TESOL QUARTERLY

Table of Contents

To print, select PDF page nos. in parentheses

TESOL QUARTERLY

A Journal for Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages

In Memoriam

Tommy R. Anderson

1933-1969

Assistant Professor of English

University of California

Los Angeles

Adrian L. Hull

1904-1970

General Supervisor of English

Department of Public Instruction

Puerto Rico

What Do We Learn When We Learn a Language?*

Robert L. Cooper

Language-teaching methods and materials are motivated in part by our conception of what it is we are teaching and in part by our notions of how students learn. Four assumptions which underlie the audiolingual method of second language teaching are presented and their adequacy examined. It is argued (1) that the importance we place on spoken skills is arbitrary; (2) that it is not yet possible to specify explicitly all of the components of linguistic or communicative competence; (3) that what we can specify does not have an isomorphic relationship to linguistic performance; and (4) that language learning is not accomplished primarily via a process of habit formation. Alternatively, two propositions are offered: (1) successful use of language requires the acquisition of communicative as well as linguistic competence and (2) first and second language learning are analogous processes.

The way we teach a subject is motivated in part by our conceptions of what it is we are teaching and in part by our notions of how students learn. If we were asked to teach mathematics to primary school children, for example, our methods would differ according to the way we viewed our subject matter, whether as a collection of discrete facts, or as a set of mechanical routines, or as a coherent, logical system. Similarly, our procedures would vary according to the way we believed children best learned mathematical operations, whether through repetitive practice, or through attending to explicit descriptions of the underlying principles and relationships involved, or through induction of principles from examples.

Similarly, our methods and procedures for teaching English to speakers of other languages are determined by our assumptions as to what it is we are teaching and as to how it is learned. When, for example, should the teacher introduce reading and writing? His decision will depend in part upon his view of what it is he is teaching. If he views speech as the primary output of the language system or if he views reading and writing as secondary and derivative or as less important than speech, he is likely to postpone the introduction of the printed word. His decision will also depend in part on his assumptions regarding the principles of second language learning. He will be more likely to introduce the written word alongside that of the spoken word if he believes that learners can exploit their visual abilities

---

and their knowledge of sound-symbol correspondences in the learning of spoken skills. On the other hand, he will be more likely to postpone the introduction of the printed symbols if he believes that orthographic symbolization will somehow interfere with the learning of the spoken system.

The assumptions we hold as language teachers are not necessarily consistent. For example, we may assume that first language learning and second language learning are fundamentally different and that therefore second language learning requires more than the random exposure to language which is sufficient for first language learning. Those of us who believe this may also believe that second language learners should learn *to* speak the second language before they learn to read it on the grounds that children learn to speak before they learn to read. Clearly the justification for the second assumption is incompatible with the first.

To some extent, the inconsistencies which may be found lurking among our assumptions are due to the fact that many of our beliefs about language and learning are unexamined or implicit. That is, we operate on the basis of implicit assumptions in much the same way that speakers of English produce and understand English sentences—without explicit knowledge or conscious awareness of the rules constraining performance. It is the purpose of this paper to make some of our more commonly held assumptions explicit and to examine their adequacy.

Just as English can be viewed as a set of dialects, which vary in degree of mutual intelligibility, so can English language teaching be viewed as a set of dialectics, which vary in degree of mutual believability. And just as some dialects have more prestige than others, some dialectics are more valued than others. In America there is little question that the audiolingual approach to teaching has more prestige, or at any rate a greater following, than other approaches. It is the assumptions which appear to underlie this school of thought that will be examined here.

The audiolingual approach is distinguished by the following features. First it places great emphasis on speech, not only as a goal of instruction but also as the medium of instruction. Second, listening (discrimination, comprehension) is taught before speaking, and listening and speaking are taught before reading and writing, when a given item, structure, or pattern is introduced. Third, the use of the student's first language is minimized and translation is discouraged. Fourth, explicit statements by the teacher about the nature of what is being learned are discouraged. Finally, great importance is placed upon mimicry, memorization of prepared dialogues, and repetitive substitution and transformation drills in which patterns are varied in controlled ways. In addition, many (but not all) audiolingual systems attempt to introduce items in a series of carefully controlled, graded materials based upon a systematic analysis of the language to be learned. Where all the students in the class speak the same first language, many audiolingual programs also rely on analyses which contrast the structures of the target language with those of the first language of the students.

There appear to be several assumptions underlying these procedures, among which are the following: (1) speech is primary, writing secondary (2) what is learned can be specified; (3) descriptions of what the student learns can account for what the student does; and (4) language learning takes place as a process of habit formation. Let us examine each of these in turn.

Is Speech Primary?

The assumption that speech is primary stems from the linguists' traditional view of speech as the primary data of linguistics and from the historical circumstance that linguists were responsible for instituting the first widely used audiolingual programs. Writing is considered secondary not only because it is of less interest to linguists, however, but also because it is thought of as a "derivative" system, with speech the basic, underlying code. To some extent this view is justified. However, the written system of English does have conventions of its own, which must be learned independently of the spoken system. The emphasis on speech is sometimes justified on the grounds that quicker mastery of the written system will be attained if instruction in the spoken system is given first. There is little evidence to support such a view. On the contrary, students seem to learn the skills which are emphasized in the instruction. Thus, Scherer and Wertheimer (1964), who compared the effectiveness of audiolingual procedures with that of the traditional grammar-translation method in teaching German to American college students, found that at the end of the first year of instruction the audiolingually taught students were superior to the traditionally taught students in listening comprehension and speaking but inferior to them in reading and writing. It would seem therefore that the primacy of speech is best justified as an assumption when spoken skills are the primary goals of instruction.

Can What Is Learned Be Specific?

Reliance on pattern practice drills, contrastive analysis, or graded, carefully controlled materials implies that we can specify enough of what it is the learner has to know to enable him to learn English. Our assumption is that if the student masters the material presented in successive drills and if the content of the drills or pattern practice is carefully enough designed and controlled, the student will learn English. We assume that we have been able to introduce, in a systematic and principled way, all that the student has to know. While it is true that certain items can be introduced systematically, it is clear that at our present state of knowledge there is far more that cannot be introduced systematically.

If we refer to the model of linguistic competence employed by the generative transformationalists (Chomsky, 1965) we can identify three components: a syntactic component, a phonological component, and a semantic component. The syntactic component enables speakers to assign structural

descriptions to sentences. Knowledge of the syntactic component enables speakers to distinguish grammatical English sentences, e.g., **The boy is hitting the ball,** from non grammatical ones, e.g., ***The is ball hitting boy the.** Knowledge of the syntactic component also enables speakers to identify two sentences with identical structures; e.g., speakers would agree that the sentences **The boy is here** and **The girl is here** are structurally identical, whereas they would also agree that the sentences The boy is here and Is the boy here are not structurally identical. Knowledge of syntax also enables speakers to identify syntactically ambiguous sentences so that speakers would agree that the sentence **He likes entertaining girls** has two syntactic interpretations.

Knowledge of the phonological component enables speakers to assign phonetic interpretations to sentences. That is, phonological competence allows speakers to produce and attend to those phonetic features of the stream of speech which are semantically empty but criteria]. So, for example, in the sentence **The ship is here,** speakers of English will interpret the vowel in ship as /r/. Let us imagine, however, a speaker who has perfect command of English syntax but no knowledge of English phonology (e.g., a speaker of Spanish who has learned English from reading but has never heard it spoken). He would be able to assign a syntactic description to this sentence; e.g., he would know that the sentences **The ship is here** and **The sheep is here** were structurally identical. However, he would not be able to distinguish the two sentences without contextual clues because he would not attend to the difference between /ɪ/ and /i/ which is criterial for speakers of English but not for speakers of Spanish.

The semantic system enables speakers to interpret sentences. If a speaker knew only the syntax of English, he would know that the two sentences **The boy is here** and **The girl is here** were structurally identical. However, he would not know that the two sentences differed in meaning. Knowledge of semantics enables speakers to give different semantic interpretations to sentences which are structurally identical. Conversely, knowledge of semantics enables speakers to assign the same interpretation to sentences which are structurally different, e.g., **The boy hit the ball** and **The ball was hit by the boy.** Also, knowledge of semantics enables speakers to identify anomalies. For example, speakers of English would identify as anomalous Chomsky's (1957) famous sentence **Colorless green ideas sleep furiously,** or such sequences as **The table laughed** or the **dainty elephant.** In addition, knowledge of the semantic component enables speakers to detect semantic ambiguities. For example, speakers of English could assign two semantic interpretations to the sentence **We saw the late Mr. Smith.**

The transformational generative grammarians have greatly increased our ability to specify the knowledge which a speaker must have if he is to produce and understand the sentences of a language. They would not claim, however, that there is now a completely adequate grammar of English in the

sense that such a grammar could specify completely the native speaker's syntactic, phonological, and semantic competencies. Available specifications of syntactic and phonological competence are closer to adequacy, however, than are specifications of semantic competence. It is probably fair to say that there is not even a general agreement among linguists as to the boundaries of semantic theory or the form that such a theory should take. Thus we cannot claim to be able to specify completely the native speaker's linguistic competence with respect to syntax and phonology, and we are far from being able to do so with respect to semantics.

One of the transformational generative grammarians' greatest contributions to language teaching has been their emphasis on the creative aspect of language. In their view, a language is an infinite set of sentences, and linguistic competence, in principle, enables a speaker to produce and understand any and all of the sentences in this set. If as language teachers we agree with this view, our task becomes one of enabling students to produce and understand novel utterances. However, as Hymes (1966) has pointed out, anyone who went about uttering any and all the sentences of English, without attending to whom he was speaking or where, would be quickly institutionalized. Speakers must know when to speak and when to be silent. They must know what to say, to whom, and when, and where, and for what purposes. Speakers, in other words, need more than linguistic competence. They need in Hymes' term, communicative competence. Just as linguists try to make our linguistic competence explicit, sociolinguists try to make our communicative competence explicit. But if linguists have not yet succeeded in specifying our linguistic competence, sociolinguists are even further from being able to specify completely and explicitly the social rules which constrain our performance.

At this point, language teachers may be tempted to throw up their hands with the exclamation that it is difficult enough to impart linguistic competence without having to worry about communicative competence as well. Whether or not the task is difficult is essentially irrelevant, however. If we were trying to teach someone to swim, for example, we would not be satisfied with simply teaching him to enter the water. Nor would we be happy if all we could do was to teach him to float. Similarly, we would not be happy if all he could do was to thrash wildly about. We would not be satisfied until he could propel himself in a straight line through the water without his feet touching the ground, i.e., we would not be satisfied until he could swim. A speaker who has linguistic competence but not communicative competence would be in a situation somewhat analogous to that of the person who can manage to enter the water but who can proceed in a straight line only so long as his feet touch the ground.

Of course, the knowledge required for communicative competence may be more obvious in some societies than in others. In east central Java, for example, speakers of a given social dialect employ different lexical items depending in part on the status relationships and degree of intimacy be-

tween interlocutors (Geertz, 1960). Inadvertent use of the incorrect set of lexical items may alter the interpretation intended. In America, distinctions between the forms of speech which are appropriate for different social situations may not be so clear, but this is not to say that they need not be learned. To take an extreme example, a boy who has learned English by reading literary essays would probably be seriously misunderstood (even, or perhaps particularly, if his pronunciation were native-like) if he attempted to communicate in English with a group of American boys in a locker room or on a ball field. His communicative difficulties would be caused only in part by gaps in vocabulary or terminology. Misunderstanding would also arise from his use of structures which might be quite appropriate for literary purposes but quite inappropriate for casual speech among peers.

Whether difficult to impart or not, therefore, the speaker must have communicative competence if he is to communicate within the target speech community. We must not confuse difficulty in describing the components of knowledge with difficulty in learning it, however. The only claim being made at this point is that we cannot specify all of the knowledge which a speaker must acquire to enable him to use a language. Thus, our students would never learn English if they depended on us to present to them in a systematic, graded, carefully controlled fashion all the components of the criterion skill.

Can What Is Specified Account for Performance?

The use of carefully controlled material based on a linguistic description of the language to be learned, which is a frequent concomitant of audiolingual programs, implies a one-to-one relationship between linguistic descriptions and the performance of the speaker. Linguistic descriptions, however, are not models of performance (Chomsky, 1965). Our actual use of language results from a complex interaction between what we know about the language (our competence) and various cognitive capacities. The nature of this interaction is not well understood. Its effects are clear enough however in such behaviors as our inability to comprehend certain types of complex sentences which are nonetheless grammatical from the point of view of a linguistic description. Another example can be seen in the failure of contrastive phonological analyses to predict in all cases the difficulties faced in the learning of a target phonology. Although a contrastive analysis does, in general, seem to predict what phonemes in the target language a student from a given first language background will have difficulty in distinguishing, the predictions are not uniformly accurate. Phonological contrasts for which difficulty is predicted sometimes prove not to be difficult and vice versa. Difficulty must, in th end, be determined empirically (Brière, 1966). Another example of the lack of a necessary relationship between linguistic descriptions and performance can be found in studies of mutual intelligibility among related languages. If linguistic descriptions were necessarily also descriptions of performance, one would expect that speakers of different but related lan-

guages would understand each other more easily if the phonological and syntactic systems of one language were similar to those of the other. In fact there seems to be no necessary agreement between the degree of phonological and syntactic similarity exhibited by two languages on the one hand and the degree to which speakers of one language will understand speakers of the other (Ferguson and Gumperz, 1960). The point of these examples is not that linguistic descriptions are irrelevant to performance but, instead, that linguistic (or sociolinguistic) descriptions are not sufficient to account for our actual performance. Thus, even if explicit linguistic and sociolinguistic descriptions of the target language were available we would still not be able to account entirely for the performance of the speaker.

Does Language Learning Occur Through Habit Formation?

The almost universal reliance of audiolingual courses on drills-whether substitution drills, transformation drills, question and answer drills, or other types of pattern practice-can be justified in terms of a conception of language as a collection of mechanically formed habits which are acquired through the forging of stimulus-response bonds. According to this view, frequent pairing of a correct response with a reinforcement (the teacher's acknowledgement of the response's correctness) results in the response being learned. Thus, great stress is placed on overlearning, i.e., the frequent repetition of the target response. As a corollary of this position, the responses to be elicited from the student are carefully controlled, not only to ensure adequate practice of the desired forms or patterns but also to prevent the student from uttering deviant forms or patterns, which might be inadvertently learned if allowed to occur.

The difficulties inherent in this position have been pointed out many times in terms of language learning generally (Chomsky, 1959) as well as in terms of second language learning specifically (e.g., Spolsky, 1966; Saporta, 1966). Part of the criticism stems from the transformationalist view of the sentence as having a latent, deep, or unobservable set of underlying structures, which are transformed into the manifest, surface structures of speech by means of transformational rules. Thus even such a sentence as **The boy runs** can be viewed as having an underlying structure analogous to **The boy singular verb run.** The transformationalists ask how stimulus-response theories of learning can account for the learning of structures which are not manifest.

The view of language learning as a collection of habits also runs into difficulty in terms of the recursive feature of language. That is, such a view does not account very well for our being able to identify the interrelationships between two items in a sentence when the items are separated by other items. For example in the sentence **The people who came to dinner are friends of mine,** the items **people** and **are** are linked. To explain the learning which enables the speaker to produce the correct form of the main verb in that sentence through a process of habit formation

would require the speaker to have learned specifically and separately the linkage of items when separated by one, two, three, etc. other items. To claim that the habit which is learned in this case is not the association between items when separated by a given number of other items but instead that it is the relationship between subject and verb is to say that habit formation is not responsible for learning, since the subject and verb are abstract structures, i.e., not manifest.

The habit formation view of language learning also fails to account for the speaker's ability to produce and understand novel utterances. If what is learned are habits, how can we understand sentences we have never heard before? Stimulus-response psychologists would attempt to overcome this objection by appealing to a process of generalization. The weakness of such an argument can be illustrated by the relationships which exist among the following sentences.

    (1) John asked Mary.
    (2) John promised Mary.
    (3) John asked Mary to leave.
    (4) John promised Mary to leave.
    (5) John asked Mary if she would leave.
    (6) *John promised Mary if she would leave.
    (7) John promised Mary that he would leave.
    (8) *John asked Mary that he would leave.

If the student learned (1), (2), and (3), a theory of generalization would predict that the student would accept (4) as grammatical. In this case the prediction would be correct since (4) is grammatical. If the student learned (5) as well, however, generalization would also predict that the student would accept (6) as grammatical. But (6) is *not* grammatical. Similarly, if the student learned (1), (2), (3), (4), and (7), a theory of generalization would predict that the student would accept (8) as grammatical. Again, however, (8) is not grammatical. A theory qf generalization incorrectly predicts that (6) and (8) would be accepted as grammatical because (3) and (4) are not in fact analogous sentences. That, (3) and (4) are not analogous can be seen when it is pointed out that **Mary** can be the subject of **leave** in (3) but not in (4). Thus, (3) can be paraphrased by (5) and not (6), whereas (4) can be paraphrased by (7) and not (8). It is difficult to see how the student's acceptance of (6) and (8) as grammatical would *not* be predicted by a theory of generalization. More important, perhaps, it is difficult to see how generalization could account for the student's learning the different interpretation of (3) and (4).

What Assumptions Can We Hold?

The argument presented thus far has been a somewhat negative one: (1) that the primacy of speech reflects not any intrinsic superiority of spoken as opposed to written systems but rather the arbitrary importance we place

on one set of language-teaching goals as opposed to another; (2) that it is not possible, at our present stage of knowledge, to specify all of the components of linguistic or communicative competence; (3) that what we can specify does not necessarily have a one-to-one relationship with linguistic performance; and (4) that language learning is not accomplished primarily through a process of habit formation.

If the assumptions which appear to underlie the audiolingual method are questionable, however, are there any assumptions which might be more useful to us? Two propositions are offered: (1) successful use of a language requires the acquisition of communicative as well as linguistic competence, and (2) first and second language learning are analogous processes. Each of these propositions is reviewed along with some of the procedures which they suggest.

Communicative Competence as a Goal of Instruction

The importance of communicative competence to the speaker of a language has already been indicated. That we are still unable to specify its components precisely does not mean that we should not attempt to impart it. Recognition of its importance as a goal of instruction implies that the first step we must take as language teachers is to determine the situations in which the student will need to use English. It is unlikely that he will want or need to use English in all the social situations in which he enters or conversely that he will want to abandon his first language entirely. It is more likely that the situations in which he will need English will be somewhat circumscribed. For example, if he is a foreign student doing graduate work in an American university, he will need to read and write English in his field of study, understand lectures, and be able to participate in seminars. The range of situations in which he will require English will not be as wide for him as it will be for his American peers, and his verbal 'repertoire in English need not be as wide.   Thus, judgment as to whether or not he 'knows enough English' to do graduate work should be based more on his ability to read, write, and understand material in his field than on his ability to produce and understand casual styles of English. Similarly, if remedial instruction in English is required for this student, it would seem inappropriate to exclude written materials.

Once the situations in which he will need English have been determined, an attempt should be made to create analogues of these situations in the classroom. If students will need to participate in seminars, for example, 'moot' seminars can be held. If students will need to attend lectures, they can be asked to take notes on brief, tape recorded passages played" in class. If students who live abroad (and whose courses are given via their first language) want to learn English in order to read textbooks written in English then it would be appropriate to devote most of their instruction to the reading of English.

First mid Second Language Learning Are Analogous

If we view our goal as enabling the student to use English in specified kinds of situations we must enable him to produce and understand novel (but appropriate) utterances in those situations. He can do this only if he has learned a set of operating principles or 'rules'. Even if we can explicitly state what these rules are, there is no reason to believe that if we simply present the rules to the student explicitly he will be able to apply them. On the other hand there is no compelling evidence to support the belief that artfully devised and systematically presented pattern practices will enable the student to infer the rules for himself. The rules which are stated by linguists or sociolinguists are abstract and their acquisition or 'internalization'. as well as their relationship to actual performance is imperfectly understood. There seems little reason to expect, however, that a second language is learned in any fundamentally different way than a first language.

To claim that first and second language learning are analogous is not to say that first and second language learners are identical. Some of the cognitive differences have been pointed out by Prator (1969), among them the important fact that the second language learner already knows a language, and his knowledge of the first language influences his perception and production of the second. Also, the second language learner often knows how to read, and this ability can sometimes be exploited in teaching him the second language. Furthermore, his ability to reason is greater than the child's, and he is thus better equipped to make conscious inferences about the nature of the language he is learning. The second language learner, moreover, is apt to be dissatisfied with teaching material whose intellectual content is as simplified as the medium through which it is expressed.

In spite of these differences, there seems to be little evidence that the actual, language-learning *processes* differ for the child and the adult. Somehow, both have to abstract the linguistic rules underlying the language as well as the sociolinguistic rules underlying its use. Some second language learners may do this more quickly than others-and the time required to learn the target language can be accepted as the criterion for second language aptitude (Carroll, 1965)—but they must do it nonetheless if they are to learn the language. The question which confronts us as language teachers is how, we can best structure the language-learning situation so as to exploit the language-learning abilities of the student.

Cook (1969) has pointed out that any language-teaching method based on the assumption that first and second language learning are analogous would have to meet certain requirements which are very much at variance 'with present audilingual procedures. First, it would permit and indeed encourage the learner to produce sentences which are ungrammatical from the point of view of the target language. This would be done on the assumption that both the first and second language learners' deviation are not random but systematic and reflect implicit hypotheses as to the nature of the language being learned. The child's language can be viewed as his latest set

of hypotheses with respect to the nature of the adult language, and his utterances are governed by these hypotheses. When he produces an utterance in accordance with a given hypothesis, he has an opportunity to test the adequacy of the hypothesis. Similarly, a second language learner's productions in the target language can be viewed as the systematic consequence of his hypotheses about the language he is learning. He cannot test the adequacy of his hypotheses if he is never permitted to act on them, i.e., produce utterances motivated by them. Thus, if he is to progress by forming hypotheses which become closer and closer to the rules underlying the target language, he should be given a chance to produce sentences freely. When he produces sentences which deviate from those of the target language, the teacher's reaction can help him to change the hypothesis. Note that the teacher would be more concerned with correcting the *hypothesis* underlying the deviant sentence than with inducing the student to correct the particular *sentence.*

A method which assumed the equivalence of first and second language learning processes would not emphasize imitation and practice inasmuch, as there is good reason to believe that imitation and practice have relatively minor roles in first language learning (Brown and Bellugi, 1964; Ervin, 1964). Rather the language teacher would "emphasize the perception of patterns rather than the intensit y of practice" (Cook, 1969). Thus, for example, where the learner produces a deviant utterance, the teacher could say the sentence correctly and could also give other examples of the same sentence type. Where the student's sentence is incomplete or telegraphic, the teacher could expand the sentence in much the same way as the mother expands the 'incomplete' utterance of the child.

The procedure which is being advanced here would encourage spontaneous speech on the grounds that this is the best way to allow the student to test his hypotheses about the nature of English. The encouragement of spontaneous speech—as distinguished from the elicitation of vocal productions' through pattern practice—is also justified on the grounds that students learn what is stressed in their instruction. If we want to enable to student to use English, then we must put him in situations which demand the use of English.

The view of first and second language learning as 'analogous does not restrict the language teacher to the roles of providing models of the language and confirming or disconfirming the second language hypotheses of the student. The language teacher also has to construct in the classroom situations which are analogous or relevant to the situations in which the student will need English. These situations must be set up in a way which will create a need for the student to communicate in English.

The challenge to the teacher which would be imposed by such a procedure or set of procedures is at least as great as that posed by the requirements of writing carefully controlled pattern practice material. The assumptions which underlie the former seem more defensible, however. By placing the

student in realistic situations that demand that the student use the target language, we would be attempting to simulate the conditions under which naturally occurring bilingualism takes place. Bilingual populations are probably more the rule than the exception in the world, both historically and at the present time. In such populations, people become bilingual by participating in situations which demand the use of the second language. If we demand its use in the classroom, in situations analogous to those in which the student will need English, if we ask the student, in other words, to do what we want him to learn, and if we help him to check his changing hypotheses as in the nature of English, by correcting and expanding the utterances he produces, we can, in the view advanced here, best exploit the student's ability to learn a second language.

REFERENCES

Brière, Eugène. 1966. An investigation of phonological interference. *Language* 42:768-96.

Brown, Roger and Ursula Bellugi. 1964. Three processes in the child's acquisition of syntax. *Harvard Educational Review* 34: 133-151.

Carroll, John B. 1965. The prediction of success in intensive foreign language training. In Robert Glaser, ed. *Training research and education.* Wiley. pp. 87-136.

Chomsky, Noam. 1957. *Syntactic Structures.* The Hague: Mouton.

— 1959. Review of Skinner's *Verbal Behavior. Language* 35:26-58.

———— 1965. *Aspects of the theory of syntax.* Cambridge: M.I.T Press.

Cook, Vivian J. 1969. The analogy between first and second language learning. IRAL 7:207-16.

Ervin, Susan M. 1964. Imitation and structural change in children's language. In Eric H. Lenneberg, ed., *New directions in the study of language.* Cambridge M.I.T. Press. Pp. 163-189.

Ferguson, Charles A.; and John J. Gumperz. 1960. Introduction. In Charles A. Ferguson and John J. Gomperz, eds. *Linguistic diversity in South Asia. IJAL* 25 (3): 92-118.

Geertz, Clifford. 1960. *The religion of Java.* Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press. Pp. 248-260.

Hymes, Dell. 1966. On communicative competence. Paper presented to the Research Planning Conference on Language Development among Disadvantaged Children, Yeshiva University, June 7-8, 1966.

Prator, Clifford H. 1969. Adding a second language. *TESOL Quarterly* 3:95-104.

Saporta, Sol. 1966. Applied linguistics and generative grammar. In Albert Valdman, ed. *Trends in language teaching.* New York. McGraw-Hill. Pp. 81-92.

Scherer, George A. C., and Michael Wertheimer. 1964. A *psycholinguistic experiment in foreign-language teaching,* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Spolsky, Bernard. 1966. A psycholinguistic critique of programmed foreign language instruction, *IRAL* 4: 119-29.

A New Technique for the Teaching of Reading to Advanced Students *

David Eskey

One result of the structuralist dogma that "language is speech" has been a relative lack of interest in the problems of the advanced student of English as a foreign language for whom the ability to read the written language with good comprehension at reasonable rates may be at least as important as the ability to converse. The materials *now* available for teaching reading to such students provide intensive practice in reading simplified English rapidly and in various ways attack the problem of vocabulary but show little or no awareness of the much more complicated syntax characteristic of unsimplified university-level prose. At this level the student *must* read by structures, not words, but many of the structures he must be able to read will be partly or wholly new to him since they seldom occur in the spoken language, especially the kind of spoken language he is likely to have heard. Thus the structure of the written language must be approached systematically if we mean to produce readers of the best books and journals and not simply better readers of simplified English. The technique described here is designed to introduce advanced students of English as a foreign language to the structure of what might be called educated written English. The theoretical orientation of these materials is transformational, but they do not attempt to teach grammar systematically; the emphasis is on just a few complex sructures that have proved especially troublesome to non-native speakers. The paper includes examples of the materials themselves.

By advanced students I mean the kind of students Ted Plaister of the University of Hawaii described,[1] the kind of students who can already converse with native speakers, understand and give directions, order a meal or buy a ticket, employ simple patterns correctly in writing, and, most important for my purposes here, read simplified or simple English prose at a reasonable rate with good comprehension. Plaister went on to point out that such students, though functionally "operational" (and relatively

---

1 "Reading Instruction for College Level Foreign Students: *TESOL Quarterly,* II, 3 (September 1968), 164-168. Plaister, in turn, took his definition of "foreign students who have reached or passed the operational level" from Schwab's "The problem of the Advanced Student in American English" *Language Learning,* X, 3 and 4 (1960), 151-156. As this sequence suggests, these students have a modem history of being ignored in foreign language teaching, possibly as a by-product of the structuralist dogma that "language is speech." This position is not so much mistaken as misstated the limited sense in which it is true hardly justifies such a sweeping generalization.

rare), are still not ready for university-level reading. He therefore devoted the bulk of his paper to describing the reading program at Hawaii intended to prepare them for this higher level.

That program is exceptionally well worked out. Each applicant is pre-tested for reading vocabulary, comprehension, and speed, and assigned to an appropriate course, if any. The program then provides him with direct instruction in what good (and bad) reading habits are and in whatever in the assigned readings seems likely to the teachers to lead to cross-cultural misunderstanding. More practically, the student must work his own way through an impressive variety of exercises designed to increase his vocabu-lary and, especially, his reading speed. All of this is possibly, and much of it unquestionably, useful to the student who wants to read English better, but the emphasis on speed reminds me of a world-weary colleague's remark that "in reading English our students are unsafe at any speed."[2]

There is more to this apparently flippant remark than meets the eye. It points directly to one question this paper tries to answer: Why can't many of our advanced foreign students understand university-level readings in English?

Vocabulary is part of the problem, but only part. To solve it, most programs and all the well-known graded readers employ a system of gradu-ally expanding vocabulary, but in the long run the only way to acquire an adequate vocabulary is, for foreign students as for native speakers, simply to read more. The major *teaching* problem here, it seems to me, is not English words but English structure. Plaister notes, for example, that most foreign students are word-by-word readers, whereas good com-prehension entails reading by structures; and this is a critical clue to the real problem. Hawaii treats it as simply a bad habit to be broken by physically dividing a set of English sentences into two columns of three- or four-word structures and then forcing the students to read through them against time. But this is surely an oversimplified approach.[3] It assumes that the students have always read this way, whereas I seriously doubt that most of them are word-by-word readers in their own languages. They read English this way not out of habit but because they have never mastered the structure of unsimplified written English.

One may argue that any kind of English is English, but the fact is that the spoken and written forms of the language are not the same. Anything that can be written can in theory be said, but the kinds of sentences that actually get said and the kinds that actually get written are by no means

---

[2] Dr. Richard B. Ness, Chief Advisor to the English Language Center, Bangkok, in conversation.

[3] This is not a criticism of the technique itself, which is obviously useful in in-creasing reading rate *provided that the material to be read is kept quite simple.* Plaister remarks (P. 166) that "it is not uncommon to get 125-word-per-minute readers up to about 400 words per minute in one semester," but adds parenthetically that "this rate, of course is on quite simple material. What we are presuming is that the student will transfer his new reading habits to everything he reads." I doubt it.

identical. In addition to some obvious differences in vocabulary, the syntax of unsimplified written English typically exhibits a degree of complexity much greater than that of the spoken language.

There are differences and some of them must be taught. Consider, for example, the following two sentences:

1. The Mongol horde destroyed the armies of Islam.
2. The armies of Islam destroyed the Mongol horde.

The words of these two sentences are exactly the same but, assuming a basic understanding of the vocabulary, any native speaker and any moderately proficient non-native speaker will see at one reading what the sentences mean and that they mean different things. Of the six sentences that follow, however, five are synonymous with sentence 1 and only one (sentence 8) with sentence 2, and I am not at all sure that many non-native speakers (or even all native speakers) will see this at one reading:

3. The armies of Islam were destroyed by the Mongol horde.
4. It was the armies of Islam that the Mongol horde destroyed.
5. It was the Mongol horde that destroyed the armies of Islam.
6. What the Mongol horde destroyed was the armies of Islam.
7. What destroyed the armies of Islam was the Mongol horde.
8. The Mongol horde was destroyed by the armies of Islam.

But this is only a beginning. Of the following ten noun phrases, eight are nominalizations of sentence 1, two (sentences 14 and 18) of sentence 2, and when we note that all would in fact occur as the embedded subjects, objects, or complements of still other sentences, we begin to get an idea of the structural complexity that readers of unsimplified English must deal with. None of these structures is rare in writing, after all, and neither of the two lists is anything like, complete:

9. that the Mongol horde destroyed the armies of Islam
10. that the armies of Islam were destroyed by the Mongol horde
11. for the Mongol horde to have destroyed the armies of Islam
12. the Mongol horde's having destroyed the armies of Islam
13. the Mongol horde that destroyed the armies of Islam
14. the armies of Islam that destroyed the Mongol horde
15. the armies of Islam that the Mongol horde destroyed
16. the Mongol horde's destruction of the armies of Islam
17. the destruction of the armies of Islam by the Mongol horde
18. the destruction of the Mongol horde by the armies of Islam

Clearly many synonymous constructions look quite different, and it is just as true that many constructions that look alike are not. To borrow a famous example from literature, Tennyson's

19. the murmuring of innumerable bees

and John Crowe Ransom's

20. the murdering of innumerable beeves

are grammatically as well as phonologically less alike than they seem.[4] Although the structure of the two phrases looks identical at first glance, any native speaker "knows" (in Chomsky's limited sense) that 19 is synonymous with **innumerable bees murmur** (that "bees" is the logical *subject* of **murmur),** whereas 20 is synonymous with **(someone) murders innumerable beeves** (that beeves is the logical *object* of **murder).**

Given this complexity, it seems extremely unlikely that students can be taught to read by structures by such mechanical means as reading against time through simplified sentences physically divided into simplified constituents. I doubt that most advanced students are retarded readers, as this mechanical approach would seem to imply. They would automatically read English by structures if they could, but English structure at this level is simply too much for them.

My point in short is that advanced English structure should be taught to students who must tackle advanced English reading, and that it should be taught in connection with this reading where (in contrast to normal speech) it commonly occurs.

For some years I have been working at a set of materials designed to implement these assumptions, and this set has now acquired something like a final form.[5]

The great problem has always been one of selection: What can be omitted on the grounds that most advanced students know it? And what must be included on the grounds that they do not? Aside from the general problem of unusual inversions and a few particularly troublesome subordinators (like *unless),*[6] the two large problem areas that have gradually emerged are the various kinds of complex noun phrases, and the free modi-

---

[4] See the discussion involving Dell H. Hymes and René Wellek in *Style in Language,* ed. Thomas A. Sebeok (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1960), pp. 112 and 412.

[5] An earlier version of these materials by George Montague and me was tested in the 1964 and 1965 Damascus summer institutes for Syrian teachers of English and in the reading classes of the American University of Beirut's University Orientation Program.

[6] I may be guilty here, for brevity's sake, of stretching the word *inversions* a good deal farther than it will go. I mean, for example, such relatively sophisticated patterns as these:

    The arts and the sciences he had no use for, but. . .
    Seldom in those confused and troubled times did they. . .
    Should you attempt to enter the building, you. . .

The reader who has learned that objects follow the verb, that any form of the auxiliary do signals a question or some kind of emphasis, and that *should* means obligation may well go astray as he reads here.

Similarly, I mean the term *troublesome subordinators* to suggest a mixed bag of single word syntactical problems. These are essentially lexical problems, despite the fact that the words are technically "structure words." Here are several examples, the last two of which especially invite misinterpretation:

    Her objections *notwithstanding,* he. . .
    However hard we tried, we. . .
    You *would* have one more drink!

It is difficult to generalize about any of these problems. They must be handled separately or, at best, in small clusters.

fiers like participles and, especially, non-restrictive clauses. Since all of these constructions involve the whole complex of relationships to be found in full sentences, it is hardly surprising that even fluent foreign students find them difficult at first. Many a native speaker is not entirely at home with them, and it is well to keep in mind that we ask foreign students at our universities to read material which might be too difficult structurally (as well as in other ways) for the average American waitress or bus driver.

The problem then is how to teach advanced structure in conjunction with the advanced reading of which it is typical. Since reading is a skill, that is, something students do, some kind of inductive method seems to be called for within which the student can work his own way up from the simple structures that he knows to the complex constructions that are largely new to him; and this is the general method of the materials.

Consider, for example, the sample lesson reproduced here designed to introduce a particular type of complex noun phrase. This lesson is one of about six dealing with the structure of noun phrase complements. For pedagogical convenience, these and the others involve a certain amount of grammatical jargon, but the total is not much more than what is here, and

SAMPLE LESSON
INFINITIVAL NOUN PHRASE COMPLEMENTS

It is not enough that a thing be possible *for it to be believed.*
    —Voltaire

People will not believe a thing just because it is possible.
Even if a thing is possible that is not enough to make people believe it.

1. (Matrix S)	It *(something)* is not enough.
2. (Constituent S)	A thing is possible.
3. (Constituent)	that a thing is possible
4. (Constituent)	that a thing be possible
5. (Matrix S + Constituent)	It *(that a thing be possible)* is not enough.
6. (S)	It is not enough that a thing be possible.
7. (S)	That a thing be possible is not enough.

8. (Matrix S)	That a thing be possible is not enough for *(something).*
9. (Constituent S)	People believe a thing.
10. (Constituent S)	It is believed by people.
11. (Constituent S)	It is believed.
12. (Constituent)	for it to be believed
13. (Matrix S + Constituent)	That a thing be possible is not enough for *(for it to be believed).*
14 (S)	That a thing be possible is not enough for it to be believed.
15. (S)	It is not enough that a thing be possible for it to be believed.

Exercises

One: Complete this chart for these words: belief, believe, believable, possibility, possible, possibly.

N	V	Adj	Adv

Two: Write sentences using the words from the chart correctly.
Three: Notice the infinitival noun phrase complement *for it to be believed. . . .*

all of it may of course be discarded once the students have mastered the structures themselves. It should be obvious that my bias is transformational, but these lessons are certainly not meant to teach any formal grammatical system. They deal almost exclusively with constructions that occur, that is, with surface structure only, thereby by-passing all the thorny questions of the nature of deep structure and of the kinds of rules required to relate it to real English sentences.

The technique for teaching a lesson like this is simply to ask a series of questions about the similarities and differences in form, function, and meaning among the members of a set of English structures arranged in ascending order of complexity. The teacher begins by reading a sentence, in this case a remark of Voltaire's, containing an example of the construction to be examined, in this case a type of noun phrase complement. Since many of the students may not immediately understand the sentence, the teacher then reads another sentence or two roughly the same in meaning but simpler in form and therefore easier to understand. Given the form and (via simpler forms) its meaning, the problem then is to relate the two in some step-by-step way that the students can follow.

This is provided by the numbered entries in the boxes. The matrix sentences are simply frames, marked for embedding by some kind of pro-form. Constituents are then developed and embedded, and this process is repeated until the original sentence reappears. Within each subset of forms the teacher always proceeds by asking the same two related questions:

1. What is the difference in *form* between this structure and the last one?,
2. What difference, if any, does this make in the *meaning?*

The change in form may make no difference in either function or meaning, a case of genuine structural synonymy (e.g., 3 to 4, or 6 to 7). Or the relationship, of the parts may' remain the same but the, function of the construction as a whole change, a change in functional meaning (e.g., 2 to 3, or 11 to 12). Or there may be real expansion of both form and ,meaning (e.g., 7 to 8). But in all of these cases the student proceeds one comprehensible step at a time. The lessons themselves are also of course cumulative. This one presupposes a knowledge of factive noun phrase complemental

(**that a thing be possible**) so that the first box is both a kind of review and a useful preparation for the structure in the second **(for it to be believed),** which is new in form but similar to the factive complement in function.

The exercises that follow can all be done orally or in writing or, preferably, both. The first two are simple vocabulary problems and should ideally be done as homework before the lesson itself is introduced in class. The third (which is only suggested here) provides a summary of the forms of the new construction and of the contexts in which it normally occurs. This also includes an exercise or two in which the students must produce these forms and embed them in a sampling of the relevant contexts.

Let me conclude with three qualifications:

These materials are for advanced students only. They presuppose a class of students of the kind I described in my first paragraph and must not be imposed on beginners or intermediate students who have not yet mastered the basic patterns of English. Since the exercises move from the known to the unknown, from simple sentences that the students should comprehend immediately to complex sentences that they may not comprehend at all, they will not of course be of any use to students who are still struggling with the simple sentences.

To complete these materials is not to master English structure. Real mastery of the more complex constructions can only follow from extensive reading in the kind of English which naturally includes them, but in doing this the student who has worked his way through these lessons will have the one great advantage of knowing what he is doing.

These materials are not a complete course in reading. Such a course might include, for example, many of the features of programs like Hawaii's and would certainly include a great deal of outside reading. The intensive class exercises must always be complemented by extensive out-of-class reading of some kind, hopefully, once the exercises have been completed, by extensive university-level reading.

Structure Placement Tests for Adults in English-Second-Language Programs in California *

Donna Ilyin

This paper describes the development of EPT (English-Second-Language Placement Test) 100-200-300 which places adult students into the first three levels of English-Second-Language classes and discusses work done on EPT 400-500-600, an experimental test to place students in the last three levels of ESL classes. EPT 100-200-300 has an overall reliability of .96 and form correlation of .93. The rationale for making structure tests was that most second language learning materials are built around structural patterns. An objective multiple choice test in a written form was used because it was easier to make, easier to take, and because we needed short tests with simple directions that could be administered to large groups and graded quickly. After analyzing books used at each level of instruction, sample tests were given to students at each level. By June 1968, eight pretests had been developed (two forms for each of the first four levels), and a bank of 300 suggested items for level five were obtained. Reliability ranged from .74 to .84 and form correlations at each level were from .76 to .86. The following problems were encountered in developing the tests: 1) protecting the security of the tests, 2) checking their validity, 3) administering them where no facilities or personnel are provided.

Students of heterogeneous background and ability should be placed at the proper level of English-Second-Language (ESL) instruction if they are to learn or to stick with the courses at all. Placement can be accomplished most accurately by testing. However, testing a heterogeneous group is in itself a problem since the wrong kind of tests can result in scaring people off entirely, frightening some teachers who feel their teaching methods will be judged negatively, or "permanently" classifying a student in the wrong type of class where he may be lost for a period of time.

The resistance one encounters is plentiful. We are told that students, if tested, will leave school and not return. We are told that students don't care what level they are in as long as they like the teacher. We are told that it is impossible to devise a test that will be reliable and valid and that can be given to students of heterogeneous background going into classes where much of the work is oral. We are told that students can't read and write what they can say although the teachers use printed materials for reinforcement. We are also told that if a student is not placed at the proper

---

level, either he will ask to go to another level or the teacher will evaluate him and he will be placed properly. Perhaps the greatest resistance to testing comes from administrators and teachers rather than from the students they feel they are protecting.

Some administrators are afraid that a test might indicate a failure of their program reflected in the failure of the students on the test. But the fact of the matter is that the students' abilities are most likely the strongest part of the program. Given a class with an interested teacher, and a definite program with stated and realistic objectives that they can accomplish, they *do* achieve and that achievement can be measured by a test. The structure tests I developed indicated that all groups using the second language-learning materials upon which I based my test showed significant gains in all levels in all geographical areas.

Some teachers feel defensive about their teaching methods and yet little is known today about which teaching method is superior. In the groups I tested, teachers used different methods. One might use a grammar translation, another an audio-lingual with reading and writing as reinforcement, another the direct method, and some used anything they felt worked. Some had teacher aids, some had an abundance of electronic equipment, many had neither. Still on my tests, in spite of the varieties of method, all groups made significant gains at all levels.

Much of the resistance to testing can be re-examined. Students do want to be placed at a level where they feel they are learning successfully and still feel challenged. Students like to have a true sense of achievement. They depend on the system to know their level and to place them properly. Many teachers resent having to shift students into another level, and they worry about the accuracy of on-the-spot assessment. Others totally ignore the idea that the responsibility to move the student is theirs. Often the teacher will keep the student, believing that it was the administrator's job to place him correctly, and expecting the student himself to ask for a change. On the other hand, many students trust the teachers, the school, and the system to place them in the correct classes. They will either stay and be "lost" in a wrong class or they will drop out and search for another way to learn English. They may give up entirely.

It is possible to develop reliable, accurate tests that will place students in English-Second-Language classes that have a course outline and a realistic plan for what is taught at each level. It is possible to make tests with simple instructions that will not frighten any students away. Give students the option to go into a level 100 class (the very beginning) or take a test if they would like to see if they belong in another level. Although it may be necessary to change a misplaced student or two, there will not be as many changes from an objective evaluation as from a subjective hit-or-miss oral interview. It is not necessary to test all things taught in each level for a placement test. Use a short test if the test includes complex items that

cover a wide sample of linguistic competence.[1] The shorter the test is, however, the more important it is to protect the security of the test. Even if the majority of your program stresses oral skills and oral practice, a test can be designed in a written form. If students have been exposed to any learning situation where they have used printed materials to reinforce oral work they have done, you can have a student answer questions that he has to read.[2]

Therefore while it is entirely possible to design reliable short tests that will place students in classes more accurately than the "friendly office interview," or the elective system, or the teacher's on-the-spot assessment, there may be other administrative, funding or organizational problems that can prevent you from developing or administering placement tests. These tests may take a number of years to develop and require work and knowledge beyond that of the normal classroom teacher or administrator. But given the time, money, and cooperative support of teachers and administrators, a school system can develop its own tests. David Harris's *Testing English As A Second Language* (McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1969) and Rebecca M. Valette's *Modern Language Testing* (Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1967) are indispensable guides. Also helpful, if funds are available, is the hiring of testing specialists with access to IBM computers. They can help check reliability, item choice, and form correlations. If a gains study is made, the results may indicate that the placement test can be used as an achievement test.

After developing a reliable instrument, it is important to protect its security and to administer it using all the normal testing procedures (rows spaced adequately apart, alternate forms, and experienced proctors) unless there are plans to make a new test each time. Limit the test administration to one or two people who number and count the tests each time and who make sure the tests are locked up and all copies intended for destruction torn up and placed in a garbage can in some area far removed from your school. If students know the questions or have memorized the sequence of answers, the test is no longer valid.

I developed a standardized placement test EPT (English-Second-Language Placement Test) 100-200-300 which places students into the first three (out of a possible six) levels of ESL classes. It is a multiple choice type test which requires a student to be able to read structural patterns. The distracters (wrong answers) come from student mistakes. The test has

---

[1] J. B. Carroll, "The Psychology of Language Testing," *Language Testing Symposium, A Psycho-linguistic Approach,* ed. Alan Davies (Oxford University Press, 1968), p. 56.

[2] There seems to be a great deal of misunderstanding and confusion about a student's ability to read patterns he has learned orally. Wilga Rivers, *Teaching Foreign Language Skills* (University of Chicago Press, 1968), discusses *this* problem thoroughly on pages 217-220. Charles Fries in *Teaching and Learning English as a Foreign Language* (University of Michigan Press, 1945) referred to the problem in a footnote, p. 136. See also Roy Steeves and Patricia H. Cabrera, *Handbook for Teachers of English as a Second Language* (Americanization-Literacy,   California State Department of Education, 1969), pp. 18, 21 and 24.

an overall reliability of .96 and a form correlation of .93. Each form contains 50 items and requires about 30 minutes to complete.

My rationale for making a structure test was that most ESL learning materials are built around structural patterns which are presented sequentially. Vocabulary is often limited and reading and writing confined to copying and manipulating oral patterns already mastered.

The two alternate forms of EPT 100-200-300 were developed in a number of stages over a period of six years. Before beginning the first stage, however, our school had to agree on what was taught and what materials were used at each level. (Later we referred to the levels as 100-200-300 to avoid confusion with grade levels which did not at all apply to what we were doing.) Teacher committees met and set the objectives for each level[3] and agreed in general what texts were used at which level.

Stage 1: I analyzed all books used at each level and made sample tests from which I obtained student errors. I also referred to a card file that I had maintained for a number of years which contained errors I had noted students usually made for particular grammar items. I scanned other teachers' achievement tests.

Stage 2: I compiled about 200-300 sample items for each level and asked the teachers to analyze them and make additions and suggestions. We eliminated ambiguous and poor items and added others.

Stage 3: For each level I prepared and administered two sample objective tests containing 50 to 75 items chosen from stage 2. I tried to select items that represented as many different grammatical and structure problems as possible.

Stage 4: From the items in stage 3 and by item analysis I constructed two one-page tests for each level which could be administered and graded in less than a minute per test. Each page contained 30 three-choice items like the sample questions below:

1. A. I *is* here.
   B. I *am* here.
   C. I *are* here.

2. What is that?
   A. *It is* a book.
   B. *He is* a book.
   C. *She is* a book.

Students read each item, considered their choice and put an X on the alphabet letter in front of the item they thought correct. When students understood how to do the sample questions, we began the test and students had 15 minutes to do 30 items.

---

[3] William Tresnon and James Norris, *A Sequential Course of Study in English for the Foreign Born* (San Francisco Unified School District, 1967).

Again, I was careful to select items that represented various grammar problems and that were statistically the most discriminating and reliable.

Stage 5: In an attempt to get more reliable and better correlated forms, I revised the tests done in stage 4 and standardized them on about 100 students in each level at Alemany Adult School. By June 1968 reliability ranged from .74 to .84, and form correlations ranged from .76 to .86.

I had a problem checking the validity of the tests because I did not have any outside form of comparison. Teachers in Adult Education classes usually do not give or keep grades. Many teachers send all students on to the next level whether they have passed or failed the work. On pre-tests for levels 100 and 200, I asked teachers to group students in the top 25%, middle 50% and bottom 25% before the students took the tests. A t test showed differences were in the expected direction and probability was in every case better than .01.

Stage 6: While these tests served as achievement tests, they were awkward to use as placement tests for new students since it was not known which level test to give to which student. I did not want to give a student all of our level tests. (By 1968 I had two one-page tests described in stage 4 and 5 above for levels 100, 200, 300 and 400, and I had reached stage 2 for our level 500 tests.) Up until this point I had done all the work alone.

No funds were available, however, to pay anyone to administer the tests or to continue to develop them. Since other areas in the state with similar problems of placement thought they might be able to use the tests if they were in a different form, the San Francisco Unified School District received a federal grant from SWCEL (The Southwestern Cooperative Education Laboratory) to put the first three level 400 or 500 tests into one test of two forms and to standardize it and set norms throughout the state. Included were funds to finish level 500 and 600 tests through stage 4, and funds to do all the necessary statistical work including a gains study of pre- and posttesting.

From 180 questions from the stage 4 or 5 tests, 110 items were selected and given to 263 students in the first three levels of ESL instruction at Alemany Adult School. By item analysis 100 of those items were then selected and used to make two equivalent forms of 50 questions each. These were at first called Alemany Adult Placement Tests Forms A (White) and

B (Blue). Later these were called EPT 100-200-300 Forms A and B.

With a standardized test with a reliability of .96 and a form correlation of .93, it was possible to set norms. Through the cooperation of the Fremont Adult School in Sacramento, the Imperial Valley Schools in El Centro, and San Francisco State College, we pre- and post-tested about 1600 students in California. We gave beginning students the option not to take the tests, but only a few chose not to. The students were neither frightened away nor did they feel threatened, although they did not know us.

We had many problems in developing and administering our tests, but they did not come from the students. Many of the problems resulted from the fact that many individuals and administrative systems were involved in handling and disbursing funds and in making decisions—individuals who were occupied mainly with other matters and who were not fully aware of the task or of the problems. This was most evident in the work we did under the federal grant from SWCEL. We had to go through our principal, the SFUSD adult coordinator, who in turn often had to go through the local school board and through personnel and other administrative sections in our district office, the California State Department of Education that had a constant change-over of personnel, each of whom had to learn about our project, and then SWCEL.

We had to change our original objectives, constantly to revise our time schedule, to bring in and train extra personnel (some of whom ended up contributing time or paying for some of their own expenses) and to do a pilot gains study rather than the complete research we had planned. We had to confer and write to people who did not have formal linguistic training or awareness of the technicalities or complexities involved in our tasks. At the end we felt we were dealing with people interested primarily in literacy and first language problems rather than people interested in having a structure placement test for classes using second language materials. Often we did not get direct answers to our inquiries, but instead received copies of correspondence between individuals who were discussing some phase of our project.

In spite of our problems, we were able to establish norms on students in Sacramento, San Francisco, Brawley, El Centro and Calexico, and we were also able to compare adult student scores with those in College English for Foreign Born and in the American Language Institute at San Francisco State College. While we expected the college students and the students in ALI to score higher than our adult students, we also expected the students in the migrant working areas to have lower means than those in the urban schools.

Night school migrant workers, however, did as well as other night school students in Sacramento and San Francisco. College students scored too

high on the pre-test to give the post-test and ALI students scored slightly higher than adult level 300 classes.

We were not surprised to learn that our test was too easy for the college groups, but we did not anticipate that except for Calexico, one of the schools in the Imperial Valley, all regular level 100 classes in day or night classes would fall into a range of means from 8.11-20.00, that all level 200 classes would fall into a range of means from 20.13-27.95, and that all level 300 classes would fall into a range from 29.80-37.13.

Another fact we learned from the pilot gains study of pre- and post tests was that EPT 100-200-300 could be used as an achievement test as well as a placement test since significant gains were made by all students in all levels in all geographical areas.

Because the final stage of the test and the norm setting was done under a federal grant from SWCEL, a limited number of copies of the test will be made available to any school using the same type of materials and having the same general objectives for each level that Alemany Adult School has. The tests are being distributed by the San Francisco Unified School District free of charge. The tests' usefulness will not only depend on programs having similar objectives and using similar materials, but also on the way the tests are administered and secured.

We had planned to make a standardized structure placement test for the last three levels (EPT 400–500-600), but funds are no longer available. Through voluntary efforts, Mrs. Jeanette Best and I, however, have made two experimental forms of EPT 400-500-600 which are now being tested in San Francisco and Los Angeles. In San Francisco, students at the junior high school, city and state college levels as well as at the adult school will be tested. Reliability on the two experimental forms tested at San Francisco City College was .89.

Perhaps one of the most discouraging factors is that after developing the placement tests, we have no way to administer them to new students as they enter our school throughout the year. We do, however, use them as achievement tests at the end of the term for the established classes. The placement problem is reflected in the following example of one of my fall classes. This class met for two hours a day five days a week. While my average daily attendance was about twenty-six, and my active enrollment averaged about thirty-five, seventy-nine students passed through this class during the semester and twenty-eight remained at the end. This was not a loss of fifty-one students since twenty-one of these remained in the school after being transferred up or down once or twice until they reached a level where they could work successfully and still be challenged. Seven were referred to other schools and colleges, three moved out of the city, four found jobs, six were ill or had baby-sitting problems. I don't know what happened to ten of the students. Perhaps if they had had a better placement at the beginning, they might have stayed in the school.

I firmly believe that *until* schools set up realistic objectives, and place

students in levels where they can handle material and feel that they are successful and learning, the drop-out rate in adult ESL classes will continue to be high. Teachers will not be able to structure lessons and provide the best learning climate until students are grouped in levels of similar ESL proficiency. At the beginning levels, especially, most of the work is oral, and it is difficult to provide interesting and challenging work when the students' ranges of achievement are too great. Until teachers get good sequentially developed programmed materials designed to meet the individual's learning and language problems, no machines, or small grouping employing currently available programmed materials will solve the present problems found in adult ESL classes. Reliable objective placement instruments can be made and used to place students immediately into the proper levels they need.

Role Playing: Rehearsal for Language Change

Lee Salisbury

> The traditional uses of role playing as a method of inducing be-
> havioral change through psychodrama or sociodrama are well known.
> The game structure in which these techniques are used allows the
> student to try on new behaviors without the social penalty he would
> encounter outside the classroom.   Positive reinforcement from other
> peers playing the game provides a more potent payoff than does teacher
> approval or grades. As a student assumes an unfamiliar role, he spon-
> taneously adopts language patterns and gestures which he perceives
> to be appropriate to the role and the situation. Non-standard English
> speakers cannot be assumed to be unfamiliar with standard patterns.
> Students from such marginal cultural groups as Hawaiian pidgin speak-
> ers and Alaskan Natives have been observed to drop their local speech
> patterns when assuming mainstream figure roles in language games.
> Role playing affords the language teacher an additional teaching strat-
> egy bridging the chasm between pattern practice and real-life usage
> of standard English.

Much as many of us would like to see the monolithic structure of our
society altered so as to allow cultural pluralism to flourish, we must live
with the reality that, for at least the next generation, large segments of
our minority citizens will remain in a socially and economically disadvantaged
status. They are penalized because their life styles and languages differ
from the Establishment norm. Those of us who are concerned with teaching
"standard English" are in the business of affecting social change. We believe
that acquisition of the standard dialect will give our students greater social
acceptance and mobility-that their range of options will be broadened—and
that they will be better able to compete on an equal footing with other
members of the mainstream society. In these days of educational ferment,
where all of us are taking a critical look at the validity of the things we
teach, our task seems to have an intrinsic relevance.

Yet, relevance is a time-bound concept. Teachers and all other agents
of change are inclined to value long-term goals. Whether this is so because
of their greater perspective or because their day-to-day teaching seems to
produce no noticeable effect is another matter! One thing is sure-the
argument that a certain skill will be "good for you someday" is a notably
ineffective way to motivate the young, particularly the disadvantaged young,
who may be more concerned with dealing with the day-to-day problems

Mr. Salisbury, Head of the Department of Speech, Drama and Radio, University
of Alaska, has published previously in *TESOL Quarterly,* III, 3 (September 1969).
In 1963, he directed a speciaI four-year summer program for Alaskan Native college
entrants, College Orientation Program for Alaskan Natives *(COPAN)* which fore-
shadowed the later *Upward Bound* program in concept and approach. His current
project is *Theatre to the Bush,* a troupe of bilingual actors who will perform dramatic
versions of Native legends for remote village audiences throughout Alaska.

of hunger, alcoholism, or brutality which they face when they leave school. For these students the middle class rewards of academic grades, teacher approval or parental support are not the answer. The resistant student's unspoken question, "What's in it for me NOW?", is perhaps the largest problem which the ESL or ESD teacher faces. Other student reasons for resistance to language change are often expressed as follows:

"What's wrong with the way I talk? It works just fine in my world."

"I don't want to change into someone else—they're trying to whitewash me."

"Nobody I know talks that way."

It is clear from these expressions that many interference problems are caused by confused expectations on the part of the teacher and the student. The teachers are frustrated because the students don't use the language outside of class-or even outside of the drill structure within the class. The students can't see the need for the language, are bored with the drills, and have the mistaken idea that the new language or dialect will erase their ethnic identity. This lack of communication between teacher and student can be eased considerably if both parties begin the language change process with some common understanding.

First, it may be helpful to remember the distinction which Bernstein has made between language and speech. Language symbolizes what can be done. Speech, he points out

is constrained by the circumstances of the moment, by the dictates of a local social relation and, so, symbolizes not what can be done but rather what is done with different degrees of frequency. Speech indicates which options at the structural vocabulary level are taken up.[1]

If we accept this distinction as a premise, language cannot be taught *in vacuo.* It must be taught as a spontaneous act which is generated in a specific situational context and one which varies in style from context to context.

Second, each of us plays many roles as we go about our daily living. In fact, "the wider our repertoire of honest roles, the more effective we are as communicators."[2] No matter what language or dialect we speak—we are not the same in every social situation; we adapt to variations in place, time, and condition-we behave differently-we vary our language style. When the student and teacher both come to realize that a person's dialects and styles are determined, not by his race, but by the role he may be playing

---

[1] Basil Bernstein, "Elaborated and Restricted Codes: Their Social Origins and Some Consequences," in Alfred G. Smith, *Communication and Culture: Readings in the Codes of Human Interaction* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966), p. 428.

[2] John W. Keltner, *Interpersonal Speech-Communication: Elements and Structures* (Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1970), p. 56.

at a particular time and place, the fear of "selling out" can be seen to be an unhappy misconception. The observable fact that the men who emerge as leaders of disadvantaged groups are bilingual or bidialectal and that their potency as leaders seems to rest upon linguistic versatility gives credence to the theory that the "effective self is the multi-valent personality."[3]

We are mimetic creatures. We learn how to talk by imitating models we see around us. The language styles which we acquire are appropriate to the roles we see being played. Games such as "House," "Doctor" "Cops and Robbers," and "School" are early rehearsals of the cluster of behavioral and language expectations for roles the mainstream child may be called upon to play as an adult. Though this is largely an unconscious process, it is, nonetheless, the way that we develop and change. Some of this learning is institutional-embodied in the curricula of our schools. But, we are discovering that most of it is situational—it takes place during the hours when school is not in session and the student is dealing with his real life situations which are important to him.

The disadvantaged child, on the other hand, lives in a closed society which offers fewer and different options. He is likely to come from a home which is not geared to mainstream role expectations. His childhood games may have prepared him to become a hunter, a skin sewer, a beach boy, or a gambler—important survival roles within his own closed society—but not with behaviors he would find useful in the larger world around him. The responsibility for teaching the skills, attitudes, and concepts which the student has not been able to acquire at home, then, becomes the school's. Indeed, the school can provide a sheltered environment in which the student can experiment with his language and behavior without the rejection and ridicule he might encounter in daily life.

However, the student and the teacher need to understand the peculiar cultural pressures each of them brings into the classroom with him. How has his original culture or sub-culture taught him to perceive language? What are the things which language can and cannot do? Until we try to understand these cultural forces and design new teaching strategies which take them into account, our content and methods will continue to seem dry, ritualistic, and irrelevant.

As I have mentioned elsewhere, one of the Alaskan Eskimo's chief difficulties in using standard English stems from his traditional reluctance to use language in the manipulative ways that we do. Coming from a culture where one's thoughts and feelings are regarded to be sacred and inviolable, he would not dream of trying to influence the actions of others. Indeed, he tries to be as much like his peers as he possibly can. As a child, he learns how to behave by watching people carefully. There is no need for our Western Thou Shalt Nots, when he can see that certain actions are not done. It is not surprising that his tendency to use language in what

---

[3] Keltner, p. 58.

we would consider to be a passive manner, coupled with the paternalistic setting in which he is taught his new language, causes him to adopt what seems to be a child-like role whenever he finds it necessary to use English.

Contrast this with the Hawaiian homestead student's bombastic use of colorful Pidgin to express his every change in feelings. Traditionally pushed out of the nest with the arrival of his next younger sibling, he spends most of his childhood years trying to gain the status and affection from his peers which his parents have not supplied. Often, the only attention he receives from his parents takes the form of beating and verbal abuse. Small wonder that sociologists note that the Hawaiian student's chief objective in relating with adults is avoidance of pain.   Bestowing or withholding love, our traditional mode of motivating others in and out of the classroom, simply does not work with the Hawaiian child. Adults, as he well knows, are not to be trusted. The rejected black child in the ghetto, with an unstable family situation, also relies upon his peer group for affection and status. Confrontation with authority and subsequent "trouble" are to be avoided at all costs.

In each of these three groups, we can see that peer-conformity pressures are far more potent than adult influences. Teacher-adult approval simply has no payoff. Any behavioral change, if it is to be accepted by the disadvantaged student, must be acceptable to the group as a whole. But, how to do it? I can think of no more natural way, within the context of the schoolroom, to teach these situational responses more effectively than through language-generating activities such as role playing. Perhaps it is because of my theater orientation that I believe that acting, or pretending, or "trying on" new behaviors is a natural part of human development. While our reluctant language student may not choose to adopt any of the new attitudes and behaviors we are trying to teach, he is constantly observing and listening to the language and behavior patterns around him and internalizing them, to a degree, whether he likes them or not. Though he may refuse to adopt the patterns we think he should acquire, he is nonetheless developing as a human being—reacting to stimuli which have meaning to him. Most importantly, if he is an avid television viewer, he may have a greater store of standard English patterns fled away in his mind than we give him credit for.

This realization struck me while I was working in an Hawaiian schoolroom a couple of years ago.   I had the opportunity to work with some rural elementary school children on Molokai, a rather isolated plantation island. Most of the children were Hawaiian or Filipino-Hawaiian, spoke only Pidgin, and displayed the boisterous and undisciplined behavior which is typical of such groups. I was using the acting games approach suggested by the Viola Spolin book,[4] a method which might be described as a physical-

4 Viola Spolin, *Improvisation for the Theater* (Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 1963).

intuitive approach to acting. As we moved out of pantomime and into improvisation, the classes suggested problem situations which they wished to play out.

One improvisation sticks in my mind. An extended strike of the pineapple harvesters was in progress at the time and many of the workers and their families were being fed three meals a day at outdoor union soup kitchens. Two of my fifth grade students, both Pidgin speakers, chose to play out a scene which took place in the plantation manager's office. The Filipino-Hawaiian boy who took the role of the plantation boss opened the scene by lighting an imaginary cigar and answering the telephone. Obviously the call was from his boss in the main office in Honolulu, and he responded with almost perfect standard dialect. As he hung up the phone, his acting partner, playing a pineapple picker, burst into the room and announced in vivid Pidgin that a machine had broken down and that he suspected sabotage. The boss almost exploded at the news (this time in Pidgin) and proceeded to berate the hapless worker with a colorful use of profanity that can be appreciated only if one has heard Island dialect.

Other scenes like this one were played out. What do you do when a policeman accuses you of breaking the law, or, when the principal calls you into the office for fighting on the playground? In almost every case, the student who chose to play the authority figure *tried to speak using the standard dialect.* In fact, the more successfully the actor avoided Pidgin and used the standard dialect, the more delighted his peers became. Although my objective as a teacher was not to change language behavior *per se,* here were students whom I had observed in English class speaking almost incomprehensible Island dialect now *choosing* not to use it, and receiving the support and encouragement of their peer group at the same time! This classroom exercise and others like it demonstrated to me that non-standard English speakers are more linguistically versatile than their teachers think they are.

An Alaskan colleague of mine who also uses role playing in his elementary classroom in a remote village mentions that his Eskimo students use the standard patterns only when they are in "pretend" situations. In the shelter of the game structure, they are able to use their new language spontaneously and unselfconsciously. The delight of the audience who, in turn, become actors themselves is all the payoff the students need. But, some cautionary notes are in order. Though tempted by the prospect, the language teacher must not use the role-playing games in a manipulative fashion-structuring the problem situations so as to load them with standard dialect roles, then suggesting more correct language patterns at the end of the scene. This stifles student enthusiasm and willingness to experiment. As Shaftel points out, a natural refining process takes place as the scene is replayed by other students who wish to offer an alternate solution.[5]

---

[5] Fannie R. Shaftel and George Shaftel, *Role-Playing for Social Values: Decision-Making in the Social Studies* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967).

Audience comments at the end of each scene are more influential than any the teacher might choose to make. Students rarely let an inappropriate behavioral response go by: "You didn't make me think that you were a doctor—doctors don't talk like that!" The next time that student's turn comes to play a standard speaker, he is likely to modify his language style accordingly.

I am not suggesting that role playing and sociodrama should replace the careful linguistic research which has led to contrastive analysis and development of patterned language teaching. Drill is an important way to practice new behaviors. We must not lose sight, however, of the way that every human being learns new behaviors or makes them " his own." He "tries them on" somewhat cautiously in a situation where he anticipates no criticism, and if they "work" he may use them again in another more threatening situation. As he develops confidence in their usefulness, they become a part of him. Speaking is, after all, a spontaneous and improvisa-tor activity, and it should be rehearsed in as life-like an atmosphere as possible. As natural human behavior, role playing can provide the bridge between classroom drill and real-life utilization of new language patterns. It can give zest and relevance to the process of language change.

Cultural Sensitivity Training for the Teacher of Spanish-Speaking Children *

John Bordie

Language-teaching techniques appropriate to the teaching of English as a foreign language tend to produce mediocre to average results when used to teach English as a second language. Teachers in EFL are usually abroad and are aware that they must make every effort to bypass the different cultural assumptions and understandings of the student in order to teach effectively. ESL teachers function in a similar situation without the general awareness of the cultural differences and generally do little to implement those factors which make EFL teaching a success overseas. When ESL teachers have verbalized their classroom problems, these have turned out to be identical to those encountered in teaching abroad. To help solve these problems and to improve teacher awareness, cultural sensitivity training has been instituted in teacher's workshops. These sessions have stressed those attitudes which are significant in inter-culture relationships. A workshop format designed to introduce and discuss these matters is presented and some of the topics are discussed.

For some years now teachers have been teaching English to those whose native language is not English with varying degrees of success and with varying degrees of acceptance. When the teacher has been enthusiastic, the students have usually responded rather well. Yet, results have been mediocre or, at best, of no better than average quality. The teaching has apparently been less successful in the United States than in various foreign countries abroad. Although one can assert that *no* one is accepted as a prophet at home, the question arises as to why the overseas situation should be a more fertile ground than the country of development.

I would like to suggest that one of the reasons is the unfamiliarity of the overseas environment. Its foreignness contributes to the successful application of the rules and principles on which the methodology is based. Many programs conducted abroad use native speakers of English for the requirements of daily classroom teaching. These teachers are aware of the differences between the place of their assignment and their home in the United States. They know that students do not have the opportunity to practice English outside the classroom. The pressures the student encounters outside the school are sufficiently intense so that he is unlikely to use English for more than a small fraction of after-school time. Teachers who

---

work in such situations are always aware that the achievement of the student is very largely due to how well the classroom hour is structured and to how significantly the lesson content has been ordered for the appropriate presentation of the most necessary topics. Student progress is a direct result of the amount of material presented during study hours and subsequent practice time. Such factors as student motivation, external and internal school pressures, cultural differences, and material control are more clearly seen when placed against a different cultural background. The teacher, though prehaps a master of the classroom situation, is not a master of the non-school situation. What is more, the teacher is not even a member of the surrounding culture and is only a temporary resident who will ultimately return to the original home situation in his native country. The attitudes of the people he meets, the food he eats, the dress, the gestural patterns, the landscape and climate, even the language he hears outside the school every day, serve as a constant reminder of the differences between the cultural settings of his temporary overseas home and his own native land. He is indeed teaching English as a foreign language and must make every effort to break through the different cultural assumptions and under-standings his students hold in order to present his material with maximum effectiveness.

As a result, the teacher is required to be constantly alert so that the cultural assumptions are not slighted, that all levels of speech are presented, and that nothing about the language and culture he is teaching is left to chance. The overseas placement requires the teacher to be oriented toward precise, specific goals to a considerable degree. This awareness is not immediate nor does it always occur.   Some teachers never achieve the understanding necessary to be effective in such a situation. All teachers, the successful and the not-so-successful, go through a stage of adaptation to their surroundings. They must learn new attitudes, new customs, and new standards which are functional for their students.

The teacher, though aware of the differences, usually has difficulty in adapting. The old cues are no longer valid in this new atmosphere, but they are still the ones which elicit his reactions to the environment. The good old days back home suddenly become golden days when everything went well and one did not have to make constant adjustments. All the problems magically disappear and all the successes are magnified. The local situation seems intolerable-the food is too spicy, the climate is bad, the student is undependable or downright hostile, the reactions of admin-istrators are horribly bureaucratic, nothing works, and life is completely miserable.

After a while, the situation improves and some awareness of the differ-ences become apparent. The teacher begins to recognize the contrasts between home and the local scene. The students begin to study and even learn something once in a while. Still feeling somewhat superior to the local

situation and not really a part of it, the teacher begins to laugh at some of the problems and begins to accept some of them as burdens which must be endured but which are not as intolerable as once thought. Ultimately, the teacher adapts to the new situation and functions normally once again. The new attitude is that while this is not Paradise, at least the situation is no longer the Inferno it once was.

The teacher who never leaves his home country encounters much the same situation and problems of adjustment when working with students from another cultural background. I recall my shock when I first arrived in Texas and encountered the culture of the Southwest: it seemed quite irrational. People seemed to be very friendly and polite, but they would never keep their appointments when made far in advance. Students could not be counted on to do anything. Absence for illness I had expected, but absence because someone's mother had a dentist's appointment seemed unbelievable. And the food was nothing but chili peppers abundantly covered with beans. Even Christmas was unusual—firecrackers exploded under my window and rockets were sent up at night. A church festival had been changed into a patriotic extravaganza. Ultimately I adapted, and last Christmas in Chicago seemed quite colorless without the fireworks. The period of adaptation was extended and the problem obscured because I was still home. I had not left the United States, and the old cues for personal interrelationships seemed to remain valid. And they were, so long as I watched television, read the newspapers, or communicated with administrators. Adjustment was complicated because we shared the same general standards but had separate individual standards.

Most teachers who work with students from minority cultural groups have the same difficulty; they are functioning in a new cultural situation without the recognition overseas life forces on one's awareness of the cultural differences. The values seem still to be appropriate, but the answers do not solve the problems. In many cases the answers only serve to intensify the difficulties which exist. The teacher, apparently still in the same environment, is responding properly; the student responding otherwise must be doing something wrong. When a problem occurs, the tacit assumption is that the student is at fault because he is ignoring all of the appropriate responses. This assumption—that our way is the natural way and that if a difference exists between us, the other person is wrong—is one of the major reasons we have difficulty in the new situation There is little awareness that teaching a non-English-speaking student in the United States requires the same adaptation required for overseas teaching. While we recognize the validity of the teaching techniques on an intellectual basis, we are unable emotionally to implement all those other factors which make the techniques a success overseas. There is a general lack of cultural sensitivity. Our responses tend to remain conditioned by our original cultural insights which are part of our scholastic and academic background.

For some time, our Program in Foreign Language Education at the University of Texas has been arranging workshops in bilingualism and the teaching of English as a second language for teachers in the school system of Texas. Last summer a large group of teachers (approximately 200) was asked to identify problem areas in the teaching of minority culture students. These were all experienced teachers with an average teaching experience of five years. They listed, among others, the following problems: (1) lack of pride in scholastic work; (2) lack of personal and classroom discipline; (3) no planning for the future; (4) indifference to scholastic requirements; (5) no desire to read; (6) over-concern with status; (7) distrust of people outside the family or the community; (8) disregard for property. These items are identical to those problems associated with foreign teaching situations. The cultural conflicts are the same whether encountered in the United States or abroad.

In an attempt to solve some of these problems and especially to improve the teacher's awareness, cultural sensitivity training has been instituted as a regular feature of the workshops presented during the course of the year. These workshops are not meant to solve all of the problems which might face a teacher, nor are they meant to provide complete prescriptions for some of the difficulties which occur. Our efforts have been directed toward an introduction to several areas in which teaching effectiveness might be improved through cultural awareness.

Among the areas stressed, several concerned with specific cultural attitudes have appeared to be the most significant. The first is the general assumption that our own way of doing things is the natural way. It is probably universal to assume that others want the same things and think the same way we do. Here we attempt the solution of a problem in terms of the particular environment in which the problem occurs rather than in terms of familiar programs or standard blueprint solutions. The goal is to make obvious such differences in values, motivation, and perception which may be the cause of difficulty. It is useful to think that such values reside within the individual but they may also be viewed as part of the social structure in which the individual moves. The expectations of others, the system of rewards and punishments, the ultimate attitudes expected of the individual are societal values rather than internal individualistic values. An individual may be willing to accept many changes but may not be willing to act accordingly because the group pressures on him will discourage such action. These values are there for teacher and student alike, and lack of awareness causes numerous problems when each expects the other to act in the same fashion each expects of himself. Personal and group awareness is emphasized in our attempt to make over these various attitudes.

A second area is that of personal success. We tend to tie our self esteem to personal success and our desire to improve ourselves. We attempt to improve the lot of the Latin-American, and this is considered a good thing in

our culture. We also attempt to ignore social distinctions. When we begin to look at these problems, we are confronted by a conflict between morality, which insists that all men are to be treated equally, and our personal success factor, which says we must ignore class distinctions in our efforts to get ahead. Since most Latin-Americans are in the lower economic class in the Southwest, we are faced with a consideration of two problems, one of which is not held to be a proper area of inquiry.

A third area is materialism. We seek tangible results that can be measured or counted. Many groups seek satisfaction in aesthetic or spiritual values. Our delight is gadgetry, and we tend to judge on the basis of plumbing or the quality of the grass on someone's front lawn. As a result we tend to stress control, progress, and material values. The Hippy violates the first, the radical threatens the second, and the poor man affronts the third. A person from another culture with long hair, no money, and with no concern for school is triply reprehensible.

A fourth area is our orientation toward time and our reliance on the value of science. We tend to treat time as a material thing that should be actively mastered or manipulated. We buy time and create time whenever possible. Our preciseness about time is a result of our attempt to manipulate it and put it to good use. Time is money and if we lose time, we lose money. We look on our manipulation of time as a duty and a responsibility which must be observed. Our scientific orientation requires us to focus on answers to particular problems. It implies that once a problem has been stated, there must be an answer to it. But the presence of a problem does not require that an answer exists for that problem. Given all the time and money we might wish, we may still be unable to contrive a solution. The best we can hope for is to bypass the problem by recognizing the limitations of the logic.

These areas are not the only ones which can be explored; inter-personal behavior, moralistic orientation, attitudes toward authority, and personal goals are others which add to our insight and contribute to an awareness of cultural differences. Not until the teacher is aware of such differences is it likely that meaningful work may be accomplished in the classroom. The teacher must go abroad, so to speak, to discover the attitudinal differences between his orientation and the students' expectations.

A workshop format which has been quite successful in the introduction and discussion of such matters is relatively easy to arrange. A general plan which I have used is the following:

1. An anthropological presentation and discussion of cultural differences.

2. A second language situation in which the teacher is required to fill out a standard job application form in an unknown language. Speakers of the second language are present who are willing to help in any way possible so long as communication is maintained within the unknown language.

3. A formal technical explanation of the unknown language suitable to

an advanced grammar but which is quite irrelevant to the problem of filling out the form.

4. Small group sessions to discuss different approaches to language teaching.

5. Appropriate technical content sessions which are as practical as may be arranged. These sessions are directly related to the subject areas the participants teach and are intended to introduce new or useful techniques suitable to the interests of the group.

6. Cultural sensitivity sessions in which the assumptions of both cultures are explored.

There has been fairly general acceptance by all participants of the goals of such workshops. While it is difficult to come up with extensive data detailing observable changes, the most apparent changes have been in the more successful use of English as a second language in the classroom and a readier acceptance of the cultural differences as expressed in student behavior.

The following story, I think, summarizes what I have said: Once upon a time there was a great flood which swept a monkey down a torrent of water. The monkey being agile and skilled in climbing managed to scramble up a tree. As he hung onto a branch panting from his narrow escape, he looked down and saw a fish being buffeted by the vigor of the current. With the very best intentions, the monkey reached down and saved the fish from the flood.

REFERENCES ON CULTURAL SENSITIVITY

Campa, A. L. "Language Barriers in Intercultural Relations." *Journal 0f Communication,* I (November, 1951), 41-46.

Hall, E. T. *The Silent Language.* New York: Doubleday and Company, 1959.

Hall, E. T., and W. F. Whyte. "Intercultural Communication." *Human Organization,* 19:1 (Spring 1960), 6-12.

Ervin-Tripp, Susan. "An Analysis of the Interaction of Language, Topic, and Listener." *American Anthropologist,* 66:6, Part 2 (December 1964), 86-102.

Hymes, Dell, ed. *Language in Culture and Society.* New York: Harper and Row, 1964.

Koerner, J. D. *The Miseducation of American Teachers.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin and Company, 1965.

Lambert, W. E. "A Social Psychology of Bilingualism." *Journal of Social Issues,* 20:3, Part 2 (April 1967), 91-109.

Lerner, D. *The Passing of Traditional Society.* Glencoe: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1958.

Radler, D. H. *El Gringo: The Yankee Image in Latin America.* Philadelphia: The Chilton Company, 1962.

Stewart, W. A. "Foreign Language Teaching Methods in Quaisi-Foreign Language Situations." *Non-Standard Speech and the Teaching of English,* pp. 1-15. Washington: Center For Applied Linguistics, 1964.

The Codes of the Spanish-English Bilingual*

Donald M. Lance

This article presents some conclusions based on research conducted in an East Texas community with a Mexican American population of less than ten percent. Three generations of one family were interviewed to determine their relative competence in English and Spanish. The grandparents showed minimal command over English, the second generation about equal command, with a slight English dominance, and the children a limited command over Spanish.

The best indicator of the availability of each of the two language codes is the amount of each language used in unstructured conversations. When the situation excludes one language, the speakers can use only English or only Spanish. But when the situation allows more freedom, the speaker uses the construction that is closest to the tip of the tongue, producing a linguistic mixture. The nature of the 'mixing' suggests that the two codes are not entirely separable, but are two codes that together constitute the speaker's competence in a singular sense.

The project also included a comparison of the English of some migrant first graders and some foreign students. The two groups made entirely different types of errors, demonstrating the need for different instructional techniques for different age groups.

This paper presents some conclusions that I have drawn as a result of a small research project conducted at Texas A&M University in the spring and summer of 1969.[1] The core of the investigation was a series of interviews with three generations of one family in the East Central Texas city of Bryan. Having grown up on a South Texas farm in the 1940's, I have generally found that my own ideas on bilingualism have seldom jibed 100% with the generalizations that I have heard and read from my Anglo colleagues in recent years. Specifically, it has seemed to me that interference phenomena have been assigned too large a role in statements about the linguistic performance of Southwestern bilingual, particularly in pedagogical studies. Thus, I wanted to collect some data and look for concrete evidence of, among other things, cross-code interference.

The research plan called for a graduate student and me to interview the three generations, with her interviewing them in English and me in Spanish; later the project secretary, a bilingual, also interviewed some of the informants. For purposes of comparison, another graduate student inter-

viewed some foreign students in order to compare their linguistic competence with that of native bilingual. Because of time limitations, the project was not large enough for the results to be deemed unequivocally definitive, nor for the sampling to be truly representative of bilingual communities in general terms.

In analyzing the informants' linguistic behavior, I have found it useful to keep in mind Chomsky's distinction between *performance*—that is, the actual use of language in concrete situations—and *competence*—that is, the speaker-hearer's knowledge of a particular language.[2] As both the linguistic data and the personal experiences discussed here indicate, it is often difficult to separate completely the purely Spanish (code) and the purely English (code)—if they are indeed separable in bilingual who have used the two languages since childhood.

The family chosen for this project, by chance rather than by design, displays the vast range of possibilities that exists in many bilingual communities. The family is more representative, of course, of communities with relatively small Spanish-speaking populations; along the Texas border, where the majority of the population is Mexican-American, the situation is quite different. Families with other educational and occupational histories would also be different.

The grandmother and grandfather, both born in South Texas, never attended school and thus received no formal education in either English or Spanish. The grandmother claimed to speak no English at all, but it was obvious when I was interviewing her daughter in English that she understood much of what was being said. The grandfather knew enough English to make a modest living in a predominantly Anglo area, but after the first interview—which was in Spanish—he would not speak English with me at all, though we conversed freely on many different topics in Spanish. Also, when I tried to get him to speak English, he displayed as much discomfort as his grandchildren did when I tried to get them to speak Spanish with me.

The grandfather's overall linguistic competence, I must add, was more sophisticated than one might expect in the unschooled. He had learned the alphabet and could sound out words in Spanish, though not in English. Rather interestingly, he did not use some of the more obvious regional dialect forms that brand rural Mexican and Texas Spanish as substandard—namely, *muncho, pos,* and *pa'* for *para* in certain expressions—and he tended to enunciate more distinctly. Though we did not engage in secondary comments about Spanish, I suspect that he has a rather clear notion of 'correctness' in the use of Spanish.

The second-generation informants consisted of the son of the preceding couple, his wife, and a neighbor. The son was not as readily available for interviews as were his wife and the neighbor, so most of the observations

---

2 Noam Chomsky, *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax* (Cambridge, Mass.: M. LT. Press, 1965), p. 4.

about the second generation are based on the performance of these two ladies. In the interview sessions with the three informants from the second generation, we talked very freely in English and in Spanish and even with a combination of the two languages. In the Spanish interviews, there were occasional lapses into English, but these consisted of only about 100 words in a total of 3800. In the English interviews, Spanish was never used. Thus, with this generation, as the occasion demands, either English or Spanish can be used exclusively, though there is a perceptible tendency to rely on English, particularly when an Anglo is present. The tendency to rely on English can easily be attributed to the subtle factor of language dominance, but politeness-whether conscious or unconscious—must also be recognized.

One of the questions in mind for the project was how 'pure' the informants' Spanish is. In analyzing their performance, I found that none of the adult informants displayed any degree of interference from English, though they of course used a few loan words—such as *bísquete, mixteado, queique, yarda, weldear*— but there were fewer of these than I had expected. I also found less nonstandard morphology than I had anticipated; and, very interestingly, upon looking into such works as Lapesa's *Historia de la lengua española,* Menéndez Pidal's *Manual de gramática histórica española,* Santamaria's *Diccionario de mejicanismos,* and the Royal Spanish Academy's abridged dictionary, I found that almost every one of the nonstandard forms is listed as occurring elsewhere in the Hispanic world. A few words such as *bolillo* 'Anglo,' *chance* 'by chance,' and *vista* 'movie' were not listed as occurring outside the United States. The same kind of temporal and geographical distribution applies to nonstandard verb forms such as *dicemos, juimos, váyamos, hicites,* and *haiga.* The only element of Spanish grammar that may be undergoing a unique development in Texas Spanish is in the use of past subjunctive verb forms. More research needs to be conducted on the use of verb forms in the Southwest and in Mexico, particularly among speakers with minimal formal education in Standard Spanish.

The third generation presents a more complex picture. The group consisted of two girls, aged 12 and 8, and two boys, aged 11 and 9. Mrs. Smith, one of the graduate students, conducted three rather successful interviews with them in English and got very eager responses from all of them. They displayed no difficulty in understanding or producing English, though they spoke with what one would call a Spanish accent. This accent, however, does not result solely from the Spanish phonological system superimposing itself upon their oral performance. Their phonology consists of a combination of (1) certain interference phenomena such as difficulty with /s/ and /z/, and /č/ and /š/, and—a fact that is seldom even noted—the failure to lengthen vowels before voiced consonants; (2) certain exclusively English phonological features such as eleven vowel contrasts, diphthongization, and breaking; and (3) an occasional typically South Midland feature such as the merger of /ɪ/ and /ɛ/ before nasals and a retracted and rounded /ɔ/.

The nonstandard morphology and syntax produced by the children does

not result simply from cross-code interference either. Forms such as *maked, tooked,* and *jumpses* also occur in the speech of monolingual English-speaking children, though monolingual seem to master such matters as tense and plural forms at an earlier age than these bilingual informants have. Their mother also used uncommon forms occasionally, such as *drinked.* Other nonstandard items can be attributed to association with monolingual in the neighborhood. Some of these are the use of double negatives, *ain't, they was, them guys, if it's a game* meaning 'if there's a game; and *When we come he be happy—* the latter construction having been picked up from local Black English rather than the speech of local Angles.

A realistic assessment of the children's competence in Spanish proved to be a rather difficult task. There is considerable secondary evidence that they can and do understand and speak the language, at least in certain social environments. The family speaks both languages at home, and apparently the children spend some time with their grandmother, who speaks no English. Also, their church services and Sunday School lessons are in Spanish. In interviews with the research team, however, their linguistic performance raised more questions than it answered.

Three interviews were held-or attempted—in Spanish. First, Mrs. Smith asked them to tell stories to each other in Spanish after they had shown considerable enthusiasm in doing so in English. All except the eight-year-old girl did so with the same enthusiasm but with less accuracy in detail. Because the interviewer, who does not speak Spanish, was present, they could not keep from reverting to English and tended to telescope elements of the plot while narrating the story.

When I attempted to engage them in conversations in Spanish, they would answer, though with some obvious inhibition, either in English or in a mixture of the two languages. During all of our visits to their home, however, they had displayed very few inhibitions in talking with me in English. When I attempted to record their Spanish, the inhibitions grew so strong that they were practically mute. Not wanting to torture them, I abandoned the idea of a taped interview and talked (in English) with the eleven-year-old boy about why he would talk with me in English but not in Spanish. His explanation was forthright and simple: "It's too hard." He meant that the difficulty arose in speaking Spanish with an Anglo, because he further said that it would be easier to talk Spanish with Miss Reyna, the project secretary, if she were his teacher than with me if I were his teacher, though he could talk Spanish with either of us in such a situation.

Miss Reyna also interviewed the children. She had eminently more success than I, but they did not talk as openly with her as they had with Mrs. Smith in the English interviews, perhaps because they associated Miss Reyna more directly with the University, a more distant element of the 'Establishment.' On our first trip to their home, they had recognized Mrs. Smith as one of the former teachers—and a favorite-of their sixteen-year-old aunt in the junior high school which they would attend later on.

Even with Miss Reyna, they displayed a marked tendency to lapse into English. The twelve-year-old girl obviously liked both interviewers personally, and her performance indicated a very strong urge to use the native language of the interviewer. In telling her story for Mrs. Smith, she reverted to English for 43% of her words, though she was obviously trying to accommodate the request for Spanish. On the other hand, when she was talking with Miss Reyna, only 4% of her words were in English. The eleven-year-old boy, who was a first-string pitcher for his Little League team, seemed incapable of suppressing English words and constructions in either of the interviews. In telling his story, he used 34% English and in talking with Miss Reyna he used even more, 42%. The nine-year-old boy was quite eager to tell his story and was more successful in staying in Spanish: he lapsed into English for only 7% of his words, and a good many of these were repetitions of *bear,* since he did not know the word *oso.* He was ill on the day of Miss Reyna's interviews, and one can only speculate on how he would have responded to her. The eight-year-old girl flatly declined to tell a story in Spanish and was reluctant at first to talk Spanish with Miss Reyna, but as the interview progressed she contributed more and more, with only 30% of her words being in English—a considerably smaller percentage than her older brother had used.

In reviewing the foregoing observations, one can see that in a manner of speaking the three generations of this family reflect a cultural development that has been taking place at a rather rapid pace in the Southwest since 1940, particularly in areas where the Spanish-speaking population is very much in the minority—between 5% and 10% in that particular part of Texas. Generation by generation, the individuals and families are developing a stronger 'Anglo' dominance, linguistically and culturally.

The matter of language dominance can be seen most clearly in the relative amount of English and Spanish used when a bilingual speaker freely switches from one language to the other in relaxed conversations. In the Spanish interviews, the hostess lapsed into English 4% of the time, her husband did so less than 1%, and the neighbor 3%; whereas the children lapsed into English 4%, 30%, and 42% in the interview with Miss Reyna. These figures indicate some tendency in all these speakers to rely on English as the stronger element in their linguistic competence. In two interviews, I recorded conversations in which the two ladies and I simply talked, using English or Spanish or a mixture, depending on the word or construction that was 'closest to the tip of the tongue.' In these interviews, the hostess used Spanish 38% of the time, the neighbor—surprisingly—only 11%, and I only 21%. Suspecting that my presence had inhibited the use of Spanish, I left the room and asked the two ladies to continue freely mixing the two languages. Though both insisted that my presence had had no influence, their use of Spanish increased very significantly-more than doubled. The hostess used 71% Spanish and the neighbor increased her Spanish from 11% to 42%.

In referring to a 'mixture,' I am not alluding to the adaptation of English words to Spanish phonology and morphology. That is borrowing, as in the use of words like *weldear, mixteado, greve, bísquete,* and *parquearse.* The mixing of the two codes (more commonly, and more appropriately, termed 'code switching') is illustrated in the following excerpts from the interviews:

> Las tortillas se las venden en . . . let's see, I think it's a dozen for fifteen, Ias dos docenas por thirty. En el paquete. En las tiendas están más caro. Me parece dieciciete o dieciocho.

> Y una vez me dijo mi chamaca, dijo, "Mami, you go there, order me a hamburger basket deluxe." "Are you sure que hay asina, porque no en todos hay?" Dijo, "Si, nomás diles que quieres un hamburger basket deluxe."

> Primero they were Ieadin' diez pa' nada. Then there was our team to bat and we made . . . 'cimos dos carreras. And then ellos fueron a batear. Hicieron una and then nojotros 'cimos cinco. Después 'ciron six, 'ciron cinco. And then they made dos and it was our time to bat and we made . . . ah . . . five or six. And they beat us by five runs.

The difference in the performance of the two women in switching between English and Spanish can be explained in terms of their personal history. The hostess grew up using only Spanish at home, but she works as a maid and has to take messages on the telephone, thus coming to depend on English as the sole or principal medium of communication on the job. The neighbor has a rather unique history. When she was six or seven, her mother died and her father married an Anglo. She then had to speak only English until her marriage at the age of seventeen. She relearned Spanish in order to communicate with her in-laws but continued to use English in her own home. Thus, she is now definitely English-dominant, but even so she has virtually complete control over the Spanish language, as is indicated by her using English only 3% of the time in the Spanish interview with me. Her Spanish is without a trace of English interference, and her English is rather unusual for a Mexican American: phonologically and morphologically it is that of the East Central Texas rural Anglo, no doubt very much like that of her late step-mother.

Judging from the way in which these three generations of informants used both English and Spanish in talking with me, with Mrs. Smith, with Miss Reyna, and with each other, one cannot simply say that Spanish-English bilingual have internalized two distinct and totally separate language codes, each one more or less completely. Instead, their Spanish and English together consitute their linguistic competence in a *singular* sense, and their linguistic performance can draw primarily upon English, primarily upon Spanish, or upon a willy-nilly mixture of the two. This same statement of course can be made of a number of other ethnic groups on this continent whose families use two languages: Yiddish-speaking bilingual, French Canadians, Polish Americans, Ukranian Canadians, Czech Americans, and Norwegian Americans. In his discussion of code switching and borrowing in the speech of Norwegian Americans, Einar Haugen makes the following statement:

In becoming bilingual they were so to speak grafting a new stem on an old tree, and their further development proceeded partly in obedience to the habits of the old language, but much more in response to those of the new.[3]

In applying Haugen's metaphor to the informants of our project, one might make the following generalizations: the grandfather's linguistic tree has a limited number of English graftings, but the original trunk and branches are the only parts in which the grain runs true; his daughter-in-law has grafted together two trunks, one for the job and one for the family; the neighbor performed a major graft at the age of seven so that the trunk of her tree is basically English, but she later grafted on a major Spanish component which grew well because there was still a trace of Spanish sap in the adopted English trunk; the twelve-year-old girl, for the time being at least, has two separate trees available and can build tree houses in one or the other depending on the native tongue of her playmates; and the eleven-year-old boy has begun to show a distinct affinity for the tree from which Little League bats are made, and in Bryan, Texas, it is an Anglo-Saxon rather than a Hispanic tree.

(It would perhaps be of interest to the reader to classify the linguistic behavior of these informants in accordance with some of the more detailed theoretical discussions in the literature,[4] but since the sampling of informants and the data in the project are rather limited, I do not feel that such a classification would add substantially to the principal concerns of this paper.)

For purposes of comparison, Mrs. Ward, the other graduate student on the project, interviewed some Spanish-speaking foreign students on campus. In analyzing her data, she used a tentative unpublished analysis by Gustavo González, of the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, of the English of a group of twenty-six migrant children who had been learning English for slightly less than one academic year. Three of the foreign students had begun their study of English only one year before the interviews.

The most significant finding in her study is that the two groups of students tended to make completely different types of errors. The most common error among the migrant children was the use of the unmarked verb form with third person singular subjects, as in *he say.* Twenty-two of the twenty-six children made this error at least once, whereas the mistake was made by only one of the four foreign students, and only one time. On the other hand, the highest incidence of errors among the foreigners was in the treatment of count versus noncount and singular versus plural nouns,

---

[3] Einar Haugen, *The Norwegian* Language *in America,* Vol. I (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1953), p. 52.

[4] Cf., for example, Joshua Fishman's discussion of coordinate and compound bilingualism in "Language Maintenance and Language Shift As a Field of Inquiry," in *Language Loyalty in the United States* (The Hague: Mouton and Co., 1966), pp. 424-458.

whereas these were among the lowest frequency errors made by the migrant children.

One of the interesting sidelights of Mrs. Ward's study is that the double negative, which one would expect to be a common error among Spanish speakers, did not occur a significant number of times in the speech of either group of informants. In the González study, this error was not listed as occurring in the speech of any of the twenty-six migrant children. And only two of the four foreign students used the construction, each using it only once. Thus, the tendency to use the Spanish double negative pattern in English apparently is rather easily suppressed. Further, if a Spanish speaker uses it at all, the influencing factor seems to be association with monolingual who use it, for the construction is widespread throughout the speech of Angles, Negroes, and Mexican Americans in Bryan.

The implications of the findings of this brief research project—for me at least-are manifold as far as future research and public education are concerned. The Spanish of the Southwest needs to be studied as a part of a broader analysis of Mexican, or North American, Spanish, including such matters as borrowing and the historical provenience and geographical distribution of nonstandard forms-for example, the fact that *semos* and *haiga,* rather than being modern corruptions, go back to medieval times. Menéndez Pidal points out that *semos* can be traced all the way back to Augustus Caesar's use of *simus* instead of *sumus* in the first century B. C.[5] As well, the English of bilingual needs to be studied as a distinctive variety of *English*— a dialect—rather than as a hedge-podge of forms that illustrate interference phenomena.

As far as public education is concerned, more attention must be paid to the age of the individual who is learning the second language. As the study of the English of the foreign students indicates, the grammatical distinctions that cause trouble for first graders are not the same ones that cause trouble for college freshmen. And in view of the recent findings of Eric Lenneberg, this difference should not be too surprising. As he says, "There is evidence that the primary acquisition of language is predicated upon a certain developmental stage which is quickly outgrown at the age" of puberty."[6] Thus, different instructional techniques and a different organizational pattern of grammatical data are needed for, say, six-year-old learners and fifteen- or eighteen-year-old learners of a second language.

One should not overgeneralize in regard to the linguistic competence or performance of individual bilinguals—particularly when they are children. As the eleven-year-old boy's performance indicates, if he were placed all of a sudden into a bilingual instructional program, he would have to undergo a considerable amount of internal adjustment. His strong tendency to

[5] R. Menéndez Pidal, *Manual de gramática histórica española,* llth ed. (Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1962), p. 302.

[6] Eric H. Lenneberg, *Biological Foundations of Language* (New York: John Wiley and sons, 1967) , p. 142.

choose English over Spanish when talking to me, to Mrs. Smith, or to Miss Reyna suggests that he would not necessarily view instruction in Spanish as an easy intellectual task—but perhaps even as an undesirable one. On the other hand, the ease with which his older sister responded to Miss Reyna suggests that she would adjust rather easily to a bilingual program. The situation is less clear for the two younger children because we did not get enough data from them. Further, if Anglo teachers are involved, the adjustment process will become more complex.

In the case of the children in this family, their contact with the surrounding community as a whole has apparently conditioned them to consider English as the appropriate medium of communication outside the immediate family environment, and any deviation from this expectation is so anomalous as to impede natural linguistic performance on their part. In making these observations, I do not mean to imply that bilingual or bicultural programs would be beset by insuperable obstacles or would be less than desirable-only that many school children with Spanish surnames have developed cultural orientations that do not fit neatly into stereotyped categories. School populations in the Southwest simply are not globally differentiable, linguistically and culturally, into two separate groups, the Mexican American and the Anglo—not even in the same family. The 'codes' of the language-using organism, one must recognize, are essentially only theoretical constructs devised to account for the linguistic performance of individuals or groups; what *really* exists in a bilingual speech community is a collection of discrete human beings, each of whom has a single mind-i. e., a central nervous system—which 'contains' Spanish-language and English-language behavioral patterns and 'behaves' in accordance with the apparent requirements of the immediate environment, producing a particular language or a mixture of linguistic items as prior experience with the social milieu has conditioned the human organism to do. In the American Southwest there are, then, individuals with varying degrees of Mexican or Anglo identificational patterns, and these genuine human responses must be respected as such.

An Adaptation of Group Dynamics Techniques to Foreign Language Teaching*

Peter Cole

The main emphasis in much foreign language teaching is on helping the learner approximate the phonetic, morphological, and syntactic patterns of the language by means of pattern practice and similar drills. Although this is useful and may, indeed, be necessary, it is not sufficient. There seems to be something other than accuracy of patterns which allows a speaker to make himself understood. The *sine qua non* for the development of communication skills is communication itself. Group dynamics theory and practice provide language teachers with a methodology which may be generally useful in language classrooms. The basic technique employed in the current application of this methodology is the goal-oriented buzz group. Small groups of students attempt to reach a consensus on the solution to problems presented by the instructor. They may later attempt to arrive at a class consensus. These activities are especially useful in oversized classes since they permit participation in communication activities by all members of the class simultaneously.

The assumption behind the teaching experiments to be described below is that the acquisition of language habits is in itself insufficient for the true mastery of a language. A methodology must be developed which will induce the student to communicate with others by employing his newly learned set of structures. The ability to use a language can only be acquired by the act of using the language.

The above assumption does not reflect a revision of good TESL practice so much as it does a revision of TESL theory.[1] Teachers have always felt the need to supplement drills by means of games, question and answer, and 'free conversation'. However, there is often a feeling on the part of FL teachers that time spent on these activities is somehow illegitimate; that this time might better be spent on drilling structure by means of pattern practice. Often the structural aspects of the program are mandatory in the

[1] The critique of certain current FL practices implicit herein is not intended as a discussion of the behaviorist learning theory on which Fries *et al.* base their program. It is, rather, an empirical attempt to improve the teaching of how to use a foreign language. The cognitive psycholinguistic assumptions of these experiments are in fact intended as a rationale rather than as a theory in the strict sense.

curriculum, while conversation (or, better, communication) activities are
left up to the judgment of the individual teacher. To a certain extent this
is valid, of course, since realistic communication cannot be forced but must
arise naturally from the immediate situation. However, the lack of emphasis
upon conversation also reflects a general downgrading of the importance
of this sort of activity in comparison to that of pattern practice.

In fact, learning a language seems to involve at least two separate
processes. First, in order to communicate in a language one must approxi-
mate the phonetic, morphological, and syntactic patterns of the language.[2]
The approximation arrived at by the learner may be quite far removed from
the speech of a native speaker of the language and still may be quite adequate
for oral communication, however.

Second, there seems to be something other than accuracy of patterns
which allows a speaker to make himself understood. The phenomenon of
'false fluency' attests to the possibility of communication despite non-native
structural patterns. As André Martinet notes,

> Mutual understanding is a highly relative concept. Who knows all of 'his'
> language? It will be easier to understand the foreigner enquiring about the
> station than to follow the discussion of two local technicians. Two speakers
> who, when first brought together, had found their respective dialects mu-
> tually unintelligible, may in a few hours or a few days discover the clues to
> unimpeded intercourse. If cooperation is a pressing necessity, everyone
> will soon learn enough of the other man's language to establish communica-
> tion even if the two mediums in contact have no genetic ties or synchronic
> resemblances of any sort. If the will to communicate is wholly or mainly
> on one side, a bilingual situation will soon develop on that side.[3]

It would appear that the *sine qua non* for the development of fluency is
the will to communicate. As used here, "communicate" means not merely
to speak but to say *something.* It is not a formal activity which can be
practiced in drills such as pattern practice, but rather is a contentive action
which grows out of the immediate needs of the speaker. In order to make
communication an intrinsic part of an ESL program, we must find a way
to bring it into the language classroom.

A similar view has been suggested by W. R. Lee, editor of the British
journal *English Language Teaching:*

> Ability to make 'well-formed sentences' is one thing; ability to use these,
> and perhaps sentences less well formed, for communication is another thing.
> The necessity of repetition arises out of the need to feel at ease kinestheti-
> cally, auditorily, and visually with the patterns of the language being ac-
> quired, but also with the matching of these patterns to those of the situations
> of use.
> Effective learning is doubtless not in direct proportion to the frequency
> of repetition, but it is tempting to think that repeatedly successful commun-
> ication has very much more to do with it, since success of this kind is

---

2 Fries *et al.* deal with this aspect of language learning almost exclusively.

3 André, Martinet, preface to Uriel Weinreich, *Languages in Contact* (The Hague,
Mouton & Co., 1966), p. viii.

likely to impress the learner with what the language can do and he can do with it.[4]

As was mentioned above, certain traditional language-teaching exercises promote fluency in communication. Various types of question-and-answer drills (especially the less structured varieties) are of great value. Question and answer is not enough, however. What is needed is a consciously applied methodology for the fostering of communication. Games and free conversation could then be used purposively, rather than in the current haphazard manner.

Such a methodology does in fact exist, although it apparently has not been applied to the foreign language classroom. This methodology is that of laboratory training, developed principally for use in sensitivity groups by students of small group dynamics.[5] It would not be appropriate to discuss the theoretical basis of group dynamics here. This would be difficult even if it were desirable, since this body of theory and practice cannot be described as a single school or trend in sociology.[6] For present purposes it is sufficient to note that laboratory training groups often have the goal of developing "mechanisms . . . for human communication and collaboration . . ."[7] The group's activities are seen as a learning process which

> . . . first focuses around the problem of *communication.* While most delegates [i.e., participants in the group] admit at the outset that they are not good listeners as it might be hoped, rarely do they realize how little listening they or anyone else in the group does during the early sessions. The discovery that they missed many things altogether and that various group members heard the same speaker say entirely different things is shocking and thought provoking. *They become more aware of the complexity of the communication process.*[8]

One theory of laboratory training (that of Harry Stack Sullivan and Carl Rogers) states that the focus of inquiry for the laboratory training

---

[4] W. R. Lee, "Editorial," *English Language Teaching,* Vol. XXIV, No. 1, (Oct. 1969) , p. 1.

[5] The reader might wish to consult the following publications in which he will find discussions of various aspects of group dynamics theory and practice.

George M. Beal, Joe M. Bohlen, and J. Neil Randabaugh, *Leadership and Dynamic Group Action* (Ames: Iowa State University Press, 1962).

Warren G. Bennis, Kenneth D. Benne, and Robert Chin, eds. *The Planning of Change: Readings in the Applied Behavioral Sciences* (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1961).

Max Birnbaum, "Sense and Nonsense about Sensitivity Training," *Saturday Review,* Vol. LII, No. 46 (Nov. 15, 1969), 82-83, 96-98.

Malcolm and Hulda Knowles, *Introduction to Group Dynamics* (New York: Association Press, 1959).

Edgar H. Schein, and Warren G. Bennis, *Personal and Organizational Change through Group Methods: the Laboratory Approach* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1965).

[6] Knowles and Knowles, p. 11.

[7] Schein and Bennis, p. 6.

[8] Schein and Bennis, p. 17.

group is the entire range of communication acts, their distortions and reliabilities. [9]

The traditional T-group (laboratory training group) consists of a small number of individuals, usually ten to sixteen, whose objectives in meeting are to help each other become aware why they behave as they do in groups. That is to say, their aim is to improve their human relations Skills.[10]

Obviously, many aspects of sensitivity training are to be avoided in the classroom. What I am suggesting here is an adaption of selected aspects of group dynamics to the classroom, especially those aspects which are valuable for the development of skills in communication.

Communication requires participation. One of the difficulties with 'free conversation' as a teaching technique is that often only a minority of the class is actively speaking or listening. Alternately, a student may think he is listening but may not really understand what the other student is saying. This can be demonstrated by requiring a listener to summarize what the speaker has said. Lack of true listening often is the result of two aspects of the classroom situation: the size of the class and the desire of the students to speak but not to hear. Obviously the latter problem is not limited to formal classes.

This is often unavoidable, even with classes as small as ten students. It may make conversation such a demoralizing experience that the teacher learns to avoid it and to substitute drill for conversation.

The following series of exercises did not seem to suffer from the defects just mentioned. In the first exercise[11] the students are presented with a problem. Each student is to envision himself as an instructor at a college. There has been a rash of cheating recently, and the board of trustees has decided that any student caught cheating will be expelled. Most students and teachers support this policy.

While he is administering a final examination to a large class, the instructor discovers a student copying from notes on a paper concealed in his hand. The student is a friend of the instructors. He is the editor of the student newspaper, a good student whose grades have fallen drastically because of the pressure of extracurricular activities. He had no time to study for this test, although he must receive an 'A' to get into law school in the fall. If he succeeds in getting into law school, his teachers believe he will have a brilliant career as a lawyer.

The students are limited to five courses of action they might take in the role of instructor: 1) ignore the cheating student, pretending not to have seen him; 2) quietly ask him to stop cheating; 3) take his notes away and announce to the class that someone has been cheating and say that if

[9] *Ibid.,* p. 332.

[10] Birnbaum, pp. 82-83.

[11] Community Development Services, Southern Illinois University (mineo). The following description of the exercise excludes many details which are not relevant to the present discussion but which are important for the carrying out of the exercise.

it happens again the next case will result in expulsion; 4) remove the student from the test and explain to the class the reason for doing so; 5) all of #4 above and also report the student to the president, which will mean expulsion from the university.

After the problem is explained, a secret ballot is held. The results are not revealed until later.

The group (in this case twelve students) is then divided into buzz groups (goal directed discussion groups, usually of no more than six members) of three students each. The task of the groups is to arrive at, a consensus regarding the solution, select a spokesman, and formulate a rationale for the group's decision. This rationale is later presented by the spokesman to the class as a whole. Finally another secret ballot is taken and the results of all the ballots are disclosed and discussed.

The process of arriving at a consensus in all four groups took over an hour. A shorter time could have been imposed, however. During this period all the students were actively participating. They were forced to make themselves understood in Engish. Obviously, much of what was said consisted of ungrammatical utterances. In effect, the students created a, pidgin language when they could not use the appropriate English structures. (An example is given later in this paper.) However, when their English deviated too far from the grammatical norm, it was rejected by the group, and the speaker had to find some more comprehensible way of expressing his ideas.

The process of arriving at a consensus was quite successful. Most groups were initially divided between the second solution (telling the cheater quietly to stop cheating) and the third (telling him to stop cheating and warning the class of the consequences of further cheating). One student was in favor of dismissing the cheater from the examination (the fourth solution). In attempting to convince the other members of his group that his solution was most appropriate, each student was forced to construct a persuasive explanation of his position. Some of the factors considered were the need to save face, pressure on the instructor from the administration, the importance of providing a warning to the other students, the moral issue, and the relation of morality to practice in light of the problem presented. These individual explanations were later combined by the group into a statement of position to be presented by the spokesman to the class as a whole. Thus the members of the groups needed not only to express their opinions but to develop these opinions clearly and logically. This was done despite difficulties in finding the appropriate grammatical expression for their ideas.

What is of interest here is the participation pattern of the buzz group. In most classroom activities there is a two-way participation pattern: i.e., the teacher speaks to the members of the class and they respond. Often this degenerates into one-way participation-only the teacher participates, without student response. In the buzz group the pattern is multidirectional;

all members speak to one another or to the group as a whole. Knowles and Knowles suggest that

> . . .many studies show that on the whole, the broader the participation among members of a group the deeper the interest and involvement will be.[12]

The success of this exercise seems to be a result of 1) the inherent interest of the topic for most students and 2) the structure of the problem, which permits and indeed demands active participation in the communication process. It should be noted that this topic, cheating, might have to be handled in different ways with students of different cultural backgrounds.

The second exercise used parallels the previous one in that it involves the use of buzz groups to arrive at a consensus.[13] The students are asked to imagine that they are members of a space crew which has crash landed on the surface of the moon 200 miles from where they were to have met the mother ship. The students are presented with a list of fifteen items left intact after the crash (water, matches, oxygen, food concentrate, etc.). Their task is to rank the items in order of their importance for survival. The items are first ranked by each student individually. Then buzz groups are formed and an attempt at consensus is made. Discussion in the buzz groups is governed by the following operational rules: 1) avoid arguing merely to support your previous judgment if it is not logical; 2) avoid agreement for the sake of agreement: do not acquiesce in a particular ranking unless it is at least somewhat acceptable to you; 3) use no techniques like voting or trading to reduce conflict: true consensus is required; 4) differences in opinion are considered useful because they help reveal the correct solution.

The response of the class was again enthusiastic. A definite increase in the ability of the students to express themselves was evident. What was also notable throughout the series of exercises was a growing tendency on the part of the students to employ in free conversation the structures learned by drill. This took place without a conscious effort on the students' part. The level of participation was high, and even the weakest students made themselves understood. The situation predicated by Martinet for the occurrence of communication had taken place: cooperation within the group was a pressing necessity.

The same pattern was employed on two other occasions during a six-week term. The following is a sample of dialogue in an exercise in which one student presents a personal problem and the two other members of his buzz group try to help him find a solution to his problem. Oscar will have to work in order to help pay his expenses while he is studying in the United States. He is having difficulty reconciling himself to this necessity. Jairo is discussing Oscar's problem with him.

---

[12] Knowles and Knowles, p. 43.

[13] In Pfeiffer, J. William, and John E. Jones, *Handbook of Structured Exercises for Human Relations Training* (Iowa City: University Associates Press, 1969), pp. 52-57.

> Jairo: It's better, you know, if you're going to independence, if you're going to stay out of your parents. You have to learn how to earn your own money. That means if you can earn enough money for yourself, you know, for getting an education, for living expenses, board, everything, you're going to get troubles. That's right. Everybody gets troubles.
>
> Oscar: I have the friends, some people I have served [observed]. They are graduate students now and they are depending on their parents. They are still depending on their parents.
>
> Jairo: They are working.
>
> Oscar: Yeah. No, no perhaps they are not working. They are still studying here and they are, their parents send them the money. And they are now graduates. They act like little babies. I, I can say that because all their life their parents have been supporting them and everything they need they wrote a letter to my father, to her, to their father, and said that they needed money. So I think that will be very helpful for me, especially for my background, as I told you before, was kind of everything I wanted I have. That will be good. But I really have to convince myself in very interior part that I have to work. I don't know. That's my trouble.
>
> Jairo: I think the only thing that you can convince yourself: try, try.
>
> Oscar: Yeah, I think that when I start probably I will.
>
> Jairo: Yeah, you're going to convince yourself.

The results of this exercise were essentially similar to those of the previous exercises. The students' attention was on what they wished to say, not how they wished to say it. Neither Oscar nor Jairo had gained full control of the structures they were using. It should be noted that some of the errors were errors of performance rather than competence. In discussing the graduate students who are still supported by their parents, Oscar says, "Everything they need, they wrote a *letter to my father, to her, to their father,* and said that they needed money" (italics mine). Oscar knows which possessive he needs to use. His difficulty is in carrying out what he knows. Many of the performance errors in a student's speech can best be corrected by giving the student the opportunity to bridge the gap between competence and performance. What is needed here is not pattern practice but rather communication practice.

Beal, Bohle, and Raudabaugh note the following characterizations of the small group discussion:

> It permits maximum interaction and interstimulation between members . . . It can place responsibility on all members to participate and to be prepared with facts and ideas . . . It can teach members to think as a group and develop a sense of equality . . . By it all members are encouraged to listen carefully, to reason, to reflect, to participate and to contribute.[14]

Although Beal *et al.* do not apply the above to buzz groups specifically, I would do so.

The use of buzz groups is especially helpful in oversized classes to permit participation in communication activities by all members of the class

---

14 Beal, Bohlen, and Raudabaugh, pp. 181-182.

simultaneously.   If an eventual class consensus is desired, the 'fishbowl' technique may be used. Each group nominates a spokesman. The spokesman of all the buzz groups meet in a circle in the center of the room and attempt to arrive at a consensus. If any member of a buzz group wants to replace the group representative, he taps him on the shoulder and takes his place. There is one chair left empty in the circle for any member of the class who wishes to join the circle temporarily. Because of the small class sizes at CESL, the fishbowl technique was not used. It has been used highly successfully in many non-ESL groups, however.

What is suggested in this paper is not the employment of a few tricks from the bag of the laboratory trainer. Rather, the parallel aims of some laboratory groups and of foreign language classes are noted. The common aim of enhancing communication leads to an overlapping methodology. In particular, the employment of goal-directed buzz groups seems applicable to TESL.

The question arises of at what point in language learning communication exercises should be introduced. I believe that communication skills of some type must be developed from the very earliest stages of language learning. In the earliest stages, these skills might best be fostered by semistructured question-and-answer drills (i.e., where the answer to the question is not a direct outcome of the structure being practiced) or by language games. A type of question-and-answer exercise which is particularly useful in giving a sense of real communication to drill work was developed by the late Jack Mason Morris, until his recent death Assistant to the Director of CESL. In answering semistructured questions, the student is required to tell the truth in his answers. If the questions themselves are realistic, this technique serves as a bridge between drill and unstructured activities,

Small-group discussion techniques have been used at CESL as early as the beginning of the third in a sequence of four intensive six-week courses (requiring three hours a day of oral drill, two hours a day of audio laboratory practice, plus one hour a day of supervised reading and one hour a day of supervised writing). The students described in this paper were all in their last (fourth) six-week term of the sequence. The particular topics used in this experiment were probably more effective on an advanced level than they would have been on an intermediate level. It is my opinion that the general principles outlined above are also applicable to intermediate learners of English, however, and might be adapted to beginners.

A Total Approach to the High School English-as-a Second-Language Program

Jay Wissot

The high school ESL program should not be isolated from the other academic disciplines in the school. Instead, it should utilize the total resources of the school and synthesize its educational approach with the school's ideological mainstream. Specific mention is made as to how the ESL program can work with the music, art, reading, home economics, and physical education disciplines. Suggestive advice is directed towards both the administrative and teaching levels. Inherent throughout the article is the author's belief that the fostering of a bi-lingual attitude towards education and the development of language classes and academic content classes in the foreign-born student's native language are goals that the ESL program is obligated to work toward. In instances where a bilingual approach is not feasible because of a divergent multi-lingual student population, it is recommended that the ESL program assume responsibility for educating foreign-born students in history, mathematics, and science. This concept is to be favored over the placing of students in subject areas prior to the attainment of a functional performance level in oral and written English.

If teaching foreign-born students is to be considered a task involving total school commitment, as well it should, then the curriculum format of an English-as-a-second-language program must be broad enough to' include many divergent academic disciplines within its scope. All of the disciplines do not necessarily have to be taught as separate subject areas within the framework of an ESL program. Nor should the teaching of such subjects as math, history, and science-specifically geared for foreign-born students— necessarily come under the control and direct supervision of the ESL department. What the ESL program should do is reach out for and make use of the total resources of the school and not operate in isolation as a field of instruction so specialized and remote that it cannot synthesize its educational approach with the other approaches found in the school confines.

Since I hope the days have long since passed when educators feel that a foreign-born youngster with limited language ability can be placed in a regular school program with the hope that he will learn English merely by listening to it spoken each day and since the theory that an ESL program is merely a form of supplemental instruction has proven essentially stop-gap in concept and emotionally frustrating in practice, then we must be prepared to understand the role of an ESL program in terms of a total school approach.

At the center or core of any ESL program is the guidance and planning of student schedules. Effort should be made on the part of the director

Mr. Wissot, Director of the English as a Second Language Program, Hackensack High School, New Jersey, has published in the *Florida FL Reporter, TESOL News-letter,* and *TESOL Quarterly,* IV, 2 (June, 1970).

to work closely with the guidance department and the individual department chairmen to choose a program of study that will be in harmony with the abilities of the individual foreign-born student. Conformity with the rest of the school or with requirements for academic credits should not be the chief criterion in selection, but rather the inclusion of subject areas which contain the greatest possibilities for success. This does not mean that the youngster should be held back from taking a well-rounded program, but that, in cases of severe language limitations, the areas of high failure in-evitabilities are withheld for a later date. It stands to reason that a young-ster finding a biology class or a history class incomprehensible may very well carry over an attitude of frustration into his English language class.

Two subjects which lend themeslves both to instruction within the ESL class and outside of the class as separate disciplines are music and art. Both require a lesser amount of language ability than other more book-oriented disciplines. Both permit the student to *do something physical* on his own rather than passively sitting back and watching someone else do something. Both, depending upon innate abilities, allow for a high degree of success and immediate progress.

Although not all secondary schools come equipped with a home economics kitchen and work area, those that do offer an excellent resource to the ESL class. In teaching the vocabulary of different objects in the house such as the stove, the refrigerator, and the sink, preference should be given to the 'realia' of the object itself over a picture or a scale model replica. Of course, scheduling visitations to the home economics area must be handled diplo-matically so that interference with the regular school program of classes does not result. But if the home economics teacher is given a sufficient amount of notice so that the visitation is not viewed as an intrusion, there is no reason why an amicable relationship between the two departments cannot be created.

More and more schools are building reading labs or reading centers to accommodate the multitudinous reading problems facing us today. If such a facility exists in a school, it can mean a great deal to the ESL program if used with discrimination in a structured manner. Not all students can make use of the available equipment. Some, particularly the beginning students, will be able to make no use of the facilities because they are still concentrating large energies towards mastering the spoken forms. Some in the intermediate group may be able to derive benefits from the lab after extensive preparation in what is commonly called reading readiness. Often included in such preparation is practice in letter recognition, the building up of a sight vocabulary, and the reading of short controlled paragraphs written by the students themselves and preferably about some phase of their school or home life. When ready, a few students at a time could be scheduled for work with controlled readers and tachistoscopes under the guidance of an experienced reading teacher.

One area of study often neglected when a foreign-born student enters an American secondary school system is the development of his own native language skills. This type of neglect assumes varied forms. In some instances, the students are scheduled for classes in an audio-lingual elementary class far below their commensurate skills. Others are not given a class in their own language on the grounds that there are so many required courses they need to take. In still other cases, the foreign-born student's own language is not offered in the school's curriculum.

One might ask at this point, why is the ESL program concerned with the foreign-born students developing their own language skills? Because language development is not a one-way street or a matter of developing the second language to take the place of the native language, the parallel development between English and the native language must be the goal of any school's ESL program. The youngster should be given an opportunity to develop his more familiar powers of expression at the same time that he is trying to acquire a new way of expressing himself. To accomplish this, a three-fold approach to language classes for the foreign-born is suggested:

1) The creation of foreign language classes set up specifically for the needs of foreign-born students and different from the advanced language classes given to native students.

2) The creation of foreign language classes for those languages not represented in the school curriculum where a sizable population of foreign-born students speaking those languages is to be found among the student body.

3) The realization on the part of administrators, curriculum coordinators, and guidance counselors alike that because a student speaks a foreign language, it does not necessarily mean that he is 'literate' in that language and unable to benefit from further instruction.

Of all the classes attended by students during a school day, physical education would appear to be the one subject where foreign-born students would have the least amount of difficulty. Such is not the case; in fact, merely attending the physical education class becomes a traumatic experience for many youngsters.   In the academic classroom a student can indicate a lack of comprehension by looking blank, remaining silent, or saying "I don't know" and affect no one but himself. In a gym class, group activities and competive games require the individual to make a contribution for the 'team's' sake. Consequently, a lack of comprehension on the student's part results in derisive jeering by his peers and embarrassment for himself. This situation can be remedied by having another bilingual student act as a 'buddy' and interpreter for the non-native speaker. If the student speaks a language unknown to any others in the school, then it becomes the responsibility of the ESL teacher to act as a liaison between departments and help to prepare the youngster for the language terminology he needs to know.

I have saved for last those three areas of curriculum most troublesome to a total ESL approach: history, math, and science. Three alternatives exist in incorporating these areas into a school curriculum: (1) Assuming that a predominant language group exists, a bilingual course could be instituted with the students receiving the content area subjects in their native language. (2) Assuming that no one language group predominates but there are sufficient numbers of students speaking one language to comprise a single bilingual class, such a class could be instituted. The remaining students would be left to alternative 3. (3) Assuming no one language group predominates or if such is the case and a minority of other language groups remains, ESL classes in content areas, relying on the same ideology and methodology as the ESL English class, would have to be organized. No matter which choice is made, all three alternatives contain built-in difficulties. If a bilingual approach is adopted, trained language teachers with a content area major would have to be sought and hired. If an extension of the ESL program into history, math, and science is agreed upon, then the task becomes one of finding trained ESL teachers with a content area major or interest.

In using the third alternative, teaching history becomes a matter of developing materials in conjunction with the language development already attained in the English class. One quickly finds that the arduous task of developing materials must be resorted to because of the great dearth of history materials published which are adequate to the task. With mathematics, the job becomes easier once the signs and symbols are fully explained and taught to the students, since many students have taken mathematics but are unfamiliar with the word-symbol equivalents. The area of science introduces a safety factor not found in either of the other two. One would hardly think it feasible for a student to experiment with formulas in chemistry class without a clearcut understanding of the dangers which miscalculation could produce. Even so, materials could be developed incorporating the science curriculum with the vocabulary and grammatical structure level of the class in mind.

The total ESL approach is really a total school commitment towards providing the best possible education for all the foreign-born who enter school. It is neither an ESL curriculum nor any other scholastic curriculum, but rather a joint effort on the part of all those concerned to put aside personal ambitions, petty quibblings, and departmental frictions in order to work interdepartmentally to remedy a total school problem with a total school approach.

Some Criteria for the Evaluation of TESOL Programs

Paul R. Streiff

Educational evaluation is emerging as a field apart from educational research. New concepts, procedures, and instruments of evaluation are evolving to meet new needs and conditions. Those supporting the development of new TESOL programs, and teachers and administrators who are considering the use of them in their schools are asking for evaluation of their effectiveness. They want to know whether making the TESOL effort will pay off for them. If they have already decided to make the effort, they want to know how to determine which among several programs might best meet their needs. This paper presents some criteria to help meet the increasing demands for evaluation of TESOL programs.

Evaluation in education has recently come into sharp focus in many contexts. There is a demand for effective evaluation, and this demand has received impetus from the requirements in federally funded programs. Those in the field who are trying to determine what a legitimate evaluation design should look like are, in many cases, at a loss as to where to turn for help. The questions are several. How does one develop a design for evaluation and translate that design into data that may effect the continuation funding of a given program? How does one determine which of several sets of instructional materials should be purchased? How does one decide whether the expenditure of funds for a specific consultant or firm contracted to design a teacher-training workshop is justified?

Demands for evaluation in education have been with us as long as formal education has existed. People have always wanted to know the outcome of their efforts to pass on information about the society into which their children were born. For the most part, however, evaluation has been seen as necessary in deciding who, among the learners, would be rewarded and who punished. In this view, evaluation is really synonymous with measurement, and the two terms have often been used interchangeably. Measurement, however, should be used to refer to quantitative descriptions of behavior, things or events; while evaluation has a broader scope, which includes measurement. Evaluation focuses on program and process rather than on the individual learner.

The definition of evaluation offered by Marvin Akin, Director of the Center for the Study of Evaluation at the University of California, Los Angeles, reflects the major aspects of evaluation which, I believe, would be agreed upon by a majority of authorities in the field. Alkin defines evaluation as

---

the process of ascertaining the decision areas of concern, selecting appropriate information, and collecting and analyzing information in order to report summary data useful to decision-makers in selecting among alternatives.[1]

Probably the most significant single factor in the current emphasis on evaluation was the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Titles I, III, and VII of that act all contain requirements that local districts receiving funds *must* evaluate the effectiveness of the educational efforts for which grants are made. Review of projects for continuation funding has shown clearly the lack of personal and facilities nationwide to meet those requirements, yet Congress wants to know what it got for its money.

To help meet this need several centers have been established for the development of new theories and procedures in evaluation, among them the Center for the Study of Evaluation at UCLA. That center is presently involved in the evaluation problems of programs funded under Title VII of ESEA, the Bilingual Education Act.

In spite of some present opinion to the contrary, ESL *must* be part of any bilingual education program in American schools. A bilingual program elsewhere may involve any combination of languages, but Title VII specifies English as one of the languages of instruction in all programs. Evaluators of Title VII projects are therefore becoming involved in learning something about ESL, while providing expertise and services in matters of evaluation. There is a considerable body of information available on evaluation, and models for evaluation which have been developed can serve in the development of other models to meet new needs. Two examples are the Pittsburgh Discrepancy Model, developed by Robert Provus and reported in the 1969 *Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education,*[2] and a model developed by W. James Popham of UCLA entitled *Program Fair Evaluation-Summative Appraisal of Instructional Sequences with Dissimilar Objectives.*[3]

What is the significance of all this for ESL programs and the TESOL organization? Along with all aspects of curriculum improvement effort we are in the position of having to justify our claims on empirical bases, and to do this we need to understand what is meant by evaluation. We need appropriate evaluation models for determining outcomes of ESL efforts in terms of *measurable learner* behavior. It is gratifying to know that evalua-

---

[1] Marvin C. Alkin, *Towards an Evaluation Model: A Systems Approach,* UCLA Center for the Study of Evaluation of Instructional Programs (CSEIP), Working Paper No. 4 (February, 1968), P. 2

[2] Robert Provus, NSSE Yearbook Part 11 1969, *Evaluation of Ongoing Programs,* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969).

[3] W. James Popham, *Program Fair Evaluation-Summative Appraisal of Instructional Sequences with Dissimilar Objectives,* (mimeo) Research Memorandum SWRL (Southwest Regional Laboratory) September, 1968.

tors are concerned with ESL matters in connection with Title VII programs, but those programs represent only a small part of the concerns reflected by our membership, and evaluation demands are upon us all. Present facilities and personnel are not adequate to meet our needs.

The evaluation process begins with a determination of what is to be evaluated. Though this seems almost too simplistic to mention, the fact is that all too often there is little or no specification by those determining the design and content of curriculum as to the intended outcomes of instruction. To be sure, it hardly seems possible that anyone could be involved in the teaching business for any period of time without having set some specfic goals by which to guide his actions, yet such specifications have, for the most part, been *implicit* in his actions rather than stated in precise and explicit form. Benjamin Bloom, in a recent paper had this to say:

Unfortunately, specifications which are *implicit* are difficult to communicate to others, they are rarely analyzed and clearly revised, and they do not serve as clear guides to particular decisions or actions. Implicit specifications may shift without the educational worker being clearly aware of any change, and, because of poor communications, the attainment of the specifications may defy any attempt at systematic appraisal.[4]

And most important for the ESL effort, and for the TESOL organization, he said,

Trust in professionals is a highly desirable goal for any field, including education, but each profession must either police itself, if it is to merit the confidence of the public that supports or uses it, or expose itself to external scrutiny when the confidence of the public is impaired.[5]

If the purposes and specifications for a curricular area like ESL are not explicit, they are likely to be altered by social pressures, by new fads and fashions, and by new schemes and devices which appear with momentary shifts in the educational scene. Implicit purposes are difficult to defend and impossible to evaluate.

What is the importance of all this? Is it possible that those who have been responsible for the design and implementation of ESL programs in American schools don't know about this business of explicit specification of learner post-instruction behavior? There is evidence that this is true as well as some evidence to the contrary. Where such explicitness is lacking the first and most important task, in order to make possible the evaluation of ESL programs, is to see to it that all of our professionals acquire the skills necessary to generate appropriate specific objectives. Once we have managed to accomplish this task, at least the foundation for evaluation has been laid and we can proceed from there.

---

[4] Benjamin S. Bloom, NSSE Yearbook Part II (1969), *Some Theoretical Issues Relating to Educational Evaluation,* p. 29.
[5] *Ibid.*

But is this the most efficient way to assist those of our number who need help in adequately assessing the impact of their efforts? If we were to take a careful look at what the TESOL membership does in education, we would see that their interests and involvements range from preschool through adult education; from teaching English to monolingual speakers of another language to teaching students who have managed, unfortunately, to mix two language systems, and as a result perform with difficulty outside their family and community in either language; from teaching English as a new language to teaching standard English as a second dialect. We have such a range of interests, in fact, that it would be most difficult for anyone to cover all areas adequately with even the most comprehensive set of language-learning objectives, and indeed these would more than likely prove to be too general for the evaluation needs of any given program.

Looking still more closely at the question "What is to be evaluated?" we find that within each level and interest area there are a number of roles to be played by evaluation. In one of the important papers on evaluation in the past several years Michael Scriven made a point of distinguishing between the goals and roles of evaluation. He states that 'goal' activity consists simply of the gathering and combining of performance data with a weighted set of goal scales to yield either comparative or numerical ratings. These data are used in the justification of (a) the selection of objectives, (b) the data-gathering instruments, and (c) the weighings.

The role of evaluation, however, varies tremendously in particular educational contexts. It is part of teacher training activity; part of the process of curriculum development; an essential element in the conduct of field experiments connected with the improvement of learning theory; part of investigation preliminary to a decision about the purchase or rejection of materials; and it is a preliminary activity in the reward or punishment of people, as in an executive-training program.

According to Scriven, evaluation can and usually should play several roles. Not only can it have several roles with respect to one educational enterprise, but with respect to each of these it may have several specific goals. It may have a role in the on-going improvement of the curriculum, and with respect to this role several types of questions or goals may be raised, e.g., "Is the curriculum at this point really achieving the intended instructional objectives?' or "Is it taking too large a proportion of the available time to make its point?"[6]

Professor Popham adds another dimension. He makes a clear distinction between evaluation and experimental research, a distinction which ESL personnel must keep in mind. According to Popham, goals of evaluation always include the estimation of merit, or value. In calling for the assignment of values to objectives Popham says,

---

[6] Michael Scriven, "The Methodology of Evaluation," AERA Monograph Series on Curriculum Evaluation, *Perspectives of Curriculum Evaluation,* ed. B Othanel Smith, (New York: Rand McNally & Company 1969), p. 43.

This, of course, is sticky business, and it would be pleasant to avoid the imprecision and subjectivity of making value judgments altogether. Unfortunately, we can't. At this point (in the process) the evaluator must reach a position regarding the respective worth of the . . . sets of objectives. Ideally, the relative value of the sets could even be quantified.

At this point there are certain clarifications which ought to be made about the process of evaluation, and several criteria established for involvement with that process. These criteria are adapted from Robert Provus' article cited above, and if incorporated into the TESOL context they should make it possible for this organization to make important contributions to the systematic improvement of educational programs.

a) First, the evaluator need not necessarily have participated in the planning of a program in order to be effective. Many programs have not been planned, at least not in terms of careful specification of outcomes as learner-post-instruction behavior. If these programs are to be evaluated, a strategy must be found which doesn't depend on participation during the planning stage. There are such designs, and others can assuredly be built.

b) Second, it isn't necessary to wait three to five years before an evaluative judgment can be passed on a new program. A whole series of en route judgments must be made to decide if one should review a stage, go on to the next, or terminate the project.

c) Third, it is not inevitable that conflict exist between evaluator and program people. Both have the same mission: either to continue and improve a program or to reject it as soon as reliable evidence is gathered that its success potential is minimal.

d) Evaluation activity should not be viewed as getting in the way of program activity since it is a necessary part of program development and should therefore be thought of as complementary.

e) Good evaluation does not depend on the adoption at the outset of a sound *experimental* design for the program being evaluated. Experimental design is irrelevant to evaluation until a program is in its final stages of development; and if the evaluation was properly conceived and conducted, the project may have been legitimately terminated long before reaching that point. In order to improve a program in its formative stages there must be opportunity to improve it on the basis of information gathered through experience and judgements made on the basis of that information. A formal experimental design would deny the opportunity to make changes while a program is in its dynamic stages of growth.[7]

Sound evaluation practice provides administrators and staff with infor-

_____

[7] Provus, p. 282.

mation they need and freedom to act on that information. Evaluation, and the provision for assistance to its members in evaluation matters, should be proper concerns of the TESOL organization for a number of reasons:

a) We have a large membership with only loosely similar objectives: They have something to do with teaching English to non-English speakers.

b) Specification of objectives in behavioral terms for TESOL programs is not a simple matter, and since it is essential to evaluation procedures we might begin here. This is a difficult task for any program, and assistance is necessary and long overdue.

c) There is probably a great deal of useful data, carefully recorded, but unused because it has never found its way to where it could be employed in evaluation. The individual struggling at the local level needs a strong assist from the outside in order that his efforts in ESL aren't eclipsed by newly popular concerns.

d) The effect of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act may establish evaluation as a necessary building block of American educational reform with greater impact on education than the programs themselves. With that in mind we may find that, through effective evaluation, ESL programs may take on a whole new look. Data derived from effective evaluation may lead to new avenues of approach, method and technique.

More effective evaluation of ESL programs is a matter of urgency and self-interest. We need to know how to find out how we are doing. I suggest that the TESOL organization establish a Center for the study of Evaluation of ESL and ESL-related programs to find out in systematic fashion what does and doesn't work. Our concerns span a tremendous range of the national educational interest. We are a new and dynamic organization, and establishment of such a center would make possible an increasingly significant contribution to education.

Review

THE STUDY OF NONSTANDARD ENGLISH. William Labov. (National Council of Teachers of English, 1970, 73 pp.)

This monograph is the revised and enlarged version of what was originally a state-of-the-art review commissioned for the ERIC System. It describes the sociolinguistic framework in which nonstandard English is currently regarded and investigated. Labov touches on many areas of sociolinguistic and educational concern, but he does not treat any particular topic in depth; instead, he provides an overview of the sociolinguist's approach to nonstandard varieties of English.

In the section on "The Nature of Language," nonstandard English is discussed in the light of what is known about language in general. Under "Some Sociolinguistic Principles," Labov discusses linguistic variation as it correlates with social level and sex. The section on "The Educational Implications of Sociolinguistic Study" deals with the possible effects of differences between standard and nonstandard English on reading and speech instruction and on teacher-student interaction. The final section, "Sociolinguistic Research Within the Schools," presents ways of determining the particular features of the language used by students.

The scope of the monograph is sufficiently wide in terms of the sociolinguistic areas it covers, but it is less complete in its coverage of different nonstandard dialects and teaching techniques. Since most sociolinguistic research on nonstandard English has been done in urban areas with black students, it is natural that most of the examples in Labov's work reflect this limitation. The teaching suggestions that Labov presents are neither numerous nor detailed. This too is understandable since little is known definitely about special teaching strategies for students who speak nonstandard English.

The study is characterized by a practical, essentially undramatic approach to research and application. Labov rejects the idea that nonstandard English is a set of deviations from standard English, but he does not go to the other extreme—that nonstandard English should be considered an entirely different system from standard English. He does not enter into the dispute about semantic differences between forms in the standard and nonstandard dialects: linguistics, he says, has not progressed far enough to permit such judgments. And the tone of most of his advice to teachers is realistic. For example, the teaching suggestions on page 13 are phrased: "a teacher may have more success . . . if . . ." and "all these things [connected] into a single pattern . . . will 'make sense' to Negro speakers . . ." It is just this reasonable, practical approach that will help overcome the fear that some teachers have of linguistics and that will decrease the shock that some teachers feel in encountering dramatic new 'answers' to their teaching problems.

At times, Labov's suggestions are much less tentative. On page 10,

for example, he says that a teacher "can teach a hundred different standard forms with the simple instruction: *The negative is attracted only to the first indefinite."* This is not a 'simple instruction'. A linguistically sophisticated teacher might understand the rule, but such an instruction would create confusion for an unsophisticated teacher or for a class. There is a difference between a linguistic rule and the type of grammar rule that can be given to students. Fortunately, such lapses occur infrequently in this monograph.

Labov writes well, and it is easy to follow his discussion, but he has not completely resolved the problem of degree of sophistication to be assumed in the readers. For example, page 7 has a tree-diagram, and the following page has a difficult five-step embedding. They are presented with little preceding discussion. A trainer of teachers might use the study in an introductory course, but he should be prepared to supplement the book with expansions for each of the topics. Teachers may not be accustomed to the type of outlook required, and much more explication of the points will be needed.

The reviewer has considered *The Study of Nonstandard English* as it might be utilized in teacher training. Such training would include discussions of sociolinguistic and linguistic principles, detailed descriptions of the students' varieties of nonstandard English, and useful teaching strategies. The first area is covered by this work; the second and third are not. No criticism is implied since the latter areas were not specifically within the scope of this monograph, and perhaps a more complete treatment cannot exist for some time. More research is needed to permit anything approaching a satisfactory description of the nonstandard dialects of English that teachers will encounter in their classes.[1] And, at our present stage of knowledge, we can only indicate some of the teaching techniques that have been workable in classrooms and some of the materials that have been successfully used. In selecting the reading material for a teacher-training course, the instructor would still have to piece together articles and portions of books for some areas, but *The Study of Nonstandard English* does a good job of covering its area of concern. It makes a valuable contribution towards that basic introductory course.

IRWIN FEIGENBAUM
RESEARCH ASSOCIATE
SOCIOLINGUISTICS PROGRAM
CENTER FOR APPLIED LINGUISTICS

---

[1] One article that makes a beginning towards an accessible description of a nonstandard dialect is Ralph W. Fasold and Walt Wolfram, "Some Linguistic Features of Negro Dialect," in *Teaching Standard English in the Inner City.* edited by Ralph W. Fasold and Roger W. Shuy (Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1970) pp. 41-86.

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 037 729 *English Now. A Self-Correcting Workbook with "Write and See."* Irwin Feigenbaum. 316 p.; Developmental Edition of Workbook, Teacher's Manual and 14 Tapes.

These materials, a self-instructional workbook, a teacher's manual and accompanying tapes, are designed for students grades 7 through 12 who are speakers of the dialect sometimes called "Black Nonstandard." The terms "standard" and "nonstandard" are avoided, however, "informal" being used for the child's own dialect and "formal" for the English which he learns at school. Also, instead of designating the child's informal speech as "wrong" and the formal speech as "right," these materials stress that formal language *is* appropriate for certain situations and *informal for others.* Thus the materials are designed to teach the child standard English without attempting to eradicate or belittle his own speech, and the use of the child's informal speech in the classroom is advocated as an effective pedagogical tool, for example, in drills involving translating between the two forms of speech. The workbook consists of 14 programmed lessons, each concentrating on a phonological or grammatical feature of the standard dialect not found in the nonstandard dialect. Drills, while relying to some extent on foreign language teaching methodology, have been adapted to the present situation. The teacher's manual provides prefatory commentary to each lesson, including suggestions for class activities such as games; page reductions of the workbook; and a teacher's script. New Century, Educational Division, Meredith Corporation, 440 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y. 10016.

ED 037 731 *Readings in Applied Transformational Grammar.* Mark Lester. 314 p.; 1970.

This volume contains nineteen essays, dealing with various aspects of transformational grammar by scholars such as Noam Chomsky, Eric H. Lenneberg, and Leon Jakobovits. These essays have been reprinted from sources such as *College English* and *Language Learning* and are intended for the most part for a nontechnical audience. The anthology is divided into two parts. Part I deals with problems in psycholinguistics, particularly in the area of language acquisition. Part II, "The Application of Transformational Grammar to

English Teaching: contains sections dealing with the use of transformational grammar in literature and stylistic analysis, in composition writing, in second language teaching and in teaching reading. With a few exceptions each essay is preceded by an introduction which attempts to paraphrase the main ideas and arguments of the essay. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 383 Madison Ave., New York, N.Y. 10017 ($5.95).

ED 037 732 *Language and Dialect in Hawaii, A Sociolinguistic History to 1935.* John E. Reinecke. 254 p.; 1969.

This minimally revised version of the author's 1935 M.A. thesis has been published at this time not only because it is considered an invaluable contribution to the sociolinguistic history of Hawaii but also because increased interest in problems of pidgin and creole languages seems to make it particularly relevant. Initial chapters deal with the problems and definitions involved in this area of study and attempt to distinguish between "makeshift languages," which develop in the early stages of language contact, and "regional dialects," which represent a later stage of linguistic development. Later chapters deal with the history of such languages in Hawaii, including the sociocultural background, and discuss such questions as why the languages of immigrants to Hawaii have persisted and the nature, functions, and future of the colonial dialect which developed from the creole dialect. The appendix contains examples of makeshift and dialectal English in Hawaii and a partially annotated bibliography updated by the editor. University of Hawaii Press, 535 Ward Avenue, Honolulu, Hawaii 96814 ($9.00).

ED 038 625 *An Approach for Teaching American English to Chinese Speakers Based on* a *Contrastive Syllabic and Prosodic Analysis.* Henry Hung-Yeh Tiee. 232 p.; Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Texas, August 1967. MF $1.00 HC $11.70.

Experiments in language teaching have indicated that, especially in the case of teaching English as a foreign language, no pronunciation of English sounds natural unless the intonation (prosodic features) is fairly acceptable. Even with satisfactory consonants and vowels, a phrase with incorrect melody still sounds foreign. On the other hand, when brief phrases are given proper pitch pattern, large errors in consonants and vowels seem much less important. English is spoken with a stress-timed rhythm; the everyday speech of Chinese tends to be a polysyllabic language which often combines two or more syllables. The rate of utterance of a succession of syllables unlike that of English, is syllable-timed, the length of each syllable remaining approximately the same. Therefore, in teaching Chinese speakers to learn English, the shift from their tendency toward a syllable-timing rhythm to a stress-timing rhythm is very necessary. Consequently, syllable analysis in both languages must become a basic step in the learning process. This contrastive study of American English and Mandarin Chinese examines the syllable structure and prosodic features of both languages and relates this analysis to language teaching.

ED 038 630 *Teaching Standard English as a Second Dialect to Speakers* of *Nonstandard English in High School Business Education.* Final Report. Barbara P. Hagerman. 11 p.; 1970. MF $0.25 HC $0.65.

Twenty girls were selected out of 110 enrolled in tenth-grade typing classes at San Bernardino High School for the two-semester experimental Business Speech program described in this report. In addition to taped language laboratory lessons on grammatical and syntactical items in standard English con-

trasted with nonstandard Negro English, instruction included pretests in audio discrimination and grammatical structure, oral drill, taped dictation tests, discussion by the teacher and small groups, role-playing, and practice in telephone skills and office procedures. The control group was taught with standard instructional procedures and no dialect study. The Business Speech students were "generally pleased" with taking dictation, role-playing, and discussion, but responded negatively to the taped lessons once the novelty interval had passed. They did not relate their change in speech production to the language laboratory lessons despite the fact that they could hear differences and see their grammatical error count go down in business letters. The author feels that the same material offered in a more informal fashion (small groups with a tape recorder) would achieve the same or better results, and could be adapted within a reorganized Business Speech class for other groups of nonstandard dialect speakers.

ED 038 632 *Reading Comprehension: A Linguistic Point of View.* Jean E. Robertson. 9 p.; Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Minneapolis, Minnesota, March 2-6, 1970. MF $0.25 HC $0.55.

This paper focuses on four studies of pupils' reading comprehension completed at the University of Alberta. A number of investigators have described the acquisition and use of connective by pupils and have indicated the importance of connective in the development of abstract logical thinking. (Teachers often consider these words too simple to teach in reading classes except as sight words.) One of the author's concerns was the identification of connective in three series of basal readers widely used in Canada at the upper elementary school level and an investigation of the understanding children have of them in reading. The amount of subordination produced by children eight to twelve years of age ranges from 10 to 30 percent of their total sentences with the amount increasing from year to year, but their basal readers use connective in about 37 percent of the sentences and the amount is almost constant from grade to grade. (Forty-two connective were identified.) As important as this task of description and explanation of oral and written English language patterning may be to educators, the investigations cannot be restricted to language matters only but must encompass the interaction between reading and the logical development of pupils.

ED 038 633 *Constructing Sentences.* Earl Rand. 197 p.; 1969.

This text consists of 112 highly controlled transformatioonal drills based on rules which reflect the competence of native English speakers to produce and understand sentences joined by processes of coordination (conjunction) and subordination (embedding). It is intended for use, together with readings and a grammar, in intermediate and advanced English courses for foreign speakers and speakers of nonstandard dialects of English. The material is designed for oral and written instruction and is presented in a semi-programmed format which allows the teacher to assign drills according to individual needs and the student to check his own responses with the correct responses in the book. See ED 032 534, abstracted in *TESOL Quarterly,* IV, 1 (March, 1970,) for the author's companion volume, *Constructing Dialogs.* Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 383 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017 ($2.95).

ED 038 642 *Hawaii Department of Education Speech-Communication Examination Audio Script.* Paul Heinberg; and others. 20 p.; 1970.

This speech-communication examination is a "dyadic" test in which students,

issued a set of cards to be marked according to directions, are assigned partners with whom they communicate and respond to in turn. This latest version
of dyadic tests has been administered in rural and urban public schools in
Hawaii, to speakers of nonstandard English (Hawaiian Pidgin). The format
allows the students fourteen roles to assume during the test (e.g., tutor/tutee
in rote numerical or verbal tutorials, interviewer/interviewee in rote numerical
or verbal interviews). Scoring is right minus wrong. Roles are summed across
sex and grade level separately. Criteria are number of six source roles in lowest
quartile, number of six respondent roles in lowest quartile, and number of
fourteen roles in lowest quartile. For related documents, see author's "Speech-
Communication Learning System," ED 020 523 and ED 020 524, abstracted
in *TESOL Quarterly,* II, 4 (December, 1968) ; and "Script of Speech-Communication Evaluation Test," ED 026 633, abstracted in *TESOL Quarterly,*
III, 3 (September, 1969). Available from author, Department of Speech-
Communication, 2560 Campus Road, Room 131, University of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii 96822.

ED 038 644 *TESOL Degree Programs for Experienced English Teachers from
Abroad.* Maurice Imhoof. 13 p.; Bulletin of the ERIC Clearinghouse for Linguistics, n15 p1-5 May 1970. MF $0.25 HC $0.75.

Stated positively, the experienced foreign teacher of English comes to the
United States to improve his English-teaching abilities. Stated negatively, he
comes, more often than not, to retrain rather than expand, to correct faulty
language skills and improper or nonproductive teaching practices. Identified
here are some of the major problem areas (1) concerning these students:
lack of high and continuing motivation, heavy burden of investment and unrealistic expectation on the part of the government or other funding agencies,
divergency in styles of learning or teaching, culture conflict in changed role
as student; and (2) concerning the programs offered at American universities:
nonrelationship between theory discussed in teacher-training program and
actual practice in the skills courses, poor skills course sequencing, lack of opportunity to observe and evaluate model techniques, overemphasis on course
content, lack of designs and techniques for the implementation of new ideas.
The author feels that influential American universities could do more for their
graduates in developing supportive facilities which would carry the impressive
weight of their resources and knowledge back to the graduates' own countries.

ED 038 645 *Instructor's Curriculum Guide; Building Services Personnel.* Puerto
Rican Forum, Inc., New York, N.Y., Basic Occupational Language Training
Program. 83 p.; 1970.

The Basic Occupational Language Training program (B.O.L.T.), a project of
the Puerto Rican Forum, Inc., is funded by the U.S. Department of Labor, and
has been in operation since September, 1967. It has taught English to Puerto
Rican and other Spanish-speaking workers employed in banks, factories, hospitals, housing projects, community agencies, and other organizations in metropolitan New York City. B. O.L.T. attempts to increase the upward job mobility
of these workers by tackling their major handicap, lack of English. This Curriculum Guide, based on an audiolingual method of language training, consists
of 20 lessons representing 50-100 hours of classroom instruction including
structured "Shop Talk;' visits by the supervisors, tours of the job sites, actual
on-the-job sessions emphasizing the vocabulary and/or structures related to a
particular job skill, and post-course testing. Directed to hospital building
services personnel, the materials in this guide may be adapted to suit other

job areas by changing pertinent vocabulary and reading materials. Other guides in the occupational areas of office skills, community action workers, factory workers, housing project caretakers, dietary service personnel, house-wives, and bank stock-transfer bookkeepers are forthcoming. Available from Puerto Rican Forum, Inc., 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10010.

ED 038 648 *A Framework for Evaluation of TESOL Programs.* Marvin C. Akin; Dale C. Woolley. 15 p.; Paper given at the fourth annual TESOL Convention, San Francisco, California, March 18-21, 1970. MF $0.25 HC $0.85.

The authors present a framework depicting an evaluation-decision sequence, describe each of the evaluation stages, and note the relationships between evaluation information and subsequent decisions. In Chart I, the four major decision areas and the five kinds of evaluation which provide information for decisions in each of these areas are identified. It is hoped that this model for educational evaluation points out the importance of evaluation information in the process of improving educational programs and helping to ensure their success. The authors emphasize that evaluation should begin when an educational agency first looks critically at the potential of the educational process in its particular system and not after all attempts at improvement have been concluded.

Publications Received

Anderson, Wallace L., and Norman C. Stageberg. *Introductory Readings in Language*, 3rd ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970.

The Bulletin of the Institute for Research in Language Teaching. No. 285 (Summer 1968). Tokyo, Japan.

Education Dialogue: A Forum for Indian Education Personnel. December 1967. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Indian Affairs.

English Language and Orientation Programs in the United States. New York: Institute of International Education, 1969.

Erazmus, Edward T., and Harry J. Cargas. *English as a Second Language: A Reader*. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company, 1970.

ERIC Clearinghouse for Linguistics: Bulletin No. 12 (September 1969), *Bulletin No. 13* (November 1969), *Bulletin No. 14* (March 1970), *Bulletin No. 15* (May 1970), *Bulletin No. 16* (July 1970). Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Ewton, Ralph W. Jr., and Jacob Ornstein, eds. *Studies in Language and Linguistics, 1969–70*. University of Texas at El Paso: Texas Western Press, 1970.

Foreign Language Annals, III, 1 (October 1969); III, 2 (December, 1969); III, 3 (March, 1970); III, 4 (May, 1970).

Heffernan-Cabrera, Patricia. *A Handbook for Teachers of English to Non-English Speaking Adults*. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse for Linguistics, Center for Applied Linguistics, 1969.

Hungerford, Harold; Jay Robinson; and James Sledd. *English Linguistics: An Introductory Reader*. New York: Scott, Foresman, 1970.

IIE Report, IV, 1 (June, 1970). Institute of International Education, 809 United Nations Plaza, New York, New York.

Language Learning XX, 1 (June, 1970).

Lester, Mark. *Readings in Applied Transformational Grammar*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970.

Linguistic-Cultural Differences and American Education. Special Anthology issue of *The Florida F-L Reporter*, VII, 1, (Spring/Summer, 1969).

McIntosh, Lois; Teresita V. Ramos; and Rosalina Morales Goulet. *Advancing in English*. New York: American Book Company, 1970.

The Modern English Journal, I, 1 (February, 1970). Seido Language Institute, Japan.

The Modern Language Journal, LIV, 4, (April, 1970).

The MST English Quarterly. Second Special 20th Anniversary Issue Featuring Filipino Literature in English, 1970.

A Preliminary Bibliography of American English Dialects. Washington, D. C.: ERIC Clearinghouse for Linguistics, Center for Applied Linguistics, 1969.

Rochmis, Lyda R., and Dorothy Dobb. *Speech Therapy: A Group Approach for Schools and Clinics.* New York: The John Day Company, 1970.

Saville, Muriel R., and Rudolph C. Troike, eds. *A Handbook for Bilingual Education.* Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse for Linguistics, Center for Applied Linguistics, 1970.

SEAMO Regional English Language Centre Newsletter, II, 4 (December 1969); III, 1 (March, 1970). Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organization, Singapore.

Slager, William R., ed. *English for American Indians: A Newsletter of the Office of Education Programs, Bureau of Indian Affairs.* Spring, 1970. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Survey of Language Use and Language Teaching in Eastern Africa, II, 4 (August, 1969). Nairobi, Kenya.

Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages: United States Activities: 1969. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1970.

TEFL: A Bulletin for the Teaching of English as a Foreign Language, III, 3 (Summer 1969); III, 4 (January, 1970). American University of Beirut: Center for English Language Research and Teaching.

Terazian, Lawrence, ed. *The Voice of the Foreign Students,* (Fall, 1969 and Spring, 1970). Queens College of the City University of New York.

Thonis, Eleanor Wall. *Teaching Reading to Non-English Speakers.* New York: Collier-Macmillan International, 1970.

Workpapers in English as a Second Language. Volume IV (June, 1970). University of California, Los Angeles.