit family group. The second language may seem to relate more to the present family situation controlled by the younger adult clan members who are suddenly very busy and facing daily frustrations of their own as they try to adjust to life in a new and unfamiliar country. It is to be expected that the child may at times prefer to use the first language in order to try to bring back some of the security of his earlier existence. Discussions with this child's mother indicated that he frequently used the words of the first language even when he had available the vocabulary of the second language, and she speculated about emotional ties to the first language.

The second child, although also a bilingual four year old, had a slightly different basis for the problem. His parents had left the United States when he was barely three, and with a year's residence in another country he had become bilingual, largely due to the fact that his parents had encouraged him to relate to the social pattern of the host country. At the time of his return to the United States, he seemed to have a greatly limited English vocabulary, non-English syntactic ordering, and articulatory deviations which his parents felt he had not seemed to have previously.

The evaluation of these two preschool children emphasized the need for certain modifications in procedure and thinking with respect to the bilingual child. The first child was given a picture type articulation test (Bryngelson-Glaspey, 1962), and it was soon apparent that a limited vocabulary development could definitely influence the results. The examiner could never be sure that the child knew the English word corresponding to the picture. Secondly, it was necessary that all atypical responses be noted phonetically in their completed state so that they might be further examined and a decision made as to whether they represented an articulatory substitution or the substitution of a correct word from one language for the word in the second language. Since it was impossible to make such a decision rapidly, this aspect of the evaluation was repeated with a different set of similar stimulus cards and the second examination recorded and replayed in the presence of the parent who assisted in deciding what the child had meant to say. From this process it was then ascertained that the child did have a severe articulation problem, and that most of the substitutions were not stimulable. The examiner had some question as to whether some of the substitutions noted related to the normal inconsistent pattern of articulatory development or to carry-over from the first language with which the examiner was, unfortunately, not familiar. With respect to this, the auditory perception of the mother was too gross to be of much help. She did indicate, however, that she suspected an articulatory deviation, since he had also had difficulty being understood in his first language. At two points, the use of the unvoiced sound for the voiced sound and a peculiarity in word accent pattern indicated a definite influence from the first language to the second. Otherwise, this child seemed to use two different prosodic patterns quite appropriately.

This child was also given a Boston University type auditory discrimination test (Pronovost and Dumbleton, 1953). In this type of test, the child was asked to choose the two items presented by the examiner from among the three sets of pictures presented visually. This was largely unsuccessful on two bases. The examiner strongly suspected that many of the wrong choices were made not on the basis of poor discrimination but on the basis of greater familiarity with certain vocabulary items, or initially, because of a lack of understanding of the instructions. For the most part, the child tended to pick the items whose names he understood. During the hearing screening process, verbal instructions again proved useless and the examiner had to rely upon facial changes as the threshold was crossed. Fortunately, this

child's face was quite expressive and a very general level of hearing acuity was established.

As a result of the second child's evaluation, another modification in thinking developed. In terms of articulation, several sound substitutions appeared most prominently. These were checked with the parent who confirmed the fact that the second language did contain these sounds. The child's misarticulations were then classified into those which could be directly related to the second-language problem, in addition to those which should have been correctly articulated by a child of this age and those which might be expected to appear at a later maturation point. A decision regarding therapy was made on the basis of this classification.

It is interesting to note that at this age level one might normally expect to find articulatory deviations, and the bilingual child is no exception. The interrelationship of two languages, however, complicates the situation in terms of the basis for the articulatory deviation. It is not likely that a phoneme which is omitted in both languages, or for which a substitution is made in both languages, can be considered to be a product of bilingual confusion. It is much more likely that noticeable distortions will reflect such a confusion.

It is also interesting to note that in the case of the two children described it was vocabulary usage and articulatory deviations rather than the prosodic pattern which was the basis for the listener confusion. Both children seemed to have the differing prosodic patterns of the two languages quite separated in their verbalizing despite a more frequent interrelating of vocabulary items and, in the case of one child, syntactic ordering. The might suggest, as indicated by Hakes (1965), a strong imitative aspect to the speech pattern of the four year old, an aspect which would probably include the use of a number of common combinations in terms of stress and intonation.

It was decided that, despite the first child's age, the complexity of his situation was such that he would probably benefit from some speech development activities concurrent with his stay in the United States. In general, however, it was felt that the prognosis was probably not too hopeful because of adverse factors within the family situation, i.e., divided feelings on the part of the parents with respect to the language to be emphasized, particularly at a point where the child is rapidly developing a sense of language "prestige" (Lambert, 1967). However, he was assigned to a clinic program which would include an emphasis on vocabulary development and greater structural complexity, since he frequently used only fragments and minor sentences. The secondary goal of the program was that of correcting those phonemes which should have been correctly articulated by children of the same age level. In addition, the mother was advised to check at each point where he used a word from the first language to substitute for a word from the second language to be sure that he actually had this vocabulary item

in English. She was also asked to take more time to talk with him in English during the day when the father was away at the university.

With respect to the second child, it was felt that the primary problem involved in this situation was the concern of the parents that the child's articulatory development might be retarded by the influence of a second language, an influence which would disappear through disuse. Therefore, the defective sounds were discussed with them and categorized as indicated previously. When it was understood that certain of the misarticulations related to a later maturation level, the parents were willing to allow the child a semester to adjust to the use of only one language and to allow certain patterns from the second language to disappear naturally before considering a remedial speech program. More positively, they were also advised to stimulate vocabulary development and to check frequently the child's perception of rapid, spontaneous discourse.

III

From these experiences, it was felt that one must be cognizant of a number of rather unique factors when evaluating and structuring therapy for the bilingual speech client. One must be acutely aware of the more subtle aspects of the English speech pattern, particularly alterations in prosodic patterns and minor phonemic distortions, since the therapy program is influenced to a certain extent by these. Unfortunately, until recently most clinical speech programs have been more accustomed to working with omissions and substitutions of sounds and the rhythm pattern in terms of pathological interruptions rather than distortions.

For the adult who has a speech deviation which interrelates with a lessened ability in a second language, a number of factors have to be evaluated. One might first need to determine just how much discomfort or penalty the deviant speech condition actually causes the individual in his own language and society. While it may be somewhat embarrassing to him, the individual may not suffer any socioeconomic penalty as the result of the speech problem. The difference in the severity of the speech problem between the two languages should also be considered and a decision made as to whether the major difficulty in communication is based upon the handling of the second language or, in the present cases, upon the severity of the stuttering in the second language, assuming that there might be some, or both factors. The third area about which a decision must be made is that relating to the importance of the second language to the individual in terms of need for usage. Admittedly, the bilingual stutterer has a greater potential for communication difficulties than the bilingual nonstutterer. However, the stutterer who intends to use the second language only while in the United States for a short period of study and, thereafter, as a means of keeping up with new information in his professional area would be considered to have less of a need than the individual who uses the second language continuously at home and who comes from a country in which

the facility with a second language is definitely a prestige and economic factor.

Work with these students also led the authors to feel that the level of the individual's development in his mastery of a second language would definitely limit the structuring of stuttering therapy. The development of a more nearly correct prosodic pattern and a greater vocabulary can easily be interrelated with actual speech therapy for stuttering even at the initial stages in the development of a second language. The development of some understanding of the problem itself, however, would seem to require greater facility with the subtleties of the second language.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The preparation of this manuscript was supported in part by fellowship grant 1F11 NB 1822-01 CDR of the National Institutes of Health.

REFERENCES

- Bloodstein, Oliver, "Stuttering as an Anticipatory Struggle Reaction." *Stuttering: A Symposium*, ed. J. Eisenson. New York: Harper and Bros., 1958.
- "The Development of Stuttering: III—Theoretical and Clinical Implications," *Speech Hearing Dis.*, 26 (1961), 67-82.
- Bluemel, C. S., *The Riddle of Stuttering*. Danville: The Interstate Publishing Company, 1957.
- Bryngelson, B. and Esther Glaspey, *Speech Improvement Cards*. Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1962.
- Hakes, David T., "Bilingualism and the Bilingual Child—A Symposium," *Modern Lang. J.*, 49 (1965), 220-227.
- Lambert, Wallace, "A Social Psychology of Bilingualism," *J. Soc. Issues*, 23 (1967), 91-109.
- Mackay, D. G., "Of Age and Experience Factors in the Control of Speech Under Delayed Auditory Feedback: *J. Acoust. Soc. Amer.*, (accepted for publication).
- Mackay, W. F., "The Description of Bilingualism," *Canad. J. Ling.*, 7 (1962), 51-85.
- Pronovost, W. and C. Dumbleton, "A Picture Type Sound Discrimination Test: *J. Speech Hearing Dis.*, 18 (1953), 258-266.
- Shames, G. H. and C. E. Sherrick, "Discussion of Nonfluency and Stuttering as Operant Behavior: *J. Speech Hearing Dis.*, 28 (1963), 3-18.
- Sheehan, J. G., "Conflict Theory of Stuttering? *Stuttering: A Symposium*, ed. J. Eisenson. New York: Harper and Bros., 1958.
- Van Riper, C., *Speech Correction: Principles and Methods*, Fourth Ed. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963.
-

Recent Research in TESOL

Bernard Spolsky

At one of its first meetings, the members of the TESOL Research Committee discussed ways of communicating the results of research to members of the organization. One suggestion was to make use of the ERIC system, and to publish in *TESOL Quarterly* resumes of reports processed through the ERIC Clearinghouse on Linguistics. The first of these resumes appeared in the last issue. We felt however that this was not enough, and proposed also to prepare and publish critical evaluations of selected reports. This is the first such evaluation; normally, evaluations will appear in the *Quarterly* in the issue after the report is first listed.

Mary Finocchiaro. Bilingual readiness in earliest school years: a curriculum demonstrated project. December 1966. ERIC Accession Number ED 012 903.

This document is the report of a two-year project funded by the Office of Education. The study demonstrated the feasibility of starting what is called a "bilingual readiness" program in Kindergarten and Grade 1.

The way for such a project had been cleared by significant changes in the attitudes of scholars and government toward bilingualism. The former is best exemplified by the work of Elizabeth Peal and Wallace Lambert: they were the first to report research in which bilingual performed better than monolingual on verbal and nonverbal intelligence tests. The new approach of government, which made support for such a project as this possible, is most clearly shown by the recent passage of the Bilingual Education Act.

Accepting then the need for teaching English without damaging the self-concept of speakers of other languages and the value of teaching foreign language skills to native English speakers, Professor Finocchiaro set out to show how it was possible to combine these two goals in existing schools in multilingual communities. She was not concerned here with the form of a bilingual school, but simply with the possibility of adding a fifteen-to-twenty-minute Bilingual Lesson once a day.

The project involved six classes (three kindergarten and three first grade) in two schools. Both schools were in areas of New York that were previously predominantly English speaking, but in which large numbers of Negroes and Spanish speakers now lived. One school was in a poverty area,

Mr. Spolsky, Associate Professor of Linguistics and Elementary Education at the University of New Mexico, is chairman of the TESOL Research Committee.

the other in a middle class community. The study lasted two years, and the children who were in the kindergarten class in the first year were in the first grade in the second year. Classes were approximately one-third Negro, one-third native Spanish speakers, and one-third others.

The teaching was done by a Bilingual Teacher, who met the six classes four times a week, about fifteen minutes a day. Working on the preparation of material was a team consisting of Professor Finocchiaro (whose own qualifications and experience in teaching English as a second language are widely known), a psychologist, a curriculum specialist, a curriculum writer, a music specialist, and a language specialist. Closely cooperating was the New York City Supervisor of the Early Childhood Program.

The curriculum was designed around themes and centers of interest used in early childhood programs. Extensive use was made of materials selected from the culture of the Spanish speakers. English and Spanish stories and songs were adapted; some were written specially. Both English and Spanish were used in the classroom, Spanish about 60% of the time.

The material was so presented that there was continual repetition of language items and expression. The same story was told and dramatized in Spanish and English five or six times within a unit. Student responses moved progressively from listening to sustained dramatization; children were generally permitted to respond in either language. All presentations were live; puppets were used extensively; there were many games and dances.

Efforts were made to explain to the regular classroom teachers the aims of the program and to encourage them to do what they could to integrate the Bilingual Lesson in the rest of the day's activities.

A testing program at the end of the project gave some evidence of the results. The English speakers' Spanish pronunciation showed a normal distribution curve; the amount and kind of exposure had not been sufficient to establish near-native pronunciation. The Spanish speakers' English pronunciation was on the average better.

More important than the test results were the changes of attitude, showing an increased acceptance by both English-speaking and Spanish-speaking children of Spanish (some bilingual children who before the project denied all knowledge of Spanish were eager to act as native informants). Also of great importance was the carry-over to regular classes of the native Spanish speakers' willingness to communicate.

The project makes clear that it is possible to add a bilingual component to the normal curriculum in a bilingual community, and suggests that such a component can be of great benefit. It is clear of course that the study does not prove that any one approach to this bilingual component is better than any other: this is not a comparative study, but one that shows that specific materials, based on certain assumptions, appear to work satisfactorily.

It must be pointed out that there will be many who disagree with some of the assumptions, which are what might be called "sensibly modified audio-lingual." One particularly interesting assumption is that children will learn

a second language from someone who obviously speaks their first language. There is reason to believe that language learning will be faster (but necessarily more painful) if the learner is immersed in the second language. To the extent that this is true, providing a bilingual teacher dilutes the experience. But this problem remains to be resolved by empirical experience.

A major question that must be asked is how effective can a second language program be if it is restricted to fifteen minutes a day. Professor Finocchiaro clearly recognized this in the attempts made to provide some correlation with regular class activity. But can we expect someone to make any real progress in such a limited time? It should be noted that in a situation like this, where two languages are being learned, the program has a different function for each of the language groups. For the speakers of English, which is the language of instruction for the rest of the day and the status language, the Bilingual Lesson is away of establishing attitudes rather than of teaching a language. For the speakers of Spanish, the Bilingual Lesson is expected to serve first as a bridge between school and home ("this is the one place in school where they'll talk to you in your home language"), and secondly as the only part of the curriculum that recognizes that the child is learning English. For the rest of the day, he is expected to function as though he knew it. Stated like this, it is most unlikely that a fifteen-minute-a-day program will have any major effect on the major problems of education in a bilingual community; only radical programs, prepared to integrate the language-learning function into all parts of the curriculum will do this. One hopes that administrators will not be satisfied with bilingual readiness programs, but will work for bilingual education. But where this is not yet possible, Professor Finocchiaro's pioneer work will make it much easier for those who wish to add a bilingual lesson to a monolingual curriculum.

Milton Wohl. Classroom experiment to measure the relative efficiency of two different linguistic models in their application to the teaching of English as a foreign language. February 1967. ERIC Assession Number ED 013 449.

This document is the report of a three-month study funded by the Office of Education. It showed the feasibility of using certain transformational concepts, symbols, and terminology in a high school class in a private school in Quito, Ecuador.

The study was an attempt to apply certain features of transformational grammar to the EFL classroom. It was concerned not with the effect of ordering materials or of showing transformational relationships, but with the value of explicit use of the graphic devices and abstract symbols characteristic of the theory.

The experiment was a matched group design with both groups taught by the experimenter. This we are told was "in order to eliminate the variable of 'teacher performance,'" but it must be pointed out that it certainly added

a variable of observer bias. The subjects were girls in the first year of the secondary division of a small expensive private school. The experiment lasted three months, during which time there were five English classes a week. Materials used were specially prepared by the experimenter. Both groups were together in the classroom for the bulk of the lesson (dialogue, new vocabulary, and "grammar frame"); the control group left the room while the experimental group were presented with a one- to three-minute transformational analysis of the grammar pattern, followed by oral drills. The experimental group went out, and the control group were given the oral drills without the transformational analysis, but with a review of the grammar frame.

There were two pre-tests and four post-tests. Analysis showed no significant difference between the results obtained by the experimental group and those of the control test. The experimenter points out that, while there was no evidence then in favor of his hypothesis, there were no adverse effects suffered by the experimental group in their having learned some abstract grammatical symbols. He believes that the experiment shows that a two-year study of this kind might show significant results.

This study makes clear some of the difficulties in attempting to compare different "methods." A first point is that method is only one of the factors effective in controlling achievement in second language acquisition. The other factors—age, attitude, aptitude—are probably equally important, and unless carefully controlled, are likely to throw off the results of a study of methods. This is why almost all comparisons of methods are inconclusive. A second point is the problem of criteria for reduction. It is clear that the results are biased by the sort of test used: a careful analysis of any two sets of materials and of a proposed test will usually show which materials will produce the best test results. An obvious example is in the various attempts to compare "audio-lingual" and "traditional" language-testing methods, in which the students in the audio-lingual group do best on the tests of aural comprehension, and the "traditional" students do better in reading and translating.

It is clear then that in Wohl's experiment the amount of manipulation was so small as to have no obvious effect on the language-learning results: the small effects that his data record are easily explainable as the result of his own attitude toward the experimental method. It is hard to see why a study such as this needs to be dressed up as a full-blown experiment, with statistics and controls; it could have been reported as well as an account of an approach used by a teacher who found it successful.

Those who are interested in the question of the difference between the effects of explicitly presenting rules, as against merely giving examples, will find some discussion in the recent book by Edward Crothers and Patrick Suppes, *Experiment in Second-Language Learning* (Academic Press, 1967).

Review

LANGUAGE AND LIFE IN THE U. S.A., 2nd edition. Gladys Doty and Janet Ross (Harper and Row, 1968, 506 pp.).

The second edition of *Language and Life in the U.S.A.* shows extensive revision. Retaining the more efficacious features of the work, the authors have tightened the entire structure and made it more linguistically sound. There is sufficient material of various types to qualify the book for use as the sole text in a course at the intermediate level.

The introductory section clearly states basic principles of the sounds and rhythm of American English with some exercises and charts to aid the student in the pronunciation and intonation portions of the lessons that follow. Part I, "Communicating in English," is divided into fifteen lessons, each a well-devised miscellany of material on listening comprehension, sentence development, and pronunciation and rhythm with extensive exercises for both oral and written work. The exercises are developed sequentially to carry the student from pattern practice to free expression. Most of the exercises are workable and interesting, although a few of the intonation patterns seem somewhat unnatural. Further, there is perhaps too much variety within each lesson resulting in insufficient follow-through in patterns. Despite the theoreticians who oppose giving the student anything other than examples of the pattern to be followed, it would, perhaps, have been advantageous to retain the brief statements of rules found at the beginning of the exercises in the older edition. While cross-references to the expository material in the appendix are extremely helpful, going back and forth is time-consuming and awkward.

Part II, "Reading English," is a series of seventeen graded essays on the people, history, and customs of the United States. Fortunately, Professors Doty and Ross have retained the admirable introductory essay on methods of reading a foreign language. If students followed the guidelines set forth on these pages, half of their reading problems would be solved. The essays, covering numerous facets of American life from tipping customs to the nation's political parties, are of real interest and provoke some lively discussions which, though they may slow down the rate of progress through the lessons, are invaluable to the students. The comprehension, vocabulary, grammar, and rhetoric exercises which accompany each essay, extensive both in scope and depth, constitute one of the principal assets of the book.

The greatest difficulty is in knowing how to use the book. This reviewer taught the book during the twelve-week summer term and found a successful approach. Rather than to go all the way through Part I and then through Part II, a better method is to alternate lessons between Part I and Part II, thus providing variety and avoiding the glaze of torpor that may result for student and teacher alike from too much of the same routine. Also, there is too much material here to be covered comfortably in one semester but not quite enough for two semesters. It seems wisest to use the book for one semester and to be selective, according to the needs of the

class, about what is included, thus making the abundance of material a definite asset. Being somewhat advanced for those still struggling with basic sentence patterns, the text is more appropriate for an upper intermediate class than for a lower intermediate class.

The appendix contains much useful supplementary material on grammar and letter writing, as well as an effective statement of rules of punctuation accompanied by a comprehensive exercise which not only exemplifies the rules but also offers a concise explanation of the various holidays observed in the United States. The term "Appendix" for this excellent and really indispensable material is an unhappy choice as it may cause the teacher and student to pass it over as of little or no consequence.

Despite the rather minor problems indicated, the book is a fine choice not only for the veteran but also for the inexperienced teacher in that the material, in content and sequence within the lesson, provides the method of teaching. It is surely the most complete textbook in the field and its substance is both scholarly and practical.

Joyce Merrill Valdes
University of Houston

ERIC - TESOL Documents

The following are TESOL documents which have been selected from those processed by the ERIC Clearinghouse for Linguistics and entered in the ERIC system. Articles from *TESOL Quarterly* or materials which have been reviewed in *TESOL Quarterly* have been omitted.

Where indicated, hard copies (HC) and microfiche (MF) of the full text are available through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service, The National Cash Register Company, 4936 Fairmont Avenue, Bethesda, Maryland, 20014. Copies of documents must be ordered by the individual ED numbers. Prices are given for microfiche (MF) and hard copy (HC). Payment must accompany orders totaling less than \$5.00. For orders totaling less than \$3.00, add \$.50 for handling. In the U.S. add sales tax as applicable. Foreign orders must be accompanied by a 25 per cent service charge, calculated to the nearest cent.

ED 017 925 *Spoken English for Turks*. SHELDON WISE AND OTHERS. 1967. (Document not available from EDRS.)

Spoken English for Turks, based on Robert B. Lees' *Konusulan Ingilizce* (Washington, D.C., American Council of Learned Societies, 1957), comprises a graded and controlled series of beginning to advanced texts for Turkish students of English at college preparatory level. Oral-aural in approach, a key feature of the series is its use of a contrastive analysis of English and Turkish. The elementary level texts provide for extensive practice in pronunciation and basic grammar structures, presented in phonemic transcription (adapted from Lees). Turkish equivalents for these practices and for explanatory notes in the grammar and drill sections appear beside the transcription. Conventional English spelling is introduced on the intermediate level, and used exclusively on the advanced level. Structural buildups with grammar drills are introduced first in each lesson, and are followed by culminating dialogs. Pattern practice types include replacement, conversion, and response drills. A special foreword to the teacher is contained in Book One. Accompanying the 16 students' texts are tape recordings, two vocabularies, an index, and a teachers' guide. These materials (the fourth edition, revised) are published by Robert College, Istanbul, Turkey.

ED 018 788 *Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages, United States Activities—1967*. RUTH E. WINEBERG, ed. 15p. Apr 1968. MF-\$0.25 HC-\$0.68.

This report summarizes a number of United States activities in teaching English to speakers of other languages (TESOL), covering roughly the year 1967. Although not exhaustive, it provides descriptions of new programs and significant developments in ongoing programs, compiled from information supplied by federal, state, and city government agencies, as well as universities, foundations, and other private organizations. In four parts, the areas represented are the following: (1) general activities, (2) English language teaching and teacher training overseas, (3) English language teaching and teacher training in the United States, and (4) materials development and testing. This report was prepared by the English for Speakers of Other Languages Program of the Center for Applied Linguistics for the Ninth International Conference on Second Language Problems, held in Tunis, April 24-27, 1968.

ED 018 789 *The Teaching of English as a Second or Foreign Language, British Activities 1967/68*. 15p. Apr 1968. MF-\$0.25 HC-\$0.68.

This report has been compiled from various sources by the English-Teaching Information Centre of the British Council for the Ninth International Conference on Second Language Problems, held in Tunis, April 1968. (See "Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages, United States Activities—1967," published by the Center for Applied Linguistics.) While not intended as a comprehensive survey, it covers the most important new developments and the significant expansion of existing projects in TESOL. Items are listed under the following: (1) recent research projects in Britain, (2) English as a second language course, (3) organizations and associations, (4) overseas projects based in Britain, (5) international conferences, (6) teaching materials, resources, and programs, and (7) examinations in English. Details of activities in the Maghreb (Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia, and Libya) and Senegal are appended. Further information on the projects and this document may be obtained from the English-Teaching Information Centre (ETIC), State House, 63 High Holborn, London, W.C.1, England.

ED 018 790 *Audio-Visual Material for English Language Teaching—A Catalogue*. Oct. 1967. (Document not available from EDRS.)

This catalog prepared by the British Council contains information on tapes, phonograph records, films, and programmed materials concerned with the teaching of English as a foreign language. British publishers are covered "as comprehensively as possible" and materials published in Western Europe and the United States have also been included. Part One lists courses on records or tapes as follows: (1) general courses, (2) elementary, intermediate, and advanced stage courses and language material, (3) specialized language material, (4) materials for teachers and teacher training, and (5) materials not commercially available. Parts Two and Three list films, and programmed materials and courses for teaching machines. Appendixes list publishers, authors and titles, and courses aimed at speakers of specific languages. This 101-page catalog is a second edition, published by Longmans Green and Company, Limited, 48 Grosvenor Street, London W.1, England.

ED 018 798 *Suggested Activities for Non-English Speaking Beginners, The First Week*. 26p. MF-\$0.25 HC-\$1.12.

This plan, covering the first five days of a bilingual first grade class, was designed to aid beginning teachers of non-English-speaking children meet some of the situations they will encounter. (Special emphasis is on Spanish-speaking children.) The daily schedule is presented as a guide to be adjusted according to need. In addition to the suggested activities and materials, the English phrases and sentences appropriate to the classroom and playground situations are included, with their Spanish equivalents. (A knowledge of Spanish on the part of the teacher is apparently assumed.) Sources of the records, puppets, and books mentioned are listed with addresses. The address of the Region One Education Service Center is 101 North 8th Street, Edinburg, Texas, 78539.

ED 018 799 *Writing Laboratories—A New Approach to Teaching Composition*. KARL C. SANDBERG. 4p. Apr 1967. MF-\$0.25 HC-\$0.24.

At the Economics Institute of the University of Colorado, a summer orientation program for foreign graduate students in economics, an approach to the teaching of composition has been developed which involves the use of writing laboratories based on the principles of the aural-oral language laboratory.

The basic principle of the latter is that by means of electronic equipment the student has the opportunity of extended self-correcting practice of materials introduced in class. The immediate verification of his response is built into the program. The writing laboratory as used by the author consists of a small group of about seven to ten students who practice composition under the supervision of an instructor. A typical session lasts for about one and a half hours. The instructor circulates among the students, correcting their lexical and structural mistakes, suggesting additional vocabulary, and pointing out stylistic devices which will make the writing more effective. The student keeps his corrected assignment in a folder which he brings each time, permitting a cumulative analysis of the types of mistakes which he tends to make. Several basic linguistic and psychological principles must be kept in mind in preparing materials for this type of writing exercise: (1) the student must not be asked to perform on a significantly higher level of proficiency than he is prepared for, and (2) while the student is still on levels two and three, emphasis on form (the manipulation of the structures) should precede emphasis on the content of the composition. A sample drill practicing past tense narration is presented. This paper was read at the national NAFLSA meetings in Houston, Texas, April 1967, and appears in the *Arizona Foreign Language Teachers' Forum*, Volume XV, Number 3, published by the Department of Romance Languages of the University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona, 85721.

ED 018 801 *Guide for Teaching English as a Second Language to Elementary School Pupils. Level II, Part 1.* ROBERT WILSON AND OTHERS. 281p. Feb 1968. MF-\$1.25 HC-\$11.32.

The 55 audio-lingual lesson units of *Teaching English Early* are designed as a guide for the teacher of elementary grade children who have reached Level II in English as a second language. Aimed primarily at the Spanish-speaking (Mexican-American) child, this prereading material may be used with other language backgrounds. (See the final report and summary of this project in ED 018 803, which contains the rationale for this approach.) Each lesson unit is presented in three sections: (1) lesson content, e.g., the basic structures and sounds to be taught, and occasional tests, such as team games and guessing games; (2) materials, e.g., the realia and other teaching aids necessary for teaching the lesson, upon which the lesson is based; and (3) procedures, e.g., the detailed account of each step of the lesson. (Some steps are suggestions only, with details left to the teacher's discretion.) Side notes provide additional information concerning predicted phonological and syntactic problems, as well as suggested teaching techniques. The format is simplified, with a minimum of technical terminology, but it is assumed that the teacher is linguistically oriented and thoroughly familiar with the materials and methods of the course.

ED 018 802 *Guide for Teaching English as a Second Language to Elementary School Pupils. Level II, Part 2.* ROBERT WILSON AND OTHERS. 325p. Feb 1968. MF-\$1.25 HC-\$13.06.

This volume comprises Lessons 56-115 of the second level of *Teaching English Early*. Following the same format as Level II, Part 1, the approach is still oral-aural, emphasizing classroom activities and "acting-out" with puppets. Somewhat more emphasis is given to "free dialog" and a greater variety of activities. See related documents ED 018 803, the final report and summary of the materials preparation project, and ED 018 801, *Teaching English Early, Level II, Part 1*.

ED 018 803 *Guide for Teaching English as a Secondary Language to Elementary School Pupils*. ROBERT WILSON AND OTHERS. 75p. Mar 1968. MF-\$0.50 HC-\$3.08.

This document is a final report and summary of a project designed to develop guides for teaching English as a second language to elementary school pupils. The guides are now titled *Teaching English Early*, and cover the first two levels of instruction. (See related documents ED 018 801 and ED 018 802.) The materials prepared by this project are organized in a series of carefully sequenced daily lessons based on audio-lingual principles of learning and are written for a situation in which eight or ten children are taken from their regular classroom each day for approximately a half-hour of special instruction. Each lesson includes review and evaluation activities as well as special directions to the teacher planned to guide effective presentation of the material. This report includes a description of two studies comparing the growth in language efficiency of children receiving special instruction for a half hour daily using the Project Materials with matched groups receiving no special instruction. These studies give strong evidence that the children receiving instruction through the use of the Project Materials compare favorably in their ability to use English with children of their own age group who speak English as their native language. Also included in this report is a description of activities and rationale, conclusions, and recommendations, as well as appended outlines of the sequence of syntactic structures and the phonology.

ED 018 804 *Some Applications to Television and Radio to the Teaching of English as a Second Language in Northern Nigeria*. R. THOMAS KINCAID. 20p. Nov 1967. MF-\$0.25 HC-\$0.88.

This report presents a description of the activities, accomplishments, host government contributions, problems, and recommendations made concerning the two-year project in which television and radio were used as media for teaching English as a second language in Northern Nigeria. A series of telecasts (eight 20-minute scripts) entitled "The Sounds of English" were prepared for the first school term of 1966. The telecasts for the ensuing two terms in 1966 and three terms in 1967 followed the arrangement, sequence, and time table of the "standard" Northern Nigeria school text *Straight for English*. In addition to these 132 TV (and radio) scripts (which were written to complement the prescribed texts), teachers' notes and guides, weekly time tables, and visual aids were prepared. Some of the special features of the project include: (1) integration of the pupils' textbooks with the syllabus, time tables, and tests, (2) an emphasis on pupil participation, (3) an emphasis on orientation for and consultation with the teachers using the materials, and (4) an emphasis on achievement evaluation. (A report on the evaluation of the tests administered is forthcoming.) Additional information concerning the scripts and this project may be obtained by writing to the Radio/TV advisor of the project, R. T. Kincaid, 1131 University Blvd. West (418), Silver Spring, Maryland, 20902.

ED 019 675 *Selected List of Materials for Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages*. SIRARPI OGHANNESSIAN AND DOROTHY A. PEDTKE. 17p. Oct 1967. MF-\$0.25 HC-\$0.76.

This listing of selected textbooks and background materials is a revised version of previous lists prepared for American teachers going overseas to teach English. This version, which also takes into account the teacher of English

to speakers of other languages in the United States, provides an indication of the variety of approaches in the background materials for teachers and the types of instructional materials available for the various age and achievement levels of students. A few British works have been included to represent a non-American approach. (For a more comprehensive coverage, see ED 014 723 *Reference List of Materials for English as a Second Language, Part I, Texts, Readers, Dictionaries, Tests, and ED 014 724 Reference List of Materials for English as a Second Language, Part II, Background Materials, Methodology.*) Presented in two main sections—Background Materials in Linguistics, and Methodology and Instructional Materials—some of the items are school texts for English grammar based on the findings of modern linguistics, and are intended for students who are native speakers of English. They are included to give the teacher an introduction to this field and to provide information on some aspects of the language which traditional grammars do not cover. A list of the publishers and their addresses is appended. Single copies of *Selected List of Materials* may be obtained free (additional copies \$0.25 each) from the English for Speakers of Other Languages Program, Center for Applied Linguistics, 1717 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C., 20036.

ED 020 490 *A Fact Sheet Concerning Closed Circuit Instructional Television for English Language Teaching.* Sp. Mar 1967. MF-\$0.25 HC-\$0.40.

This "fact sheet" is a description of a project financed by the Asia Foundation and the Sogang Jesuit College in Seoul, Korea, in 1966. The project was designed to develop more effective English language teaching techniques at Sogang College which may later be applied to broadcast instructional television in Korea. Described are the following: (1) the key principles operative in the schedule, (2) a sample schedule, (3) the materials used (audio lab tapes and *Spoken American English* by William Clark), (4) an "ideal" design for a foreign language course as proposed by John B. Carroll in 1953 and how this program compares with it, (5) the instructional television film format, and (6) student comments which indicate that they found the TV and printed words on the screen helpful and gained a new awareness of the meaningfulness of gestures and actions. Appended is a translation of the results of a questionnaire given to the freshmen after two weeks of study with the TV presentations of English dialogs.

ED 020 493 *From Theory to Practice—Some Critical Observations on the Organization and Assessment of Teaching Practice for Prospective English Language Teachers.* ALUN L. W. REES. 11p. Sep 1967. MF-\$0.25 HC-\$0.52.

The author discusses the "Practice Class" as it is implemented in the final year of the five-year course for secondary school teachers of English at the National University of Trujillo. The Peruvian student-teacher (with 56 hours of theoretical instruction, in addition to a background in linguistics) conducts a minimum of 15 one-hour practice classes approved and supervised by appointed members of the staff. The practice classes are carried out in local secondary schools with groups of 25 to 40 boys or girls whose ages range from 11 to 19. A supervisor ("tutor") observes and later discusses his observations with the trainee and other trainees who may be observing. A culminating class session is conducted before a jury of three—two tutors and the Head of the Department. A secret ballot determines passing or failing. The other proceedings (carried out in English) are open to the public, according to a University regulation. The author also discusses recent improve-

ments in the Language Department which have a wide range of applicability. This article appeared in *Lenguaje Y Ciencias*, Number 25 (September 1967), published by the Universidad Nacional de Trujillo in Trujillo, Peru.

ED 020 497 *Basic Education for Spanish-Speaking Disadvantaged Pupils*. ELIZABETH H. OTT. 23p. MF-\$0.25 HC-\$1.00.

A bilingual education program has been field tested in San Antonio, Texas, in classes of disadvantaged Mexican-American children. This Southwest Educational Development Laboratory (SWEDL) Program is also applicable to teaching French Acadians and Negro Americans. The strength of the program, according to the author, lies in what it does to change the children. It helps them become "intellectually curious, profoundly sensitive to opportunities around them, and friendly and responsive human beings." By talking first about an impersonal subject like science, the children gain language proficiency and confidence which enables them to move toward learning about social studies and how they fit into the larger world beyond their neighborhoods. Reading in the two languages is introduced early and is based on what they have learned to understand and use orally. Subject materials are taught in both Spanish and English at separate periods during the day. A description of Horn's Language Research Project (begun in 1964 and still ongoing in the San Antonio School District) and the Ott Study (the Spanish-English Fluency Test which was given to children participating in the Horn Project) is followed by test data.

ED 020 504 *The Lingua Plan*. FRIEDA B. LIBAW. Mar 1968. (Document not available from EDRS.)

Included in this document are the rationale and outline of *The Lingua Plan*, a bilingual education program developed by the staff of the Galton Institute to improve the primary education of Mexican-American children who enter kindergarten with little or no knowledge of English. The major purpose of Project Lingua is to determine whether (1) classroom use of the child's native language, (2) special materials written to reflect Mexican-American cultural values, or (3) a combination of both is most effective in raising the level of educational achievement of Spanish-speaking Mexican-American children. The comparative effectiveness of these different factors would be tested through actual classroom teaching. Procedures to implement the plan are described in this document and center on (1) selection of children and teachers, (2) implementation (teacher training, curriculum development), (3) evaluation, and (4) dissemination of findings. Appended are a review of other bilingual education programs and three bibliographies of recent work in this area, children's books in Spanish, and lists of Spanish classroom materials. The publisher of this document is The Galton Institute, P.O. Box 35336, Preuss Station, Los Angeles, California, 90035.

ED 020 505 *Running a Language Laboratory*. ALUN L. W. REES. 13 p. Mar 1968. MF-\$0.25 HC-\$0.60.

This article describes the language laboratory at the National University of Trujillo as it is used in the five-year English teacher-training program. The first two years of this course are intensive, based on a study of English using Lado-Fries materials (for Latin American learners) which require five hours of classwork a week supplemented by five hours in the language lab. Classes are scheduled by the hour with different monitors for the various groups. A regular 50-minute session begins with a free conversation warm-up, after which

books and other student paraphernalia are removed before drills begin. A short break after the first 25 minutes (for roll call) is followed by a short language game and further drills. The four-phase drills (which accompany the Lado-Fries materials) offer a variety of oral work and range of voices. Students are strictly monitored by a teacher listening in, and structural errors and careless pronunciation are corrected on the spot. More fundamental problems are noted on slips and sent to the classroom teachers. A practical discussion of the care and cataloging of the tapes concludes the paper. This article appeared in *Lenguaje y Ciencias*, published by the Universidad Nacional de Trujillo, in Trujillo, Peru.

ED 020 523 *Speech-Communication Learning System*. Volume One, Learner's Handbook. PAUL HEINBERG AND OTHERS. 52p. 1968. MF-\$0.25 HC-\$2.16.

This programed *Learner's Handbook* is designed to be used in the *Speech-Communication Learning System* in the Speech Communication Center at the University of Hawaii. The purpose of the course, intended primarily for speakers of non-standard English dialect in Hawaii, is to "develop a style of speech which is intelligible and acceptable in a wide variety of situations throughout the United States." The majority of learners complete the entire "learning system" in 10 to 15 hours, using the programed material and tapes with guidance from a "Tutor" and a progress "Evaluator." Variables selected for testing are (1) eye-contact, (2) loudness, (3) voice-quality, (4) pitch, (5) rate of sentence production, and (6) articulation. The approach is innovative, emphasizing an awareness of paralinguistics, rather than the linguistic content and form of English.

ED 020 524 *Speech-Communication Learning System*. Volume Two, Scripts of All Audio Programs. PAUL HEINBERG AND OTHERS. 110p. 1968. MF-\$0.50 HC-\$4.48.

This volume contains the scripts of the taped materials to be used with the Learner's Handbook in the *Speech-Communication Learning System* at the Speech Communication Center at the University of Hawaii. See related document ED 020 523.

Publications Received

- Alter, Jason B., Roy W. Collier, and Miho Tanaka Steinberg. *Utterance-Response Drills for Students of English as a Second Language*. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1966.
- Applied Linguistics: A Survey for Language Teachers*. Monika Kehoe, ed. New York: Collier-Macmillan International, 1968.
- CEA Critic*, XXXI, 1 (October, 1968). Saratoga Springs, New York: The College English Association.
- English Pronunciation: A Manual for Teachers*. English Language Services, Inc., New York: Collier-Macmillan International, 1968.
- ERIC Clearinghouse for Linguistics*, Bulletin No. 6 (September, 1968) and Bulletin No. 7 (November, 1968).
- Problems in Foreign Language Testing*. Special Issue Number 3 of *Language Learning* (August, 1968).
- Survey of Language Use and Language Teaching in Eastern Africa*, I, 4 (August, 1968) and II, 1 (November, 1968).
- TEFL: A Bulletin for the Teaching of English as a Foreign Language*, II, 3 (June, 1968). American University of Beirut: Center for English Language Research and Teaching.
- TESL Reporter*, II, 1 (Fall 1968). Laie, Hawaii: English Language Institute, The Church College of Hawaii.