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The Past as Prologue

James E. Alatis

The privilege of writing this article was earned, not by distinguished scholarship, but by my serving you as Executive Secretary-Treasurer for nine and one-half busy years. A TESOL Executive Secretary has two chief duties: first, to implement the policies set forth by the membership through its representatives on the Executive Committee; and second, to act as historian for the organization. It is in this latter capacity, as your corporate memory, that I address you now.

Our Quarterly editor, Ruth Crymes, has graciously invited me to "... present a picture of the state of the TESOL organization, indicating the chief changes and directions since the beginning in 1966—membership increases, trends in membership distribution, organizational changes, the role of TESOL in language education today." What Ruth had in mind was "... something like a portrait of TESOL on its tenth birthday," a brief article on the "... state of our professional organization."

I am happy to report that the membership has increased from 337 in March, 1966, to over 5,000 at the end of calendar year 1975. Of the total 1975 membership 22.7% are memberships from abroad. Of the membership from abroad, Canada represents 23% and Japan 13.5%. Of the domestic membership, New York State has the highest number or 17.9% of the total, with California a close second at 16%. By way of comparison, the total membership in 1972 was 2700. The total for 1973 was 3393, an increase of 693 members, or 25.7%. The 1975 total membership represents an increase of 1371 members since last year, or 35%. This is definitely the largest rate of growth for any year. Thus, in numbers alone, we have come a long, long way since 1966.

But we have also grown in the number and quality of services which we are now able to render to our membership. In his Presidential Address delivered to the Miami TESOL Convention in 1967, our first President, Harold B. Allen, specified nine services which he believed our organization should provide. I should like to turn to these now and report briefly on their present status.

First, the TESOL central office was established in August, 1966 with a part-time Executive Secretary-Treasurer at the School of Languages and Linguistics of Georgetown University. The organization was incorporated as a non-profit professional association in the District of Columbia on December 26, 1967. Our application to the Post Office Department for mailing privileges at special third-class rates for non-profit organizations was approved effective January 1, 1969. A permit to use imprints and pay postage in cash at the time of the mailing was also obtained. Also in 1969...
our application for income tax exemption as a non-profit, charitable, educational and scientific organization under Section 501 (C) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code was approved. In the same year, TESOL qualified by the same application under Section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code which made substantial tax benefits available to our potential donors. Application for an employer identification number was also made in conjunction with the request for tax-exempt status and was approved. During the past nine years the services provided by our office have increased significantly in both scope and facility. The central office tries, within the limits of its resources, to act as a clearinghouse for the profession. It has, on numerous occasions, been able to supply information to legislative and other governmental offices, which has figured significantly in considerations of legislation in ESL, bilingual education and language education in general. For example, in 1967 the TESOL office submitted no less than fifty pages of testimony to the Hearings before the General Subcommittee on Education of the Ninetieth Congress on H.R.9860 and H.R.10224, Bills to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in order to assist Bilingual Education Programs.

Second, the TESOL Quarterly, the organization's scholarly journal under the editorship first of Betty Wallace Robinett, then Maurice Imhoof and now Ruth Crymes has appeared in nine volumes and four numbers, the latest being that of December, 1975. The Quarterly continues to be an outstanding publication for ESOL, Bilingual Education, and applied linguistics in general.

Third, under the successive editorships of Alfred Aarons, Richard Light, Ruth Wineberg, and John Haskell, the TESOL Newsletter has appeared in nine volumes, the latest number being that of December 1975. The Newsletter complements the Quarterly by specializing in news notes and short reports to keep our membership apprised of recent developments and coming events on the evershifting ESOL and Bilingual Education scene. The new editor, John Haskell, plans a special edition of the Newsletter for February, 1976, TESOL's tenth birthday.

Fourth, the TESOL central office has developed, at last, the much needed roster of specialists. This is intended as a national register of ESOL personnel. It lists highly qualified people in English as a Second/Foreign language, some of whom are willing to accept temporary positions abroad. The information on these specialists has been coded on an INDECKS Research Deck for efficient retrieval. In addition, the TESOL central office operates a modest placement service. It has developed a candidate file which consists of brief resumés of three to four hundred qualified job-seekers in the field of ESOL. This information is also coded in a research deck for quick retrieval under a dozen categories, thus giving TESOL the potential to provide greater assistance to employers. We have begun to provide more timely assistance to candidates by updating the job listing six times yearly, in place of the former semi-annual listing. We have also produced three membership directories, 1972, 1973, and 1974. Procedures are being changed
so that future membership directories can be issued several months earlier in the year.

Fifth, we have made a modest beginning in a publishing program which has thus far produced: On Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages, Series III, edited by Betty Wallace Robinett; TESOL, 1967-68: A Survey, by Kenneth Croft; A TESOL Bibliography: Abstracts of ERIC Publications and Research Reports 1969-70, by Anna Maria Malkoc; A Handbook of Bilingual Education, by Muriel R. Saville and Rudolph C. Troike; Studies in Honor of Albert H. Markwardt, edited by James E. Alatis; three issues of The TESOL Training Program Directory (1971-1972, 1972-1973, 1974-1976), by Charles Blatchford; A Composite Bibliography for ESOL Teacher-Training, compiled by Kenneth Croft; a series of papers delivered to ESL teachers at the Lack.land Air Force Base, Texas in 1974 (in xerox form); Classroom Practices in ESL and Bilingual Education, Volume I, edited by Muriel Saville-Troike; Papers on Language Testing; 1967-74, edited by Leslie Palmer and Bernard Spolsky; On TESOL 74, edited by Ruth Crymes and William Norris; and On TESOL 75, edited by Marina Burt and Heidi Dulay. In addition the central office has prepared a list of TESOL publications available which consists, among others, of materials already available from the ESOL program of the Center for Applied Linguistics and includes such items as the TENES Survey by Harold B. Allen, and Adapting and Writing Language Lessons, by Earl W. Stevick. These and other materials are purchased at a discount from the original publishers and made available to the members at a nominal cost. In November, 1975, three of TESOL's publications were selected for entry into the Exhibition of U.S. Materials in EFL and Applied Linguistics held in Warsaw, Poland. Two publications were also displayed at a large convention of librarians in Australia in August. In addition, a letter inviting perusal of the Quarterly and consideration of membership has been sent to a listing of libraries, universities, and other agencies, mostly abroad.

Sixth, while we have no formal speaking and consulting program in operation yet, the President, the Executive Secretary and other officers, of TESOL constantly make themselves available for meetings, institutes, and workshops to the membership and the public at large. Also, under contracts with the Defense Language Institute, Lackland Air Force Base, English Language Program, we arranged for six lectures on practical problems of teaching English to adult speakers of other languages for each of six consecutive years. The results of most of these presentations have been published as special issues of the TESOL Quarterly. The last six lectures are available individually in xerox form for a nominal price.

Seventh, we have had nine very successful annual conventions in the following cities, listed chronologically: Miami Beach, San Antonio, Chicago, San Francisco, New Orleans, Washington, D.C., San Juan, Denver and Los Angeles. The 1975 convention in Los Angeles had an attendance of nearly 2200. This was an increase of more than 33% from the largest previous convention due in great part to the concentration of people with ESOL
and bilingual interests in the Los Angeles area and the state of California in general. The Tenth Annual Convention will be held in New York City, March 2-7, 1976 at the Americana Hotel. The Second Vice President and Program Chairman is John Fanselow of Teachers College, Columbia University. Holda Dorsey of La Puente Community Adult School in California is Workshop Chairperson, and the Local Chairperson is Darlene Larson of New York University. Future conventions are scheduled for Miami Beach in 1977, Mexico City in 1978, Boston in 1979 and Seattle in 1980. Each year we have managed to organize a balanced and comprehensive convention program. Through the years TESOL has been fortunate in securing efficient and dedicated convention chairmen and committees. It is significant to note that we had the honor of being addressed in the plenary sessions of our conventions by such important men as Senator Ralph Yarborough of Texas (San Antonio, 1968) and Congressman Roman Pucinski (Chicago, 1969), the two chief architects of the Bilingual Education Act. I am particularly pleased with the evolution of our printed convention program, with its useful abstracts, and colorful covers, which now serves as a model for many other professional organizations as they prepare for their annual conventions. Our annual convention programs are programs of which we can be very proud indeed.

Eighth, I am happy to report gratifying progress in another service area recommended by Harold Allen in 1967. We now have a total of 25 regional affiliates. They are, in order of affiliation: New Mexico, New Jersey, Puerto Rico, Texas, California, Illinois, Florida, New York State, Washington (D.C), Arizona, Venezuela, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Ireland (A.T.E.-S.O.L.), Wisconsin, Massachusetts, Hawaii, Dominican Republic, Mexico, Washington (state), Rhode Island, British Columbia, Intermountain (representing Utah, Idaho and Wyoming), Michigan and the most recent one, Central and Northern Florida. This last affiliate is a new development in that it represents the Executive Committee's decision to interpret the constitution liberally so as to permit more than one affiliate in some of the larger states in which the need seems to have arisen, such as Florida, Pennsylvania, and Texas.

Ninth, with regard to organizational cooperation TESOL has cosponsored workshops and sent representatives to meetings in cooperation with National Council of Teachers of English, American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (an offshoot of the Modern Language Association of America), American Speech Association (now the Speech Communication Association), National Association for Foreign Student Affairs and the Center for Applied Linguistics. Thus we have taken special care to cooperate with the five original organizations sponsoring the first three ad hoc conferences which were held in Tucson (1964), San Diego (1965), and New York (1966). We cosponsored a program in ESOL with NCTE at the 1969 NCTE Convention in Washington, D.C. and all subsequent NCTE conventions; and we cosponsored with NCTE the 1970 spring institutes on bilingualism and English as a second language or dialect. We have co-
sponsored with ACTFL a panel and a clinic on the teaching of English to speakers of other languages every year since it was created by the Modern Language Association, and have cooperated with the Center for Applied Linguistics' and the Modern Language Association's Education Research Information Center (ERIC) in listing abstracts of TESOL documents for dissemination to the membership of TESOL. We were one of the joint sponsors of the NAFSA Convention in Washington in May, 1975, and have made special efforts to send representatives to and to organize and participate in the national and regional programs of the Association of Teachers of English as a Second Language (ATESL) of NAFSA. Our most recent constitutional revision was written specifically with ATESL in mind, in an attempt to accommodate that important group of professional colleagues, most of whom are also TESOL members, within the organizational structure of TESOL, thereby encouraging and assisting them in playing an important role in the deliberations and policy-making of the organization.

As Executive Secretary of TESOL, I have been a member of the Advisory Board both of CAL/ERIC and MLA/ERIC and have participated in all meetings of the National Advisory Council on the Teaching of English as a Foreign Language (NACTEFL). In 1973 TESOL held its first panel in conjunction with the International Reading Association at the IRA convention in Denver and has continued the practice annually since then. We have explored the possibility of cooperation on the national level between TESOL's Committee on the Sociopolitical Concerns of Minority Groups and similar committees in other professional organizations. TESOL has been represented at meetings of practically all its own regional affiliates, as well as at international meetings such as those of MEXTESOL, IATEFL in London, ATESOL in Dublin, and The Dominican Association of Teachers of English. I have also represented the organization on the Executive Committee of the Federation International des Professeurs de Langues Vivantes with which TESOL is also affiliated, thus giving special emphasis to the international dimension of our work and looking after the international interests of our members.

In 1967, President Allen had also called for the establishment of national guidelines for the preparation and certification of Teachers of English as a Second Language. His interest in such guidelines coincided with a similar interest originally expressed by Sirarpi Ohannessian and the Center for Applied Linguistics. Therefore, at a special working conference funded by CONPASS (Consortium of Professional Associations for Study of Special Teacher Improvement Programs) held in Washington in May, 1970, TESOL adopted eight broad qualifications and guidelines for the preparation of ESOL teachers. A preface by Albert H. Marckwardt and interpretive comments were added and the complete report was published and disseminated to the profession. I prepared a preliminary draft of an expanded version of the guidelines, which was later revised by William E. Norris, then of the University of Pittsburgh. This last revision was ratified by the Executive Committee of TESOL at its Los Angeles meeting in March of 1975. The
guidelines have been printed in each of the issues of the Training Program Directory prepared by Charles Blatchford and were widely disseminated and discussed at the National Convention and among the regional affiliates. Attempts have been made to translate these guidelines into competency-based criteria and, I am happy to report, they have been instrumental in achieving certification and accreditation in ESOL and bilingual education, most notably and most recently in the State of New Jersey. Similar attempts have been in progress in Florida, Virginia, Pennsylvania and elsewhere. It is gratifying to note that the TESOL guidelines have also served as a model for the preparation of similar guidelines in related educational fields. Imitation, someone once said, is the sincerest form of flattery, and I am delighted that our relatively new organization has been able to show such foresight and leadership in this important area of teacher education.

In an early article in the TESOL Quarterly, Dr. Allen had also called for organizational cooperation with appropriate government agencies and private foundations. TESOL has thus entered into contracts with the Government, such as those with the Defense Language Institute's Lackland Air Force Base mentioned above, and with the Bureau of Indian Affairs for an evaluation of English teaching on the Navajo reservation. As to the foundations, TESOL has been awarded five successive grants by the Asia Foundation, beginning in 1972, to encourage the establishment of professional links between Asian teachers of English to speakers of other languages and their colleagues in the United States and other countries. These grants have provided memberships in the organization to teachers in Asian countries, ESOL materials for the libraries of universities and language centers in those same countries, and travel assistance for Asian students and scholars residing in the U.S. to attend TESOL conventions. In addition, each year since 1974 TESOL has received $2,000 from the Institute of International Education (provided by the U.S. Department of State) to distribute among ten foreign students from non-Asian home countries to assist in attending the TESOL convention while studying in the U.S.

TESOL committees now in existence are: 1) Executive, 2) Publications, 3) Bibliography, 4) Membership, 5) School and University Coordination, 6) Resolutions, 7) Liaison, 8) Sociopolitical Concerns of Minority Groups, 9) Editorial Advisory Board, 10) Research, and 11) Nominations. In 1974 an ad hoc committee was appointed to prepare a position paper on the role of English as a second language in bilingual education programs. The Committee is under the chairmanship of Carmen Perez of Albany, former President of the New York State affiliate of TESOL. Recently the Committee on the Sociopolitical Concerns of Minority Groups, under the chairmanship of Robert Kaplan of the University of Southern California, has taken on a new form. Dr. Kaplan organized a panel of legislators and other persons in politics for a session at the 1975 TESOL Convention which he plans to repeat in New York in 1976. In the meantime he is organizing an inter-associational committee, or consortium, composed of representatives of other professional organizations who likewise have an interest in the concerns
of minority groups. The first meeting was held in Washington in April, the second in Texas in September, 1975. This consortium will concern itself with legislation and with teaching and learning as they relate to linguistic and cultural diversity.

There have been four constitutional changes since we began as an organization. The change which occurred in Chicago in 1969 allowed for the succession of the First Vice President to the Presidency, vested responsibility for the regional affiliates in the First Vice President, and provided machinery for affiliation. The second constitutional change, which came about in New Orleans in 1971, dealt with the appointment of committees, asked for a written questionnaire to be sent to the members to identify those willing and qualified to serve on committees, and provided for reports from standing committees. The third and fourth constitutional changes, which took place in 1973 in San Juan and 1974 in Denver respectively, brought about the most recent changes in the structure and operation of the organization.

In a revision proposed in May 1973 in San Juan, there was provision for two representational bodies in addition to the Executive Committee. The proposed Advisory Council would represent special interest groups, and the proposed Legislative Assembly would represent the state affiliates. The basic work for the revision was done by Harold Allen. A portion of this revision was accepted at the business meeting in San Juan, while the remainder, principally the By-laws, was referred to an ad hoc committee under the chairmanship of David P. Harris for further study. The basic work which had been done by Dr. Allen remained, and the final form of the By-laws prepared by Dr. Harris was incorporated. This second revision was approved and adopted at the 1974 convention in Denver. Under the revision, seven special interest groups were organized. They are: EFL in foreign countries, EFL for foreign students in the United States, ESL for U.S. residents in general, ESL in bilingual education, ESL in adult education, standard English as a second dialect, and applied linguistics. Under the revision each group will not only be represented on the Advisory Council of the organization, but will provide a three-hour segment—including a business meeting—during the convention program. The regional affiliates are also given an increased role in the convention with representation of each on the Advisory Council.

The composition and function of the major organizational units within TESOL according to the constitutional revision are as follows:

1) The Legislative Assembly is composed of all TESOL members present at the annual meeting. Its principal functions are to elect members of the Nominating Committee and determine the general policy of TESOL.

2) The Advisory Council is composed of representatives from the special interest groups and the regional affiliates. Its principal functions are to nominate candidates for members-at-large of the Executive Committee and to prepare recommendations for the attention of the Legislative
Assembly. It must therefore meet before the Legislative Assembly at the convention.

3) The Executive Committee is composed of past and present officers and members-at-large (a total of twelve). It implements the policies of the Advisory Council and Legislative Assembly.

4) The Nominating Committee is composed of a Chairman and four members. It provides two candidates for the positions of First and Second Vice President.

5) Each of the Special Interest Groups is composed of those TESOL members who designate a particular interest as being their chief area of concern. Each group conducts its own special segment at the annual convention, nominates its candidate for the TESOL Nominating Committee, and elects its own Associate Chairman (who succeeds to the chairmanship) and one representative to the Advisory Council.

6) The General Affiliate Meeting elects one candidate for the TESOL Nominating Committee and makes recommendations to the Advisory Council for submittal to the Legislative Assembly. It must therefore be held before the Advisory Council meeting at the convention.

7) Each of the Regional Affiliates is represented (in proportion to its membership) on the Advisory Council, thus providing more input from the regionals into the overall concerns of the organization. In the future they may thus influence the choice of convention sites, officers, and the general policy of the organization.

It is clear that this is a very representative system, as it was intended to be, the basis for power vesting in the entire membership.

The seven Special Interest Groups of TESOL met for the first time at the 1975 convention in Los Angeles. With G. Harley Stevenson of CEMAC, Mexico City as Chairperson, the group on EFL in Foreign Countries listened to papers on “Language Content,” “Culture Content,” and “General Principles in Teacher Training.” The EFL for Foreign Students in the U.S. group, chaired by Shigeo Imamura of the University of San Francisco, hosted a panel session on “The Non-Native in American Colleges.” Robert Wilson of CITE in Los Angeles spoke on “How to Motivate the Second Language Learner” to the special interest group for ESL for U.S. Residents; that group was chaired by Rita LaNell Stahl of Kinchlee Boarding School in Arizona. Under the chairmanship of Alfonso Ramirez of the Region One Education Service Center in Texas, the ESL in Bilingual Education group listened to a report on “Bilingual Education and the New Federal Legislation” and to a “Review of Legislation in California and Texas.” The ESL in Adult Education group, with Alice Perlman of the New York City Schools as chairperson, held an open discussion on the future direction their group should take; they also scheduled exhibits and visits to adult classes. The Standard English as a Second Dialect group, with Grace Sims Holt of the University of Illinois Chicago Circle as chairperson, heard talks on the “Linguistic Phenomena of Cross Dialectal Interference,” “Formalization of the Decreolization Process,” and “Sociolinguistic Problems on Standardized Tests for Speakers of Black English Vernacular.” The Applied Linguistics group, under Chairperson Bernard Spolsky of the University of New Mexico,
hosted a panel on “Error Analysis” and a paper presentation on “New Directions in Language Testing.” Subsequent to the 1975 convention, each Special Interest Group was funded with $200 operating expenses by the national organization as directed by the Executive Committee.

These, then, are the most recent developments in TESOL. I have tried to report on the past history and present status of the organization. I turn now to the role of TESOL in American education, and its future prospects as a profession and an organization.

The final part of the task that our Quarterly editor has given me is a little more difficult to discharge. What is the role of TESOL in language education today? Aside from our inextricable interconnection with the field of linguistics with which we began, as well as such related hyphenated quasi-disciplines as anthropologico-linguistics, socio-linguistics, and psycholinguistics, one cannot speak of the role of TESOL in this country’s education today without reference to bilingual and bicultural education. In this connection, it is appropriate for me to quote from the Position Paper by TESOL’s Committee on the Sociopolitical Concerns of Minority Groups issued in February 1970. Under the general heading of “Obligations,” that Committee states: “We particularly reaffirm the importance and the validity of the bilingual and bicultural approach to the teaching and learning of English as a second language.” This report was accepted and ratified by the Executive Committee of TESOL and widely disseminated.

Also pertinent here is a resolution passed at the Business Meeting of TESOL’s Fifth Annual Convention in New Orleans on March 5, 1971. A resolution was introduced, and passed by the assembled members, as follows:

Whereas we recognize that any human being’s language constitutes his link with the real world, and
Whereas we are collectively engaged in teaching another language to human beings who already possess a fully articulated and developed linguistic system,
Therefore, be it resolved that TESOL affirms
1. That bilingual education must be assumed to mean education in two languages;
2. That this in turn presupposes full recognition by every available means of the validity of the first language;
3. That such recognition includes positive attitudes of all teachers and administrators toward the student’s language;
4. That the validity of that language not only as a communication system but as a viable vehicle for the transfer and reinforcement of any subject content in the classroom must be central in curricular policy; and
5. That, where numbers of individuals justify such concern, the student’s own language must specifically constitute a segment of the curriculum.

Most recently, at the Legislative Assembly (business meeting) of TESOL’s Ninth Annual Convention held on March 7, 1975 in Los Angeles, Carmen Perez, Chairman of TESOL’s Ad Hoc Committee on the Role of ESL in Bilingual/Bicultural Education, introduced on behalf of that Committee the following resolution:
Be it resolved that the organization of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages go on record as recognizing, supporting, and actively furthering the position that ESL is an integral and necessary component of Bilingual-Bicultural Education; and

Be it further resolved that the organization of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages urge all those involved with ESL and Bilingual-Bicultural programs to adopt a cooperative attitude toward one another.

This, too, was passed and adopted by the assembled members. I think it is clear, from these statements, where we as an organization and as a profession stand and have stood on this vital issue, and I will let the matter rest there. We have indeed come a long way since 1966—and yet without losing the strong idealism and dedication to cultural and linguistic pluralism with which we started.

And now, if I may use “the past as prologue,” I should like to look into my crystal ball and suggest some directions in which I think TESOL should move as we enter the second decade of our professional existence. I would suggest that TESOL in the years immediately ahead must involve itself more and more in teacher education—and I use the word “education” advisedly here. In the last two years the Executive Committee has been considering the possibility of a summer TESOL Institute at the University of California in Los Angeles, analogous to those which are held each year by the Linguistic Society of America. It is unfortunate indeed that we could not get our collective minds made up in time to launch such an institute next summer. Not only must we turn our concerted attention back to this important matter, but we must also consider further sponsorship and co-sponsorship of institutes and workshops, in order that more and more information can be brought directly to more and more teachers and administrators.

We must encourage our regional affiliates in every way possible. I am convinced that the growth and progress of TESOL depends upon the health of its regional affiliates. We must do everything we can to strengthen state organizations and make local action more meaningful by keying it to national purposes agreed upon by local leaders. I predict that through the affiliates the leadership of TESOL will gradually be transferred to school teachers, as they grow ever more professional and more sophisticated through their unparalleled energy and devotion.

While TESOL is not a rich organization, we are becoming sufficiently strong financially to be able soon to provide budgets for our standing committees, especially the Research Committee, the Publication Committee, the Bibliography Committee, and the Committee on Sociopolitical Concerns of Minority Groups. We must encourage liaison between standing committees of the “international” TESOL organization and the committees of its affiliates. It is time we started paying the expenses, at least, of dedicated professionals, many of whom provide personal funds for their organization work, and eventually even rewarding them for their efforts with hard cash!

These, and many other activities which I expect can be suggested and will be suggested by the membership through the Advisory Council and the
Legislative Assembly, will cost money. The present strength of TESOL, both numerical and financial, is largely attributable to the selfless dedication, devotion, and energy of its membership and its officers. We owe much to many of our distinguished universities throughout the country which have assisted us by giving released time to our members for TESOL activities. A large debt is owed also to many of the local school systems who act as our hosts at national conventions. However, it is unrealistic to assume that the universities or the school systems or volunteer members can continue by means of “hidden” contributions and private outlays to support the activities of the organization. Some attention must be given to the possibility of an increase in dues to meet the ever-spiraling operational costs. While a professional organization is not primarily concerned with making money, money forms the sinews of its activities.

One of the reasons that we were not able to mount the summer institute at UCLA for next summer was the lack of funds. I regret to say that this is the one area in which we have made less progress than we would have hoped. Our initial application to the Ford Foundation for funds to support the roster of specialists, which was the original catalytic reason for creating TESOL in the first place, was postponed until our relationship with the Center for Applied Linguistics could be clarified. A subsequent proposal to the Ford Foundation for assistance in mounting the Summer TESOL Institute at UCLA was also unsuccessful. Yet, as I have said earlier, notwithstanding the lack of foundation support, we have managed to provide a roster of specialists and a placement service out of what may be considered the “ordinary revenues” of the organization. In university circles, “ordinary revenues” means tuition; in organizational circles, it means dues. Many professional organizations which provide far fewer services than TESOL does for its membership charge much higher dues than we do. It would be fascinating to contemplate the prospect of doubling present dues and using the additional revenues for additional help to the central secretariat, salaries and travel for the prospective professors of the Summer TESOL Institute, and fellowships and travel for students to participate in the Institute. For these and other worthy projects the membership would be getting more than their money’s worth in professional services. Twice the present TESOL dues, for example, would amount to no more than the cost of a good dinner at an expensive restaurant with a drink and wine for two people. Similarly, to go back to my original contention that TESOL’s strength lies in its affiliates, it would be interesting to contemplate a like policy adopted by the affiliates enabling them to pay for a full-time secretariat, thereby assuring more services towards the professional growth of their members, who in turn would provide more input to the “international” organization thereby bolstering it, and so on, in a never-ceasing cycle of mutual supported reinforcement.

We as professionals have said all along that teacher education is the heart of the matter. Such education is currently being provided by many of our leading universities. Nevertheless, a Summer TESOL Institute accompanied by a summer convention could serve as a supplement to current
programs (and I must emphasize here that extreme care must be taken to
guard against duplication and overlap with existing programs), and as a
focal point for other very much needed organizational activities such as, for
example, an additional meeting of the Executive Committee each year. The
organization is getting much too large and its activities much too com-
plicated for the present arrangement.

TESOL is at the crossroads! I have been told by other Executive
Secretaries that once an organization goes beyond 5000 members it is no
longer a small organization, or even a medium-sized one. It is a large organi-
ization, and a powerful one. Our rapid growth in the last two years may be
attributed to a number of causes: 1. For the past two years we have had
for the first time a full-time administrative assistant in the central office,
thus making it possible to give better and more prompt service to members.
2. The growth of the affiliates has had a “ripple effect” on the growth of
the “international” organization. 3. The outstanding quality of our con-
ventions and our publications has drawn attention to TESOL as a profession
and as an organization. 4. We are gaining a respectable reputation interna-
tionally and our services are more in demand because of developments in
the Near East, Southeast Asia, Africa, Latin America, and elsewhere. 5. The
growth and development of Bilingual/Bicultural Education in the United
States has been a very beneficial force. 6. Individual and institutional mem-
bership campaigns which have been conducted by such people as directors
doing ESOL programs throughout the country—such as those listed in the
Blatchford Training Program Directory—and the leaders of our newly formed
Special Interest Groups—to cite but one example, the energetic campaign
recently put on by the Adult Education Special Interest Group—have
greatly increased TESOL’s visibility. 7. Last, but not least, the promotional
and representational activities of TESOL’s indefatigable officers as speakers
and consultants—both at our own meetings and those of organizations hav-
ing related interests—have helped to spread “the word.”

“The word” is, as I have said elsewhere, that TESOL—the field and the
organization—has great vitality and a sense of youthfulness, idealism, and
social mission that distinguishes it from all other professional organizations.
Our abiding belief in cultural and linguistic pluralism and in equality of
educational opportunity seems to unite us and gives us that special excite-
ment and relevance that no other organization or field has. We have been
responsive to the needs of teachers, of students, and the special interests
which have arisen among our members throughout the nine and one-half
brief years of our existence. Our flexibility and adaptability is demonstrated
by our most recent constitutional revision. Though we may sometimes
despair of it, the democratic process does work and has worked in TESOL.
A conservative estimate from the central office predicts that we may have
as many as 7 or 8 thousand members by next year. Taking “the past as
prologue,” we must continue to adjust to changing situations and to give
our members the kinds of services which have resulted in this success of
our young organization as we approach our tenth birthday, and move into
the next ten years of dynamic growth and development.
Some Limitations to the Classroom
Applications of Current Second Language Acquisition Research

Elaine Tarone, Merrill Swain, and Ann Fathman

Second language acquisition research is still in its infancy, and hasty pedagogical applications should not be made on the basis of its findings. Among the limitations of current research are the following: (1) the restricted linguistic scope of studies to date, (2) lack of data on cognitive processes and learning strategies, (3) limited information about the role of individual variables in second language acquisition, (4) insufficient information about the role of social and environmental variables in second language acquisition, (5) undeveloped methodology for data collection and (6) for data analysis, and (7) the limited number of replicated studies to date. Suggestions are made for future research.

Research in second language (L2) acquisition has developed rapidly in recent years. With this rapid development has come an increasing desire on the part of some teachers and researchers to apply the results of research to the language classroom. However, although progress has been made, the reality of the situation is that second language acquisition research is still in an infancy stage, and hence cannot yet provide the classroom teacher with the kind of valid and reliable guidelines needed to effect curriculum change.

The purpose of this paper is to outline some of the more specific limitations of current research in second language acquisition and to caution that hasty pedagogical applications should not be made from the limited research work done to date.

Most researchers in second language acquisition have at one time or another been language teachers, and many still are. As a result, we are acutely aware of the frustrations and complicated pedagogical considerations which daily face the language teacher in the classroom. The teacher has a myriad of questions which s/he would like research to answer:

—Should the teacher focus on points of grammar or on communication?
—What sorts of learner errors can be predicted? Should the teacher

1 Ms. Tarone, Instructor at Seattle Central Community College, has published in Language Learning and the TESOL Quarterly. Ms. Swain, Assistant Professor, Modern Language Centre, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, is co-editor of Working Papers on Bilingualism and is principal investigator of the Bilingual Education Project at OISE which is involved in the evaluation of French-English bilingual education programs for native English speakers. Ms. Fathman, a doctoral candidate at Stanford University has published in Language Learning and Working Papers on Bilingualism.
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attempt to keep the learners from making errors? How should the teacher deal with errors once they are made?
—Can a teacher prevent errors from fossilizing in a learner’s interlanguage (IL)? How?
—Why do some learners have greater difficulty than others in learning an L2?
—Is there an optimal sequence for the presentation of linguistic structures in the classroom?
—To what extent do variables such as the age of the learner and the social or language background of the learner affect language learning? How can the teacher adapt curriculum materials in accordance with the different needs of the students?

The list of questions goes on and on, as we all know. The issues are complex and the need is immediate. As of yet, there are no definitive answers. Yet the L2 teacher is forced to provide ad hoc answers to such questions on a daily basis: “Yes, grammar is important”; “No, I will not correct every single error”; “Slow learners cannot be helped,” and so on.

Both the researcher and the teacher are interested in finding more definitive answers to questions such as those listed above. But the teacher and the researcher approach this issue from different directions. As teachers, we work immersed in the complexities of the language learning process, dealing pragmatically with its uncertainties and immediacies. As researchers, we attempt to simplify that process into very basic elements, and try to understand those elements bit by bit, so that the factors involved in the successful learning of an L2 may be understood, and language teaching methodology may ultimately be improved. The immediacy of the need in the language classroom may cause some impatience with the slow, bit-by-bit approach of research. But research takes time. Answers provided by the limited number of second language acquisition studies undertaken to date are at best tentative and must be interpreted with caution. Teachers and researchers who wish to implement research results must examine current studies critically and be aware of the following limitations which exist within second language acquisition research at this time:

(1) The linguistic scope of the research undertaken to date has been quite limited;
(2) research is just beginning to investigate the cognitive processes and

---

2 “Fossilization” occurs when particular forms or parts of the IL (interlanguage) stop developing, and remain at a plateau beyond which they do not progress. (See Selinker (1972).)
3 The term “interlanguage” as used in this paper refers to the linguistic system underlying the speech forms produced by a second-language learner, as s/he attempts to express meaning in the second language. This linguistic system is at least partly distinct from both the native language (NL) and the target language (TL). The term “interlanguage” was coined by Selinker (1972); other terms used to refer to this linguistic system include “learner-language system” (Sampson and Richards 1973) and “approximative system” (Nemser 1971).
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learning strategies which underlie successful second language acquisition;
(3) current research has not yet systematically evaluated the influence on second language acquisition of several important individual variables.
(4) the environmental variable of the relationship between learner speech in research situations and learner speech in classroom interactions has not been investigated;
(5) the methodology used in the collection of second language data is still in a developmental state;
(6) the methodology used in the analysis of second language data is also still being formulated; and
(7) few second language acquisition studies have been replicated by other researchers.

We will discuss each of these limitations in turn, describing some of the relevant current research, and showing what is necessary to make current studies more relevant to the classroom. We are not attempting to provide an exhaustive review and critique of all the L2 acquisition research to date. Such an attempt would lie far beyond the scope of this paper. Rather, we have chosen to focus on the most central recent studies which examine the actual interlanguage production of second-language learners. It is these studies towards which many teachers and researchers are at present looking for answers to classroom problems.

(1) The linguistic scope of the research undertaken to date has been quite limited. As Schumann (1975) points out, most current research is “product-level”—that is, it is concerned with the description of the linguistic structure of what has been produced by the learner. But in fact, we are just beginning to gather basic information about that structure—about the phonological, morphological, syntactic and semantic characteristics of the interlanguage of second-language learners.

Research into the structure of interlanguage phonology has been restricted. Asher and Garcia (1969) have studied the success of learners of different ages in acquiring L2 phonology. Dickerson (1975) has studied the sociolinguistic variation of several phonological markers as produced by L2 learners in different situations. Tarone (1975) has conducted a pilot study of interlanguage syllable structure and questioned its origin as being from

\footnote{For the purposes of this paper, error analyses of compositions written by second-language learners are not considered; rather, the focus is upon studies of the learners' production of L2 speech in meaningful situations.}

\footnote{For an exhaustive bibliography on language learner systems and error analysis, see Valdman (1975).}

\footnote{Schumann (1975) contrasts this “product-level” research with “process-level” research—the latter being defined as research into the questions of how and why the interlanguage is learned. “Process-level” research investigates the issues of the cognitive processes underlying L2 learning (discussed in Point 2 of this paper), and the initiating factors for that learning (touched upon in Points 3 and 4 of this paper).}
either the native language (NL) syllable structure or from more universal patterns of syllable formation.

In the area of IL morphology, the focus has been primarily upon the order of acquisition of a limited number of morphemes. Dulay and Burt (1973, 1974) used a measure called the Bilingual Syntax Measure (BSM) to examine the order of acquisition of 11 English morphemes by Spanish-speaking and Chinese-speaking children. They found an invariant order of acquisition of the 11 morphemes. Madden, Bailey and Krashen (1975) replicated this study using the BSM with adults learning English as a second language and found substantially the same order of acquisition as Dulay and Burt. Fathman (1975) and Larsen-Freeman (1975) examined children’s order of acquisition of morphemes, using tests other than the BSM; Fathman’s test, while it did not measure exactly the same structures, showed many similarities with the order of morpheme acquisition shown by Dulay and Burt, but Larsen-Freeman did not find that same invariant ordering of morphemes. Hakuta (1975) examined the order of acquisition of morphemes in a longitudinal study of the free speech of a child learner of English as a second language, and found a “very different” order from that described by Dulay and Burt. Thus, the question of the existence of an invariant order of acquisition of morphemes has yet to be clearly established, and certainly cannot be used to delimit an optimal sequence of introducing these linguistic elements in classroom instruction. Furthermore, there are limits to the strength of generalizations which can be made about L2 acquisition when they are based only on the study of order of acquisition of morphemes. In short, there is more to language than a few isolated morphemes.

Several studies of IL morphology have dealt with other aspects of morphology than order of acquisition. Natalicio and Natalicio (1971) examined pluralization, contrasting native and non-native speakers; and Tarone, Frauenfelder and Selinker (1975) examined morphology from the point of view of variability at a single point in time and instability in the system over time.

In the area of interlanguage (IL) syntax, researchers have barely scratched the surface. They have begun to look at the development of the negative (Milon 1974; Cancino, Rosansky and Schumann 1974a); certain question forms (Ravem 1970; Cancino, Rosansky and Schumann 1974b); auxiliaries (Hakuta 1975; Rosansky, Schumann and Cancino 1975); and articles and concatentatives (Hakuta 1975). In addition, Dato (1972) has studied the development of the verb phrase in IL, Ramirez (1974) has examined syntactic complexity using a T-unit analysis, and Boyd (1975) has described the development of several grammatical categories.

Much more remains to be done in the area of phonology, morphology and syntax before applications can confidently be made to classroom teaching. There is a need for (a) a larger data base of phonological, morphological and syntactic aspects of L2 acquisition from a wide variety of L2 learners (including individuals learning languages other than English as a second language); (b) more knowledge about the causes of fossilization-
whether these causes are physiological, psychological or socio-cultural (obviously, the latter two can be affected by appropriate teaching strategies, while the former cannot); (c) a better understanding of the existence of "critical periods" for the learning of phonology, morphology and syntax, so that we can design curriculum to take advantage of such periods if they can be shown to exist; (d) an ability to determine which aspects of phonology, morphology and syntax are most crucial to communication (both in understanding and speaking) and therefore most important to teach; (e) a systematic examination of the influence of phonological environment, semantic content and social context upon the occurrence of particular morphemes and syntactic elements; (f) a systematic examination of the issue of variability and instability in phonology, morphology and syntax in order to understand the change which takes place in different semantic or social contexts, and the change which takes place over time (thus enabling teachers to possibly predict and avoid fossilization in ILs); and (g) studies which investigate the role of language transfer at the phonological, morphological and syntactic levels. The importance of language transfer (both positive and negative) in L2 learning must not be underestimated; understanding this process may help us to structure L2 lessons to maximize positive transfer and minimize negative transfer.

Very few studies have considered any aspect of interlanguage semantics to date. Zytadiss (1972) has explored thematization in the IL; Våradi (1973) and Tarone, Frauenfelder and Selinker (1975) have investigated the use of avoidance strategies used by the L2 learner when s/he does not know a particular vocabulary item.

Adjemian (1975) has pointed to the misleading nature of product-level studies which examine isolated aspects of phonology, morphology and syntax, rather than examining the totality of communicative competence. Such studies, Adjemian claims, underestimate the abilities of the students in their second language. Perhaps other frameworks for examining the IL product should be considered, such as discourse analysis, which can take into account semantics and social context.

Clearly, the area of semantics is complex; the classroom teacher would want to know more about several aspects, among them: (a) the variables (e.g., motivation) which are important for the development of communicative competence in the IL; (b) the role of such non-linguistic types of communication as kinesics and proxemics in the repertoire of the successful L2 learner; (c) the importance of vocabulary in IL, as opposed to phonology, syntax or morphology; and (d) the role of cognates in the acquisition of vocabulary (i.e., language transfer at a semantic level).

---

7 The term "critical period" is used to describe an age range during which it is possible to learn a second language easily; after that period, it is suggested that the L2 cannot be learned with the facility supposedly characteristic of children.

8 The term "communicative competence" is defined by Savignon (1974) as an ability to engage in spontaneous interpersonal transactions in the L2. Savignon offers several suggestions as to ways in which communicative competence might be studied.
To summarize then, studies of the linguistic product of interlanguage are, to date, limited in scope. Furthermore, to focus solely on the linguistic product is misleading.

(2) Research is just beginning to investigate the cognitive processes and learning strategies which underlie successful second language acquisition. If research can show clearly how language transfer, overgeneralization and other processes operate to form the learners' interlanguage, then teachers should be able to formulate teaching strategies more confidently. For example, if research were to find language transfer to be the dominant influence shaping IL phonology, then perhaps contrastive analysis and language drill would be the dominant strategies for the teaching of L2 pronunciation. But if research were to find other strong influences on IL phonology, then perhaps other teaching strategies would be more appropriate.

At one time the only process underlying IL forms and structure was understood to be that of language transfer from the NL. A good deal of theoretical work, bolstered by (primarily) anecdotal examples of learner errors, then suggested that other strategies, such as overgeneralization within the target language, may also be influential in shaping the IL. Some research has been done which attempts to isolate and identify such strategies. As Schumann (1975) points out, such research begins with product-level data and reasons back to underlying processes. Dulay and Burt (1973, 1974) have formed the creative construction hypothesis, based on their work with morpheme acquisition. In this hypothesis, the learner is thought to actively construct rules about the L2, with almost no influence from language transfer. Selinker, Swain and Dumas (1975) and Boyd (1975) show a number of processes to be operative in shaping the IL, including language transfer, overgeneralization, and simplification. Hatch (1974) has examined several product-level studies, and arrived at a number of possible L2 acquisition universals. Other researchers who have speculated about the nature of the learning strategies which shape interlanguage include Hakuta (1975), Sampson (1971), Madden, Bailey and Krashen (1975) and many others.

A quick perusal of these research results will demonstrate that there are conflicting conclusions drawn by different studies as to the nature of the cognitive processes underlying L2 acquisition; some conclude, for example, that language transfer has a negligible influence on IL, while others conclude that language transfer (together with other influences) is important in shaping IL. Ultimately the answer to this issue may be extremely complex; certain processes may be operable for certain kinds of learners and not for others. But it is clearly risky at present for a teacher to attempt to “apply” any research findings in this area to curriculum until there is more conclusive evidence, and more agreement among the various studies.

(3) Current research has not yet systematically evaluated the influence

---

9 See Lado (1957) for an extensive discussion of language transfer and the role of contrastive analysis in language teaching.
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on second-language acquisition of several important individual variables. How does motivation affect success in second-language acquisition? What is the effect of age, sex and personality? Is ability in the native language related to success in learning a second language? What amount and type of exposure to the L2 is most effective for a particular learner? How does the learner’s cultural identity affect success in language learning?

It appears likely that individual variables such as those listed above may be of crucial importance in second-language acquisition. It may be precisely these variables which cause some to be “fast learners” and some “slow learners” in the language classroom, and thus it is the effect of precisely these variables which the teacher would like to know more about.

There appears to be an influential, but untested, teaching folklore which “answers” some of these questions. So, for example, this folklore has it that children always learn a second language better than adults; that the successful L2 learner is emphatic, outgoing and involved in the L2 community; that success in the NL is directly related to success in the L2; that instructed learners learn better than free learners. Some of this folklore may be accurate, but some may not; these assumptions need to be tested systematically by research. Although such research into the influence of individual variables is just beginning, there is already strong evidence that at least one of the “answers” of teaching folklore is not always true—children do not always learn a L2 better than adults (Ervin-Tripp 1974).¹⁰ On the other hand, preliminary evidence from research suggests that empathy may be an important key to success in the L2-learning task. In an exploratory study, Guiora et al (1972) have artificially induced a state of empathy (or a “modified ego-state”). Under this condition, L2 pronunciation seemed to improve.

However, overall, it is proving to be difficult for L2 acquisition research to isolate and control these individual variables successfully. The population that is studied must be carefully analyzed and the relevant variables identified and controlled if possible. Case studies (Huang 1971), small group studies (Cancino, Rosansky and Schumann 1974a,b) and large group studies (Fathman 1975) offer alternative ways for controlling and studying individual factors. When the number of subjects in a study is small, the ability to isolate individual variables is better, but the generalizability of the study is not great. In studying large populations, the generalizability of results is greater, but the control of variables is more difficult and is typically achieved through the random selection of subjects. In many studies, a large number of subjects has been chosen who vary along one specific dimension, such as age or language background (Larsen-Freeman 1975; Fathman 1974). By dealing with large numbers, the influence of other

¹⁰ Further, Ervin-Tripp (1974) points out that children in general are not expected to be able to talk about as complex ideas in the L2 as adults are; hence, the L2-learning task is much easier for children than for adults, and it is easier for them to appear to be successful.
variables is in effect cancelled out through randomization in the selection of subjects.

The relevance to teaching of results from isolated studies, with both small and large populations, is limited. The effect of individual variables on the L2 learning process will be better understood only through the continual build-up of data from different studies. Through such a composite picture the relevance of results for teaching should become clearer. For the present, each study should be critically examined in terms of what individual variables are considered, and how well the variables are controlled.

(4) The environmental variable of the relationship between learner speech in research situations and learner speech in classroom interactions has not been investigated. From sociolinguistics we have learned that language varies in different social situations. Dickerson (1975) has provided evidence suggesting that interlanguages respond to different social situations just as first languages do. Thus, it is reasonable to assume that differences may exist in the speech of an individual as s/he interacts in the second language with different people in different situations. The IL speech used with the teacher may differ in unknown ways from the IL speech used with the researcher. The IL speech used in the classroom may differ from the IL speech used outside the classroom. Given that IL speech does vary in different social situations, and given that most data on ILs have been collected outside the classroom situation, we must assume that little of the current research on second-language learning can be directly applied to the classroom. It is clear that environmental variables should be more carefully considered in future L2 research.

Clearly the most immediately “relevant” research for the classroom should be research done in the classroom. More studies done in the classroom are needed, such as those being carried out by Allwright (1975) and Fanselow (1974, 1975). Allwright’s work involves the observation of teacher-student interactions in the L2 classroom in order to identify how teachers deal with students’ linguistic errors and what effect this has on student learning. Fanselow’s work involves the development of a coding system for the observation of teacher-student interaction, in order to contrast the behavior of experienced and inexperienced language teachers. Research of this nature, conducted in the L2 classroom, is likely to be of direct help to the language teacher.

(5) The methodology used in the collection of second-language data is still in a developmental state. Almost nothing is known about the way in which methodology may affect the results of a study in this field. For example, different orders of acquisition of English morphology have been observed when data were collected using an elicitation device (the BSM) (Dulay and Burt 1974) as opposed to when data were collected from the spontaneous speech of a learner (Hakuta 1975). These observed differences may be related to the method of data collection rather than to actual learner differences. Thus, the validation of instruments used in the collection of data is necessary before the results of a study can be used to influence
teaching. By “validation of instruments” we mean the process of determining whether the tests used in L2 acquisition research really measure what we want them to measure. Does a particular elicitation device really obtain an accurate measure of a child’s knowledge of syntax at a particular point in time? Does the BSM measure the order of acquisition of structures, the relative difficulty of a particular structure, or something else?

Another methodological issue relating to the collection of data is the equivalence of cross-sectional and longitudinal data. If, in one study, cross-sectional data are collected at a single point in time from a large number of subjects, and in a second study, longitudinal data are collected regularly every two weeks for a year, are the results of those two studies going to be similar? In the studies described in the paragraph above, Dulay and Burt’s (1974) study on the order of acquisition of morphemes is longitudinal. As we have pointed out, they find different orders of acquisition. Those observed differences could be related to the fact that cross-sectional methods of data collection were used in one study, and longitudinal methods in the other. If cross-sectional and longitudinal data are shown to be consistently different, then cross-sectional data cannot be used to make claims about order of acquisition. Here again, the validation of techniques used in the collection of data is needed before the results of such studies can be used to influence teaching.11

Finally, as Corder (1972) points out, there is a need for three kinds of data to be collected in the investigation of interlanguage: “textual” data (a body of spontaneous utterances by the learner), data obtained from several types of contrastive analysis, and data obtained from elicitation procedures designed to tap the learner’s intuitions about the IL. The data described in this paper are primarily “textual”; they are gathered from the relatively spontaneous speech of L2 learners. There is a need for more collection of the other two types of data as well. Naiman (1974), Swain, Dumas and Naiman (1974), Ervin-Tripp (1974) and Chun and Politzer (1975) are among the few who have worked with IL data obtained by elicitation procedures such as “elicited imitation” and “elicited translation,” designed to obtain some access to the L2 learner’s linguistic knowledge.

(6) The methodology used in the analysis of second language data is also still being formulated. Once the data have been collected, there is the problem of deciding what they mean. If there are patterns hidden in the data, what is the best method of uncovering them? The researcher always faces the problem of what to count and what to discount; in searching for a particular kind of pattern in the data, s/he may easily be blinded to other kinds of patterns. In discarding data that look disorganized, variable and void of pattern, s/he may be overlooking valuable information. Thus, as Adjemian (1975) has pointed out (cf. above) the researcher may be searching for isolated patterns of syntax and disregard data which provide valuable information about the learner’s communicative competence.

11 E. Ingram (forthcoming) outlines the dimensions of a valid testing procedure.
Different methods of data analysis used in current research have included morpheme counts (used in Dulay and Burt 1973, 1974; Hakuta 1975; Boyd 1975) are limited in that they cannot handle utterances that are correct morphologically but incorrect in word order or semantics. So, for example, an utterance such as this one would be considered correct by an analysis solely of a morpheme count:

*Sees John the cow's carburetor.

Error analyses are limited in that they cannot determine the extent to which learners avoid producing those second-language forms which they do not know (Schachter 1974). A strict error analysis would be unable to tell the researcher that a particular learner is, for example, not producing the conditional tense at all, but rather is cleverly avoiding any discussion which would require the use of the conditional tense. Error analysis operates only on those language forms which the learner produces; if the learner chooses not to produce certain forms, error analysis is unable to detect such avoidance. More comprehensive methods of data analysis need to be developed, methods which are better able to reveal the knowledge of the L2 learner which underlies the collected data.

Another point to consider is the appropriateness of applying statistical analyses to developmental language data, which tend to be unstable over time. What does it mean to say that, for example, the rank order correlation between two known sequences of acquisition are statistically similar or different? What the educational implications of such a statement? Statistical significance can provide input in considering “educational significance,” but the two must not be confused.

A final related question is that of the presentation of the data. Interlanguages tend to be both variable and unstable over time. So, for example, if we look at an individual’s acquisition of a particular L2 item over time, we might be able to chart it this way:

The individual does not seem to learn the item all at once; at any given point in time there is variability, so that the item is used correctly one minute and incorrectly the next. Furthermore, there is a good deal of instability over time; the item is not learned all at once, but rather very slowly with periodic fits of backsliding. Such a pattern of acquisition is very typical of the patterns found in longitudinal studies such as Hakuta (1975), or Cancino, Rosansky and Schumann (1974a,b). Such studies have
usually presented their data in chart or graph form, in order to demonstrate such variability and instability. To date, it has not been possible to write more economical descriptions of what is taking place in L2 acquisition; linguistic grammars usually describe language which is both systematic at a single point in time and stable over time. To date, we have been unable to find linguistic rules capable of handling both the variability and the instability of interlanguage.

In sum, then, better and more comprehensive methods of data analysis are needed before educational applications of research can confidently be made. Those methods will undoubtedly be developed with time, but for now the reader should bear in mind that the methods of analysis presently being used can only provide partial insights into the system involved in the complex activity of L2 learning.

(7) Few L2 acquisition studies have been replicated by other researchers. If the results of a study are to be used to influence the teaching of a second language, they should be replicated in some way, possibly by other researchers using different methodologies with the same population, or using the same methodology with different populations. A study should be successfully replicated in order to establish whether its findings are reliable (that is, whether the same results will always be found in other studies); if the study cannot be successfully replicated, then one must assume that some unknown and uncontrolled variable produced the results. For example, Cancino, Rosansky and Schumann (1974a,b) have conducted a longitudinal study with five Spanish-speakers learning English as a second language. Their findings, although interesting, should be replicated by other studies in order to establish their reliability. It may be that many of their findings hold only for their particular subjects, and not for example, for Spanish-speakers in Albuquerque schools. Only a sequence of successful replications of their study in a variety of situations will be able to establish the reliability of their findings. Until then, those findings should not be used to influence educational policy in any direct way.

In short, then, the field of second language acquisition research is still in its infancy. We have outlined some of the specific limitations of current research, in order to stress that hasty pedagogical applications should not be made on the basis of that work as it now stands.

Such hasty pedagogical applications of theory have been made in the past, with unfortunate results. For example, when Chomsky and other generative grammarians pointed out the inadequacies of the structuralist approaches to linguistics, several attempts were made to incorporate transformational generative linguistics into second-language teaching curricula. It was assumed that if transformational generative grammar represented a better linguistic theory, it must also provide better educational curricula. Textbooks such as Rutherford (1968) were published; such books used transformational-generative terms such as “T-yes/no” or “T-neg” to teach English to foreign students, and drills were devised whereby the students provided “transformations” of various utterances. Such textbooks and cur-
riculum materials are no longer frequently used, because teachers found they did not work as well as expected.

J. P. B. Allen has suggested (personal communication) that there is, perhaps, something wrong with the idea that the only way to “apply” the results of research is to write a whole new textbook or a brand new curriculum sequence. Perhaps it is better to see the current applications of research as comprising an influence which indirectly and subtly changes the teacher’s attitude towards what s/he is trying to do in the classroom—changing the teacher’s attitude towards errors, for example, or leading the teacher to pay more attention to forms the students are producing. Such a change in attitude may be the most important application of current research which can be made to the field of language teaching.

Meanwhile, a good deal more research needs to be done—research which untangles the multitude of variables involved in language learning, research which is done in the classroom, research which is done with refined methodology and analytical tools, and research which is replicated, comprehensive, and informative. The major creative task of translating research findings into innovative language curriculum ideas remains to be undertaken and should prove to be a challenge to both researchers and teachers in the future.
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The Feasibility of Test Translation Between Unrelated Languages English to Navajo*

Annabelle R. Rosenbluth

This study investigates whether a test can be translated into Navajo in a form suitable for assessing the language development of kindergarten, first, and second grade Navajo students. The norms from an English test administered in Albuquerque, as well as from the Boehm Test of Basic Concepts norm group, were used to provide comparison of difficulty and discrimination of the test.

It is concluded that there are four crucial differences between the Navajo and English tests. 1. Different level of syntactic difficulty in a number of items, which could not be overcome by paraphrase; 2. Differences in the way English and Navajo languages organize experience into concept units; 3. Accidental similarity of concept words in Navajo that have no such similarity in English; 4. Different range of meaning in concept words in Navajo, leading to duplication of Navajo test words in items that are not similar in English.

Though words for concepts such as those in the Boehm Test of Basic Concepts must exist in every language, the way they are incorporated into surface grammar for expression differs so widely between Navajo and English that the universality of this concept core probably cannot be tapped in a practical way by the translator or teacher.

The project of translating an English test into Navajo came about because of a growing concern in New Mexico with the educational problems of Navajo students. Test scores are low, usually in the lowest quartile of standardized measures (Scoon and Blanchard 1970). Dropout figures for the Indian students in Arizona and New Mexico, which include the majority of Navajos, were around 34% in 1969, the last year for which figures are available (Bass 1969). Students who remain in school are often older “by two or more years than the expected age for their grade (Aurbach 1970).

The question that must be asked in the face of such symptoms of educational difficulty is whether the fault lies in the child, the system of education provided for him, or in the interaction between the two. There are many contributing factors: the cultural disruption of Indian societies, their economic disadvantages, and the many resulting personal and social difficulties. All these problems should be addressed, but they are far from simple, and are not within the reach of educators.

One thing that educators can consider, however, is the language the Navajo child brings to his school experience. This problem, simply stated,
is that schools are taught in English, and most Navajo children come to school speaking little or no English. Spolsky (1971) found that in 1970, 68% of all Navajo children entering school had insufficient knowledge of English to function in a classroom where only English was used.

Children beginning their school careers experience a shift from imitation and action as major learning modes to the more abstract learning through explanation and verbally directed activity (Bruner 1966). The child's level of language accomplishment is an important readiness factor. English-language preschool activities teach and reinforce the basic concept words of English. School readiness tests in English, such as the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (American Guidance Service) and the Primary Mental Abilities Test (Science Research Associates) assess the child's language and concept readiness for school learning tasks. These tests have been translated into Spanish for use with Spanish speaking bilingual children. But Spanish is a language related to English, with cognate words and a common Indo-European base. Navajo has no such relation to English, and so it is a question whether an English test translated into Navajo would have value in identifying a student's level of readiness for school or his knowledge of basic concepts. Yet the need to know something about the Navajo child's level of development in his own language when he starts to school remains.

A translated test could at least identify areas in which the Navajo child is significantly different from the English-speaking child in the concepts to which he has attached language labels, giving teachers a base line from which they could begin to teach language concepts in English.

The Test

A study of the basic concepts that appear to be necessary for doing school tasks was made by Ann Boehm in 1966. From examination of 13 texts and teacher's guides used in kindergarten through the third grade in reading, arithmetic, and science she identified a total of 108 English words and short phrases that were repeatedly used in directions and explanations to the children, but were neither explained nor taught in the actual lesson materials.

From those 108 items, Boehm chose 50 that, on a preliminary tryout test, had a discrimination of at least .30, yielded an even rise in percent passing across age levels, and gave a roughly normal distribution of percent passing values, centered around .50 for kindergarten pupils (Boehm 1970).

If the concepts of the Boehm test are really basic, they should be examples of language universals and be translatable in the sense Katz meant when he said that "... natural languages are capable of providing a sentence to express any thought a speaker might wish to communicate. ... For any example in English, a fluent speaker of any language could provide a parallel." (Katz 1972: 12)

The objects referred to in the test are common and, for the most part, culturally neutral. Answers are given by marking one of several pictures in
response to verbal instructions. A translated version of the test should, if successful, allow comparison of the degree of concept understanding reached by children at ages six to eight in the two language groups.

The Boehm test was chosen as the vehicle for this feasibility study for the following reasons:

1. The test was developed to test basic concepts required for school tasks that most Navajo children eventually will have to do in English.
2. It has been extensively tested so that a comparison group is available.
3. Test development is a difficult and demanding job. The translation process, if feasible, could save many hours of effort in writing and testing new and untried instruments.

The Translation

The translation was prepared by fully bilingual Navajos, who checked and rechecked each other's work. Four translators were used in all, and Dr. Robert Young, Navajo linguist, also assisted.

After the test was approved in written form, the original translators recorded it to guarantee an accurate and fluent verbal presentation of the test sentences.

Pretesting was done to accustom the children to the activity of test taking. Even so, it is possible that young Navajo children in a boarding school on the reservation were less test-wise than any of the English-speaking students. The overall analysis of test results indicate, however, that many more important factors influenced student responses.

The Navajo test was given in March, 1972, at the Rock Point Boarding School near Chinle, Arizona. One hundred twenty-six children in kindergarten, beginner, and first grades were tested. The beginners are the age of first graders in public school, and the first graders are the age of second graders. Grade labels of the English-speaking students will be used for all, for ease of comparison between the groups.

The kindergarten students were nearly monolingual in Navajo. The older students had begun to learn English but did not use it freely. All classes had Navajo-speaking teachers or aides, and the Navajo language was often used in class.

The total test required about an hour to administer, with a break between the two halves. Kindergarten children became tired before the end, but they had also reached a point where few of the concept words were known, so they were suffering as much from frustration as from fatigue.

On any test, wrong answers as well as right ones are of interest. Since this information was not available for the original Boehm English-speaking group, the test was administered in English to six classes of first and second grade students in an Albuquerque public school. Since their scores were close to the averages of the Boehm groups, these tests were used for item analysis.

Percent-passing scores compared the degree of difficulty of various items for Navajo and English-speaking children. These scores were subjected to
chi-square analysis, item by item, assuming the Boehm English-speaking students' average score on each item to be the norm. Navajo scores were significantly different (p < .001) from English scores at all grade levels on ten items, and on three more at p < .01.

VALIDITY

The validity of the Boehm test in English was based upon the relevance of the test content to material in the school curriculum (Boehm 1970). This same content validity should apply to the Navajo version of the test, since these are the concepts the child will encounter when he studies from English materials. Internal validity of the Navajo version of the test, as measured by the indices of discrimination of the item analysis, will be discussed below.

RELIABILITY

The Boehm test in English yielded reliabilities of .82 at grades 1 and 2 and .86 at kindergarten. The Navajo reliabilities (KR 20) were lower: .23 at kindergarten (N 30), .75 at grade 1 (N 46), and .65 at grade 2 (N 50).

The Albuquerque English-speaking children's score reliabilities were very close to the Navajos: .80 at grade 1 (N 60), and .69 at grade 2 (N 67).

The Navajo kindergarten group's very low reliability was partly due to the small size of the group and its little variance, with a standard deviation of only 4.0. These children also had the least experience with testing, and probably made many random responses. It was impossible to interpret the meaning of the test results for these youngest students.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

General statistical analysis of the Navajo and two English tests showed that the Navajo children scored significantly below the English speakers at all grades. The Navajo kindergarten mean score was at the fortieth percentile of the Boehm group, grade 1 was at the fifteenth percentile, and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The reliability of the total Navajo test, as measured by the Kuder-Richardson formula 20 is .83. Total test reliability is not reported for the Boehm sample.
* Split-half coefficient, Spearman-Brown correction.
\* Kuder-Richardson Formula 20.
grade 2 was at the tenth percentile. Thus, starting fairly close together, the two groups moved further apart at each grade. Nonetheless, the Navajo students showed a steady improvement through the grades.

The test may have been harder overall in Navajo than in English. However, the basic criteria set in the Boehm test, that kindergarten students should score on the average around the 50% mark, and that there be a steady improvement through the grades, is met.

The question of comparability between English and Navajo groups and the possible use of English norms is another matter. In a test with such a large difference between the means at grades 1 and 2, it would be unwise to use English grade-level norms. If the test were to be used in its present form, Navajo norms would have to be established through further testing. The first conclusion drawn from the statistical analysis must be that the English Boehm and the translated Navajo tests are not the same test.

Item Analysis

The item analysis performed on the Navajo and the Albuquerque English tests confirmed that the Navajo test was harder and less successfully discriminating than the English test.

The test was normed to an average score of 50% at kindergarten level, so the first and second grade English speakers found it easy. In both the Boehm sample and the Albuquerque group, 35% of the first grade students and 43% of the second grade students passed more than 75% of the items. Among the Navajos, only about 25% of the same age students scored in the upper quartile.

To be considered a good discriminator, the index of discrimination for a test item must reach .40. Between .30 and .39 is reasonably good, between .20 and .29 is marginal, and below .20 is poor (Ebel 1972). In the Navajo test as a whole, 9 items were below .20, 8 between .20 and .29, 13 between .30 and .39, and the rest .40 or above. Thus 35, or 70% of the Navajo items were reasonably good or better in discrimination.

Ranking Navajo items by difficulty shows that the assumption of Boehm (1970) that the test is organized to become progressively harder from item 1 to 50 is not met in Navajo.

The difference in level of difficulty between the Navajo items and the English items is hardly surprising, since there is no genetic relation or structural similarity between the two languages. The correlation expected was between meanings. If the two languages expressed a similar concept, the test items might be answered similarly. This was the case in only about 10 sentences out of the total of 50. This does not mean that the same content was not being presented, but rather that if the semantic content was similar, other factors governed the Navajo children's choice of answers.

Linguistic Analysis

Several categories of problems were identified by examination of the Navajo response patterns.
SYNTACTIC DIFFERENCE

The most important difference found was in the level of syntactic difficulty required in Navajo to express the concepts of the English test. Concepts that could be expressed in English in relatively simple syntax sometimes proved to require long and indirect expression in Navajo.

An example was item 23 of the test, which in English was: “Look at the pictures of a girl. Mark the picture that shows how the girl looked after her hair was cut.” The concept word being tested was “after,” in the sense of subsequent in time.

In making the Navajo translation, the translators found it necessary to use three sentences: At’ééd beda’alyaaáígí nínítí, “Look at the pictured girls.” Díí at’ééd táa’go naháaztánígíí t’áá tá’ yígíí át’éego át’é. “Those three girls are the same one.” Bitsii’ k’égizhgo áádóó bik’íizoh “Her hair having been cut, then afterward how she looked, mark it.”

This item was hard at kindergarten level for all children, probably because of the need to impose a time sequence upon the three pictures. But by the first grade, the English speakers had reached 92% right. The Navajo percent was significantly lower.

The Navajo sentence was, of course, much longer and placed a greater burden on the child’s attention and memory. In Navajo it is not acceptable to refer to a picture as the thing pictured; therefore it was necessary to point out that the girls were drawings, and that each drawing was of the same girl.

This item might be rewritten to omit the second sentence, since the concept does not require the same girl in each picture. If the sentence had read “Mark the picture that shows how a girl looks after her hair has been cut,” the correct answer would have been equally well selected in English. Though the response also might be to “cut” instead of “after” the middle picture of a girl with her hair being cut presumably directs the student’s attention to the time word “after.”

A much more difficult syntactic problem was found in the translations involving relations between two nouns. Many Navajo relational sentences take the form of noun-noun-postposition-verb. The post-position has a pronominal prefix that indicates the noun to which it is related. If the two nouns are in different persons, there is no problem. If they are both in the third person, as in the sentences of this test, then a potential ambiguity exists.

Examples are: Item 20, in English, “Mark the toy that is behind the sofa.” In Navajo, Daane’é bik’ídah’asdáhí nteeligíí bine’déé s’i’áigíí bik’íizoh. Literally, “Toy sofa it-behind being-which mark.”

The referent of bi- is clearly the sofa, second noun in the sequence. Yet in item 6, “Mark the box that has some but not many marbles,” Tsits’aa’ máazo ta’ biyi’ígíí bik’íizoh, bi- refers to the box, the first noun of the sequence.
One cannot predict from the bi- which of the two nouns it refers to. This fact caused no apparent mistakes if the nature of the relation did not allow semantic confusion. That is, since a box could not be "in" the marbles, this sentence was not misunderstood. But the toy could be behind the sofa, or the sofa behind the toy—the picture included a toy in each place. Some children marked the sofa itself.

The identification of pronominal referents in sentences including two third-person references may prove to be one of the difficult constructions of Navajo, which children do not learn thoroughly before age seven or eight.

English superlative constructions created another kind of difficulty in translation. The comparative sets such as "far, farther, farthest" are important in English grammar, but in Navajo some of them apparently cannot be directly expressed. Equality comparisons are made, but inequality comparisons are not (Young 1971). Test items involving superlatives were successful only because the pictures did not really require the concept of the superlative. The concept "nearest" was tested by a Navajo sentence literally meaning "near," and the concept "farthest" was tested by the word for "far." But in both items, only one picture showed objects near or far. The rest of the items were obviously not near, or not far.

Some Navajo static verbs can be modified by the word alaah, "beyond anything." In those cases, the superlative concept was tested with phrases meaning "beyond anything relatively much," or "beyond anything relatively wide," and the Navajo scores were similar to the English scores.

One more superlative created a special problem in Navajo. The English test item 50 is, “Look at the groups of stars. Mark the group that has the least stars.” In Navajo: So’ dah naazhjaa’go beda’-alyaąiįį níilíi. So’ áičti’digo naashe’aa’įįį bikt’iisoh. Literally: “Stars up there clustered in groups pictured—which look at. Stars being few drawn—which mark it.” The pictures contained two, three, and five stars. The problem is that the verb naazhjaa, “they are clustered in groups,” is in plural form and Navajo has a dual as well as plural. Thus the picture with two stars in it, the correct answer, is syntactically excluded from the reference of the verb. If dual form had been used, the question would have been a giveaway. The majority of Navajo kindergarten and first grade students marked the group of stars that was syntactically correct, the smallest plural number, 3.

DIFFERENCE IN RANGE OF MEANING

Another problem encountered in translating the test was that several of the different concept words of English had to be translated by the same word in Navajo. For example, the form bikáa occurred three times, translating “at the top,” “over,” and “above.” Six Navajo morphemes accounted for 17 items of the English test.

English students were being tested on their knowledge of different words. Navajo word variations simply did not match the English variations. A rewritten version of the test might well omit some of the repetitions, and
substitute additional concepts, perhaps from those left out by Boehm because in English they proved too easy. The different levels of difficulty discovered between the English and Navajo test items suggest that it might be wise to replicate the entire selection process for determining difficult concepts, and the selection for the Navajo test would probably turn out to be different from the selection for the English test.

Another aspect of the range-of-meaning problem was that English and Navajo words sometimes did not have enough overlap. For example, in item 3, “Look at the table and the boxes. Mark the box that is away from the table,” the concept to be tested was “away from,” contrasted with “near” or “on” in terms of the pictures. In Navajo the translation of this concept word, bitsʼáádi, included the box that is under the table, since it too is “away from” the table in a sense.

Another concept that proved difficult to translate was “different.” The Navajo word used, tʼáá sahdii, means “by itself” or “unique,” which includes some but not all of the meaning of “different.” In the picture that tested this concept there were two groups of blocks alike and one different. But the different one was not “by itself,” though it was unique. This item proved to be a reasonably good discriminator, though very hard at kindergarten level. However, one important part of the meaning of “different” is that it is the opposite of “same.” This is the meaning the picture was meant to test, and in Navajo it failed to do so.

One final example will illustrate very clearly the problem caused by starting with a word rather than a concept in making a translation. Item 29 of the test says: “Look at the trees and squirrels. Mark the squirrel that is beginning to climb a tree.” The picture shows squirrels at the bottom, in the middle, and up in a tree. The squirrel at the bottom is supposed to be “beginning to climb.”

It was clear from the lengthy discussions of this item among the translators that the idea of “beginning to climb” was hard to express in Navajo, since the verb used, haaʼnéeh, did not accept an inceptive prefix. The translation, Tʼii s yaah haaʼnéehgo yaa ndiiidhígíí bìkʼiizoh, literally means “tree it-alongside climbing around doing-which mark it.” Since the imperfective form of the verb suggests action in progress though not completed, more than half the Navajo students in kindergarten and first grade marked the “correct” tree—the one in which the squirrel was in the act of climbing.

This appeared to be a syntactic problem. But later, in discussion with another informant and the Navajo linguist, it developed that the word “climb” in English had elicited a word in Navajo that translated “climb” but did not translate the Navajo idea of what squirrels do. If the Navajo writer had looked at the squirrels without seeing the word “climb,” he would have chosen another word, probably one that would be translated in English by “scamper” or “scurry.” The translators, in trying to be accurate, had inadvertently created an unusual sentence that may have distracted the students from the point.
Conclusions

The working hypotheses on which this study was undertaken were:

1. Theories of universals in language suggest that a reasonably accurate transfer of meaning can be accomplished between any two human natural languages.
2. The similarity of children’s rates of development and ability to communicate in any language native to them strongly suggests that basic relational concepts will be a part of each child’s linguistic repertoire.
3. A translation of a test of these basic relational concepts could tap this similar meaning stratum in two languages, and enable cross-language comparison of concept development.

A practical consideration related to these assumptions was the fact that such a test could be useful to teachers of Navajo children. At the very least, concepts soon to be needed in English and apparently lacking in the Navajo children’s language could be taught directly.

Only the first assumption was reasonably supported. Native speakers of Navajo who were fully bilingual in English proved to be able to translate all the test items to their own satisfaction. In one or two instances, it appeared that they were too literal and thus changed the intent of the meaning.

Negative results were that it proved impossible to maintain the translation at the same level of syntactic and vocabulary simplicity that was required to yield scores comparable to the English averages. This failure is related to basic differences between English and Navajo. The Navajo language does not use different discrete words to express the concepts of this test, but rather employs stems with core meaning of a very general nature, which become specific by the addition of affixes of location, direction, benefaction, and the like. In a sense, the Navajo child has fewer basic concept forms to learn, but more complex ways of assembling them.

The problem of syntactic complexity could not be overcome in Navajo by paraphrase of the complex sentences. This supported the conclusion of Young (1971) that syntactic variety is lacking in Navajo. Young reported that no informant was able to produce a syntactic variation of a given Navajo sentence, and that all Navajo sentences within the same semantic category followed the same pattern. Thus, when any one of the concepts of the Boehm test happened to require a difficult syntactic form in Navajo, the test unavoidably become harder for Navajo children than for English children.

Translatability of this specific test for a specific age group of Navajo children must be considered low. The fact that children of all language group learn to speak at about the same age and meet their communication needs very adequately (C. Chomsky 1969; McNeill 1971), suggests that there are simple sentences in Navajo and there are important basic concepts expressed in them which children learn to understand and use at an early age. However, these simple expressions of basic concepts were not found by translating this English test of basic concepts. Perhaps they can be found by studying large samples of natural speech of Navajo children.
If the translated test of the Boehm Test of Basic Concepts is to be used, it should first be rewritten to eliminate the identified bad items, and then Navajo norms should be established. These two procedures should not be unduly difficult since 70% of the test appears to be statistically acceptable.

A better way to create a language test for young Navajo children would be to use this test as a model, but to write the items directly in Navajo after a study of Navajo child language. This would have the virtue of being a truer comparative measure of levels of linguistic development among the children, though it would not help with English language concepts.

One final question remains to be considered. That is why, since at the kindergarten level the Navajo test proved only 10% harder than the English test, did the Navajo scores improve so slowly?

Possibly the kindergarten scores included many random accidental correct answers. The group was small and the reliability was very low. If the actual language content of the tests is much harder in Navajo than in English, the fact that Navajo students improved more slowly would be explained.

However, there is another possible explanation. Both John (1971) and C. Chomsky (1969) pointed out that the Navajo child’s normal development in his own language is interfered with at a crucial stage when he enters school. He has learned the basic language that all children learn by age five or six, but the more difficult syntax, the subtler nuances of meaning, and the wider vocabulary of older people have not yet been established. As Vigotsky (1962) said, he may be using words for concepts that are not yet fully understood, or he may have a concept but not yet have learned how to express it in Navajo.

What happens to his language at ages five to ten may determine whether or not he ever reaches the adult level of Navajo language development. Perhaps interference in native-language growth is the cause of the complaint often heard from Navajo adults, that “our children do not know any language—they don’t know English and they don’t know their own Navajo very well either.”

Summary

The Navajo version of the Boehm Test of Basic Concepts is a harder test than the English version. At least 30% of its items are statistically poor. A number of other items within acceptable ranges of difficulty and discrimination appear to be measuring a different meaning than that intended by the English. Only about 20% of the items measure in the same way in both groups.

Experience with this translation suggests that any such test translation not only be carefully prepared, but tested, rewritten in light of the statistical analysis of the test, then retested and renormed within the target population. Unless this is done, it is unlikely that a valid interpretation of test results could be made.
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Bilingual Education: The “Immersion” Model in the North American Context

Andrew D. Cohen and Merrill Swain

Although non-English-speaking minority groups have largely attributed school difficulties to an inability to learn both English and subject matter at the same time, recent experiences in North America suggest that it is possible to do so successfully. The purpose of this paper is to account for these apparent contradictions by examining first the characteristics of “immersion” education for the majority group child. The possibility of programs based on the successful model of immersion education for several target groups is then considered. It is suggested that the advent of successful immersion education may motivate bilingual teachers to reconsider their methodology for creating bilinguals.

Non-English-speaking minority groups have often struggled and even failed to successfully complete their education in North American schools. This has been attributed in large part to an inability to learn both English and subject matter at the same time. However, recent experiences in North America suggest that it is possible to learn both a second language and subject matter at the same time. The purpose of this paper is to account for these apparent contradictions by examining first the characteristics of “immersion” education for the majority group child. The possibility of programs based on the successful model of immersion education for several target groups is then considered.

The school experience of minority groups not receiving any form of bilingual education has tended to include the following characteristics:

1. The students were grouped indiscriminately with native English speakers for all or most of the school day. Whereas heterogeneous language grouping is valuable at the right time and place, such grouping may be counterproductive at the outset. The child acquiring a second language has initial difficulties in communication and consequently may have a sense of insecurity or even one of failure in the presence of native speakers of that language. Sometimes native English speakers—even from the same ethnic background (e.g., third-generation Chicano)—may tease the non-native speaker because of his imperfect English.
(2) If English as a second language (ESL) lessons were offered, the programs were of a pull-out nature, that is, the students were segregated for ESL instruction. Pulling students out for ESL classes has often resulted in stigmatizing the students as possessing a “language handicap” or a “cognitive deficit,” labels which are damaging to student self-esteem.

(3) The ESL lessons were of a formal, structured nature, generally from kindergarten or from first grade on. The value of explicit teaching of ESL syntax at such an early age has been questioned (Dulay and Burt 1974). Furthermore, such classes have often produced only mixed results in English acquisition, at the expense of progress in the content subjects.

(4) The teachers of both the ESL classes and of the regular academic program were unilingual English speakers. Thus even the simplest of requests from a student in his native language were misunderstood or ignored.

(5) The students were not permitted to speak their native language in school. The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (1972) has documented beyond reasonable doubt that such practices existed.

(6) The teachers had low expectations for the success of the students, particularly those from certain ethnic groups. For example, two separate studies (Carter 1970; U.S. Commission on Civil Rights 1973) found that Mexican American teachers had lower expectations for the academic success of Mexican American pupils than for Angles. It is quite possible that these low teacher expectations for minority student success academically—partly a reaction to their imperfect English—have been passed on to the students such that they performed accordingly (the self-fulfilling prophecy syndrome).

(7) There was little effort to provide reading or subject matter instruction in the student’s native language. The lack of instruction in and through the native language may have heightened minority student feelings of linguistic insecurity already present in a majority society where English is the dominant and more prestigious language.

(8) Parental involvement in the school program was limited. The lack of parental involvement in the school program has worked to the detriment of the students. Recent experiences in bilingual education have demonstrated that such parental involvement, even from low-income homes, can be engendered.  

The form of school language experience described above has often been referred to as “immersion.” The reality of the situation for the non-English speaker in English-medium schools is perhaps better reflected in the term “submersion” than “immersion.” Submersion reflects the sink-or-swim nature of the school experience for the minority group student. Another form of school language experience, also referred to as “immersion,” has begun to

---

1 Few rigorous evaluations of such ESL programs have been conducted.
2 Cohen evaluated a bilingual program (Rosemead, California, 1974-75) which attracted a number of Spanish-speaking parent volunteers from low-income homes. A community liaison person contacted parents by phone or in person, and arranged some English instruction for volunteer aides. One kindergarten classroom had at least five regular volunteers.
IMMERSION MODEL

appear in many parts of Canada (Swain 1974) and in several schools in the United States. These carefully planned immersion experiences have led to considerable success in that the students involved acquire a high level of competency in a second language, while keeping up with peers (schooled in the native language) in native language development. They also make normal progress in the content subjects although these are taught primarily, or exclusively, in a second language. Their cognitive or intellectual development shows no signs of a deficit. The students develop a healthy attitude toward the second language and toward their own language and culture. Furthermore, they enjoy school and are motivated to continue studying rather than dropping out (see, for example, Lambert and Tucker 1972; Cohen 1974, 1975; Cohen and Lebach 1974; Barik and Swain 1975(b), in press; and Swain 1974).

What are the characteristics of immersion education that have led to such positive results? Below we have listed some of the important characteristics. L1 refers to the student’s native language and L2 refers to his second language.

(1) All instruction initially (i.e., in kindergarten and grade 1) is in L2.  
(2) In second, third or fourth grade, L1 language arts (reading, writing, etc.) are introduced in L1.  
(3) By fifth grade, content subjects such as Geography or History may be taught in L1.  
(4) All kindergarten pupils are unilingual in L1. In essence, the successful program starts as a segregated one linguistically. This segregation eliminates the kinds of ridicule that students exert on less-proficient performers. In immersion education, all learners start off linguistically “in the same boat.” In later grades other children with more advanced L2 abilities can be brought into the class with positive effects.  
(5) In first grade, native speakers of L2 may be introduced into the classroom to provide native peer models of L2, to foster interethnic interaction and friendship, and, in essence, to make the program a two-way bilingual education program. For the native speakers of L2, it may be in actuality a native language program.

The form of immersion education described is that which has been referred to as early total immersion. Late immersion programs, consisting of total immersion at the fourth, fifth, seventh or eighth grade level, have also been initiated. In these instances, the students had been receiving second-language instruction (French) for at least one year prior to the program. Following the one year of total immersion, at least one content subject is taught via that language in subsequent years (see, for example, Barik and Swain 1975(a), in press). Another variation in immersion programs is that of partial immersion, whereby the students receive, for example, instruction for one half of their day entirely in the second language (see Barik and Swain 1974).

In 1974-75, the Culver City Spanish Immersion Program included a group of six native English-speaking first graders who had already had one year of immersion in Spanish in the same classroom as the new kindergarten pupils. Apparently this approach stimulated the kindergarten pupils to produce more Spanish sooner than had been the case with those kindergarteners grouped separately in previous years (Personal Communication with Irma Wright, the K-1 teacher).
(6) The learners are selected without special attention to social class, intelligence, personality factors (such as shyness) or any language disabilities they may have.

(7) The teachers are bilingual, although they only speak L2 in the classroom. They need not be native speakers of L2, but must be perfectly fluent in it and possess the appropriate adult-speaking-to-child register. (Particularly if it is intended that the students get the message that it is desirable for everyone to be bilingual, then there are advantages to having a blond-haired blue-eyed teacher as the Spanish-speaking model in a California Spanish immersion or bilingual education program.)

(8) The students rarely hear the teachers speaking L1 to each other. If L1-speaking visitors wish to address the teachers in the classroom, the teachers use students to interpret for them. At the kindergarten level—before the children can perform this task well—the teacher may step outside with the visitor. Outside the classroom, the teacher is also careful to use L2 whenever the students are around. Although this procedure may appear to be excessive, it does emphasize to the students that L2 is a language the teachers use—not just when they “have to” in the classroom.

(9) In kindergarten, the children are permitted to speak in L1 until they are ready to speak in L2. The teacher makes it clear that she understands L1 by responding appropriately. The teacher will often repeat the children’s remarks or comment on them in L2. (For a description of teaching strategies used in response to the use of L1 by the students, see Stern and Swain 1973.)

(10) In first grade and beyond, the teacher requests that only L2 be spoken in class, except during L1 medium classes (see nos. 2 and 3 above). Ideally, a teacher other than the immersion teacher teaches L1-medium classes so as to keep the languages separated by person, at least at the early grade levels.

(11) The program follows the regular school curriculum. Sometimes this is difficult if L2 materials are not available in the same series that the school is using for L1 instruction. Careful curriculum planning and development are essential.

(12) In the early grades, there are no structured L2 lessons (pattern practice drills, etc.) in class. This avoids the selection and sequencing of structures in a way that is inconsistent with how children actually learn language. L2 is the medium of instruction rather than a separate subject. Formal discussion of persistent problem areas in pronunciation (e.g., aspiration of voiceless stops) and grammar (e.g., gender agreement) may be introduced in later grades.

(13) The teacher has the expectation that the children will learn L2 and content material through immersion.

---

Footnote: Research results from a French immersion program for working class students indicated initial success (see Bruck, Tucker and Jakimik 1973) although the research had to be discontinued due to severe attrition.
(14) When attrition occurs, new unilingual L1-speaking children may or may not be permitted to enter. Programs allowing replacements have varied in the procedures they adopt, some only allowing new entries at the kindergarten level and some at various points up through the grades.

(15) The program is optional. Students participate in the program voluntarily and only with the consent of the parents.

(16) In many cases the program has been initiated because of parental pressure. Support of both the community and the educational administration is essential.

(17) Some programs elicit and receive parent volunteer support in the classroom.

The above 17 characteristics typify the recent wave of successful immersion programs in North America. Yet as suggested at the outset of this article, it would appear that many of these characteristics are not found in the education of minority group students. In review, they are points 2, 3, 4, 7, 9, 12, 13, 15, and 16 above.

The successful immersion program as described above has generally only included children whose L1—English—is the majority or dominant language in North America. In Canada many French immersion programs have been initiated in recent years. One has only to read through the November 1974 issue of The Canadian Modern Language Review, which was devoted to immersion education, to see how widespread the phenomenon of French immersion education for English Canadians actually is. Total immersion programs exist in almost all the provinces of Canada, including New Brunswick (Fredericton, Moncton), Nova Scotia (Dartmouth), Quebec (Montreal), Ontario (Toronto, Ottawa, Cochrane, Brampton), Manitoba (Winnipeg), and British Columbia (Vancouver, Victoria, Coquitlam).

Immersion education for majority group English speakers in the United States is still much more limited. There is the Spanish immersion program (K-4) at El Marino School in Culver City, California (Cohen 1975), and there is a French immersion program going into its second year at the Four Corners Elementary School in Silver Spring, Maryland. The Culver City program began in 1971 with one kindergarten group. The Silver Spring program began in 1974 on a multi-graded basis, grades 1-3.

Paulston (1975b) suggests that there are not adequate socio-structural incentives for U.S. parents to want their children to become bilingual and that the success in Culver City can be attributed largely to the idealism and dedication of the parents. Tucker and d’Anglejan (1974) also see little incentive in the United States for the middle class to enroll their children in bilingual instruction. There is no doubt that the language policy at both the federal and provincial levels of Canadian government is helping to provide incentive for English-Canadian parents to enroll their children in French immersion programs (see Lambert 1974, for example). In the United States the majority group English speakers have not been the target group of federal and state bilingual programs, and this has both limited the majority
group's participation and generated only a moderate concern for becoming fluent in a minority language. Perhaps as English-speaking parents begin to appreciate the benefits of having their children comfortably fluent in a minority language such as Spanish and likewise comfortable interacting with native Spanish speakers in that language, the number of U.S. immersion programs for the majority-language child may increase.

But what about immersion education as described above for the minority group child? Concerning the minority non-English speaker, it may not be possible to create a comfortable English immersion environment for these students, nor may it be socially or politically feasible, given the prevailing educational climate which favors vernacular-language as the initial medium of instruction. For immersion to be successful in the case of the non-English-speaking minority student, it would be necessary to provide most or all of the positive factors lacking in what we termed submersion education above.

For the minority group child who has already learned English—perhaps as an L1—immersion education might be an appropriate model. For example, Spanish immersion education might be an appropriate model for English-speaking Chicanos, just as French immersion education might be an appropriate model for English-speaking Francophone minority groups. For those Chicanos with some or even substantial skills in Spanish already—but skills that have been passive or dormant—Noonan (1975) suggests that a concurrent approach to bilingual schooling would be most appropriate.

It is important to note that total immersion for minority groups would have as the intended outcome functional literacy in both languages. What the total immersion model does is reverse the usual order in many bilingual education programs from L1 first/L2 second to L2 first/L1 second as far as the medium of instruction and the introduction of reading are concerned.

To date, there is little conclusive evidence that one order is inherently superior to any other (Engle 1975; Paulston 1975a; Cohen and Laosa 1975). Proponents of U.S. bilingual education may take issue with such a language reversal, but advocates of the English-first/minority-language-second approach include experienced minority educators (see, for example, Valdés-Fallis 1972). Ironically, many programs that have supposedly been providing primarily Spanish schooling in the early grades have actually been hurrying the introduction of English to the point where English reading is introduced simultaneously in English and the minority language anyway (in about 52% of the U.S. Federal Title VII projects started in 1969 and 1970; see Shore 1974). Such an approach may be less effective than that of L2 reading first, provided there has been an adequate pre-reading

---

6 Hither because of the ethnic composition of the school or because of the bilingual schooling model employed (e.g., one-way bilingual education), majority group English speakers have been excluded from a number of programs.

7 Sometimes referred to as “simultaneous translation,” in the concurrent method of teacher uses both Spanish and English interchangeably in the same lesson, alternating languages for words, sentences or sections of the lesson. This approach is intended to remind the student of the Spanish at the same time that he is hearing the content in English.
period in L2 (Barik and Swain 1974). Furthermore, some projects that indicate in their proposals that teachers use Spanish 80% of the time in kindergarten are in reality employing a model where the teacher uses English more than Spanish. Shultz (1975) found English used considerably more than Spanish in a first/second grade bilingual classroom. He described Spanish as a “marked” language in that classroom. Phillips (1975) studied the language switching behavior of teachers in a bilingual project in California. During designated Spanish-medium lessons, teachers frequently switched to English, primarily for disciplinary-manipulative purposes. Phillips concluded that such behavior was inadvertently attributing more “importance” to communication in English.

Perhaps one of the more important side-effects of immersion education is the double standard it points to: People applaud a majority group child when he can say a few words in the minority language and yet they impatiently demand more English from the minority group child. Undoubtedly, both groups merit praise for their accomplishments in L2. Furthermore, the immersion approach appears to have a beneficial message for staff involved with other models of ongoing bilingual education: “Be consistent.” For example, the Culver City Spanish Immersion Program has had notable positive spin-off effects on bilingual programs in Southern California. After visiting or viewing videotapes of the immersion approach, teachers in bilingual programs have become more conscious about consistently using Spanish, rather than slipping into English. Some teachers have even abandoned the concurrent method in favor of A.M.–P.M. or alternate days approaches so that they use only one language at a time. They have also moved away from formal second-language lessons in the early grades in favor of the immersion approach.

These consequences are promising. If nothing else, perhaps the advent of successful immersion education will simply motivate bilingual teachers to reconsider their methodology for creating bilingual. Undoubtedly, there is a long way to go in the design, execution and evaluation of innovative language programs. But, we are certainly beyond the point where bilingual education can be viewed as a simple entity. There are numerous approaches—of which the immersion model as characterized in this paper is but one—which should all be given consideration before the selection of any particular one is made in a given context.
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An Experience Approach to Teaching Composition*

Thomas Buckingham and William C. Pech

The teaching of intermediate ESL composition presents a problem to the teacher: controlled composition techniques used at the beginning stages of training seem to leave the student unprepared to cope with the problems of free writing. While the usefulness and appropriateness of controlled composition in specific situations is not disputed, such techniques intrinsically involve two weaknesses. The first is that controlled composition techniques lack a means of determining gradations of control or decontrol which permit a smooth transition from highly manipulated writing practice to free writing. The second is that they seem to force students to write for teachers’ or textbook writers’ purposes, but not their own. An approach to composition for intermediate or better students is proposed here which utilizes students’ own interests and knowledge, prepares them adequately for the writing task, makes smooth transitions from oral to written English, and encourages students to achieve their own purposes in written communication. A detailed example of the technique in use is provided.

The teacher of intermediate level ESL composition faces a somewhat difficult problem. The students have reached a point where the use of controlled writing practice no longer serves a useful purpose; where, in fact, no further improvement is observable. On the other hand, few such students are writing with sufficient ease to be treated essentially as native speakers. Such “pre-criterion stationarity” may be remediated by an experience approach to teaching intermediate composition which develops the advanced writing skills free composition will entail.

Experience-based Instruction

The language experience approach is neither new nor especially original to English as a second language instruction. For several years the experience approach has seen extensive use with native speakers in the teaching of beginning reading and writing. The experience approach, especially as it relates to beginning reading, is based on the belief that learning must be rooted in the experience of the learner in order for it to be effective. It should be noted that there is nothing inherent in the experience approach itself which limits its use to either native or non-native speakers.

* This article is a revised version of a paper presented at the 1975 TESOL Convention in Los Angeles, California.

Mr. Buckingham, Assistant Professor of ESL at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, has published previously in the TESOL Quarterly and has had a number of articles appear in the English Teaching Forum. From 1966-68 he was director of the intensive English program at the American University of Beirut. Mr. Pech is a Teaching Associate at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
With specific regard to the ESL student the experience approach usually operates under this assumption: as a result of exposure to oral English, the ESL student possesses some language and some experience mediated by that language which he may draw in learning to read. Paramount in the experience approach is the introduction to written language through the active use of whatever oral language the student possesses. The thoughts and words which the learner can express become the material for his reading/writing program. Since the thoughts and words are his, they are of great interest and importance to him. As he is able to express himself verbally, he is taught to associate the written symbols with his own thoughts and words. Thus the written forms of the language become attached to his speech sounds and are gradually built into a reading and writing vocabulary. (Thonis 1970:45).

In brief, the language experience approach is being used in ESL instruction largely as a method for introducing the students to reading and writing. While some work has been done with the experience approach to reading at a more advanced level, little work has been done related to writing at other than the very basic "pre-composition" stage.

A New Variation

While the experience approach is being used in ESL instruction largely to introduce students to writing, it should not be limited to that area. There is nothing in the experience approach which limits its application to one area of writing or another. In fact, it is our contention that this approach can be effectively related to any level of writing/composition teaching: controlled, less restricted, or free. The approach can be used at the level of controlled composition by having students copy paragraphs written by the teacher in which they are the subjects and in which the stories come from their own experiences. Free composition as well can be and often is opinion oriented to involve the student. For the purposes of this project, we have chosen to focus on the experience approach specifically in the area of less restricted writing. To repeat, our primary rationale for emphasizing experience is that we recognize a genuine need for an approach to composition instruction which can effectively bridge the gap from controlled to free composition, from no-mistake learning to experimenting which includes the risk of error. We feel that the experience approach is the most useful at the stage of the giant leap which students must make if they are to write autonomously.

Our Primary Concern

Our concern, then, is to meet the needs of the ESL student who is ready to move beyond this controlled, highly manipulated stage of composition into a less structured, more expressive and productive stage. This less restricted intermediate stage of composition will place much less emphasis on controlling output in the sense of having students copy and rewrite
models. Instead, the emphasis at this stage is to move the student in the direction of generating his own models—his own composition. This less restricted stage might have some of the following behavioral objectives:

1. Students write about a personal or observed experience, putting events in the original temporal order.
2. Students choose/observe details and describe them in the order of spatial arrangement.
3. Students write opinions giving supporting statements.
4. Students write several paragraphs in any of the above combinations.
5. Given their own compositions about vicarious or personal experiences, they write their opinions and supporting statements, showing their sense of organization by having no sentences irrelevant to the opinion which they choose to defend.

Implicit in these objectives are two notions. First, at the beginning of this stage, careful attention is given to paragraph development. Our assumption is that on the basis of the work done in the controlled stage, the student is able to produce effective sentences. It does not necessarily follow that he is able to organize these sentences into equally effective paragraphs. Even though he has copied paragraphs, we do not assume that he can produce them on his own.

The second notion implicit in these objectives is that later in the less restricted stage, emphasis begins to be shifted from paragraph development to a more generalized development of the whole composition. At this point, the balance between content and form begins to weigh heavily in favor of content, and the very directive approach to eliciting student-spoken and student-written output gives way to a more unstructured approach. Also at this point, students should be made aware of the reasons for having paragraphs at all: to shift the point of emphasis or to separate a composition into temporal units.

The Basic Components: Activities and Their Interpretation

Inasmuch as any experience approach to teaching language arts intends to move the performer from the activities to the output stage, the basic structure of the experience approach to teaching writing will share fundamental components with other variations of the experience approach. These components are (1) selected activities, and (2) interpretation of activities.

At the core of the experience approach are activities: what happens to students and/or what students do. The activities are the planned stimuli to aid students in tapping and extending their experiential backgrounds. In order to determine which activities for a language experience are useful and appropriate, a method of determining the experiences that the students have had and the experiences that the students should have is necessary. One method of getting this information is through direct questioning. A brief questionnaire elicits student response to questions on their past ex-
periences and future plans which will yield useful data. Once this data is collected and collated for general trends in students' responses, the information on the experiential background and needs of the students will form a general class chart, or socio-topical matrix (Stevick: 1971). The socio-topical matrix is a catalogue of student background which identifies the interactors-situations and topics of communication, the input to the experience approach. There are many different types and levels of socio-topical matrixes which can be developed. The class and specific objectives of a writing course will determine the components of a matrix. An example will be given below.

Once the determinants of the activities (the matrix) have been formulated, more attention can be directed to the specific activities to be experienced by the students. The content of the activity will be determined by the matrix—what the students have and what they need. The form of the activity will be chosen from a “catalogue” of possibilities such as field trips, dramatization, role playing, tele-play, reading, slide or movie presentation, public performance, and many others. The selection of a particular form to use will be determined by the compatibility of the form with the socio-topical matrix input and feasibility of using a particular form. Orientation to the activity is also important. Students must be made aware of what the activity entails and what they as students will gain from the activity. Orientation to an activity can take several forms. Vocabulary building may be stressed or cultural/social norms may be emphasized. A whole host of other possibilities with occupational data can be used.

After the activity has been completed, the second component of the experience approach, the interpretation of the activity, is considered. Through oral responses to teacher-directed oral questioning, the students reconstruct the activity orally. This approach is used to introduce the writing stage of activity interpretation. Student oral responses are channeled with varying degrees of assistance on the part of the teacher, into student written responses. The amount and kind of interpretation done as well as the role of the teacher will change as the activity is interpreted with various styles in mind. We are teaching three types of writing through three types of organization of thinking. These are narrative style/temporal order; descriptive style/spatial order; and expository style/logical order. A closer look at the three types of writing will show how an oral reconstruction of an experience can be channeled into written student output.

In a narrative interpretation of an activity, students give a temporal account of the events they have experienced. This account will at first be an oral response to direct questioning by the teacher. In the case of a field trip, the following questions may be asked:

1. Questions on this brief questionnaire included areas of personal history, educational background, work experience, travel, career objectives, academic and recreational interests, and personal hopes and aspirations. The more extensive and detailed the questions the better.
EXPERIENCE APPROACH

Where did you go on your field trip?
What happened first? (A)
What happened after A?
Then what happened?

These responses prerecorded by the teacher, and according to the level of the students the teacher channels the reconstructed event back to the student for writing.

In a descriptive interpretation of an activity, students describe what they experienced during the activity. Once again a specific and detailed oral questioning session will be led by the teacher. In the case of a picture or slide presentation as an activity, students can be asked to describe what they see. Such categories as the following may begin an oral questioning session:

- Naming objects in a picture.
- Describing people in a picture.
- Describing activities in a picture.

Through detailed questioning the students construct a description of an activity. Transforming the oral description into a written description of the activity will be the task of the student, determined by the student level of ability and the objectives of the course.

In an expository interpretation of an activity, students react by giving their opinions about what they have experienced. Oral questioning by the teacher will elicit student evaluations. With activities such as dramatization or role playing, the following questions may be asked:

- What does A do?
- Why do you think A behaves like this?
- What does A want? How do you feel about it?

The student answers form an oral response which can be transformed into a written response.

The three writing approaches to interpreting activities are not intended to be segregated. Indeed an integrated interpretation is the only realistic approach to a total experience. Nonetheless, at the elementary level, narrative may be the best place to begin since temporal ordering will not trouble most students. At the more advanced stages a total integration of the narrative, descriptive and expository will allow the students to reconstruct the activity into a total and uniquely personal interpretation. The sequencing is spiral; that is, we move into the next type while phasing out the first type of writing. In whatever form the interpretation occurs, it is essential for student writing progress to be accompanied with less directed, more unstructured guidance by the teacher and more free student response.

To this point we have considered in very general terms how the experience approach can be applied to the teaching of writing at an intermediate
level. It might now be appropriate to consider the application of the experience approach in more specific terms. The following model applies the experience approach to the teaching of composition in a specific instance. This model application describes a number of different experiences which afforded us the opportunity of trying most of the methods and techniques we have suggested.

The experimental class we used consisted of ten Saudi Arabian students between the ages of twenty-five and thirty-five. The students were enrolled in the Intensive English Institute at the University of Illinois in preparation for further study in the area of the hospital administration.

A Model Application

The experience approach involves five main phases as well as several general steps within each phase. In the model lesson described below, we have outlined (on the left) the five phases, and provided (on the right) a sample application of these phases and steps.

I. Preparation

The purpose of this phase is to provide the teacher with the necessary information about students’ background, interests, and experiences.

A. Students respond to a brief questionnaire.

B. The teacher categorizes the student responses obtained in the questionnaire and forms a sociotopic matrix.

C. On the basis of the matrix, the teacher determines the general content and form of the experience. The teacher also prepared for the experience orientation -phase.

II. Orientation

The purpose is to orient the students to the experience/activity. In this phase the students are made aware of what the activity entails.

In our experience with the Saudi hospital administrators, we asked them such questions as: What are your career objectives? What do you like to do in your spare time? What work experience have you had?

B. Then the teacher constructed both a professional and a non-professional matrix (see Fig. 1) and selected one cell (hospital officials X facilities) for the first writing experience.

C. Arrangements were then made with a local hospital to have the student visit the facility and meet one of the officials.

In the experience orientation session with our group of Saudi administrators, we attempted to generally orient the students to the meeting which had been arranged with a local hospital official.
FIGURE 1
Model socio-topical matrixes for Saudi Arabian hospital administrators studying hospital administration in the U.S.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SITUATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hospital activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hospital personnel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hospital patients</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hospital officials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community officials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SITUATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>classroom activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>local merchants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community residents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. The class reads and discusses a introduction to the experience.
B. The class discusses relevant vocabulary.
C. The class generates and responds to questions.

III. Experience
This phase actually provides students with an activity which extends their experience.

The meeting with the official took place on the day after the orientation session. It took forty-five minutes, and the topics were limited by time to the first two above (IIC), with most of the time devoted to the second. Although a number of the stu-
dents' questions did not logically follow one another, the advanced question preparation clearly paid off in terms of the depth and continuity of the discussion.

IV. Oral Reconstruction
The purpose here is, through oral responses to teachers' questions, to reconstruct the activity. This oral interpretation is used subsequently to introduce the written interpretation. The oral reconstruction involves:

A. The teacher directs the students' A. reconstruction of the experience through the use of comprehension questions. The teacher tape records the reconstruction.

B. The teacher transcribes the re- B. The entire reconstruction, guided by the teacher’s careful questioning, was recorded on a cassette recorder. The questioning elicited both narrative and descriptive information from the students. The questions were largely spontaneous since there was not time between the activity and its reconstruction for the teacher to put a great deal of effort into the formation of questions. This factor was not, however, a problem.

V. Output
In this phase, the students move from the oral to the written reconstruction of the activity.

A. The class briefly reviews their A. During the next class meeting, parts of the tape were replayed and the students’ verbal reconstruction reviewed. The teacher skipped around and refreshed the class' collective memory. This took fifteen minutes, and the class immensely enjoyed listening to their own production.

B. The class works with a written B. The teacher distributed transcriptions of the recording. Transcribing the tape by identifying the students’ major comments and putting them into grammatical ut-
EXPERIENCE APPROACH

The teacher makes a specific assignment.

C. At the end of the session, the teacher assigned the students the task of rewriting their paragraphs using at least two words from several categories of transitional expressions which had been taught in class.

Some Observations

A few observations about the experience approach may be made on the basis of the example we have described above.

A. The limited writing experience of these students caused us to modify certain elements of our approach. Since students at this level have seldom mastered the basic morpho-syntactic structure of English, and since grammar corrections are secondary in this approach, instructors should make certain “non-negotiable demands” of the students to prevent carelessness, such as not accepting papers with third person singular verb endings missing. Toward this end, it might be appropriate for the instructor to identify some of these demands and put them in the form of a writing checklist which students would be required to run through before submitting papers.

B. It should be apparent from the example application that the instructor’s ability to guide the students’ thinking and discussion through careful questioning is crucial to the experience approach. We believe that it is important for oral reconstruction to precede written reconstruction; we also believe that the instructor should not dominate the discussion, but encourage the students to do the talking; he should function more as information source than as model.

C. As we had anticipated, the students responded enthusiastically to our attempts at applying the experience approach, and the key to this enthusiasm was intimately related to the fact that the writing program was largely created by the students themselves. The initial use of the socio-topical matrix channeled student input in such a way that they were writing for and about their purposes.
Summary

The writing/composition student has to learn to organize his own thoughts and experiences in order to write freely. Learning to write involves selection and organization of experience to achieve a certain purpose. In the experience approach, writing becomes a process of reorganizing content into form, not just one form into another form. In controlled writing, little attention is paid to subject matter. It is only when content becomes the students' tool, however, that he is writing generatively and not mechanically. It is our belief that the experience approach provides a systematic and effective means of teaching less restricted composition to ESL students, so that they may achieve their own communication purposes, not somebody else's.
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Teaching Composition in the ESL Classroom: What We Can Learn from Research in the Teaching of English

Vivian Zamel

Methodologists and teachers have suggested numerous approaches as to how composition should be taught in the ESL classroom. Whether or not these methods are truly effective, however, has not been established, for research in ESL composition is almost totally non-existent. In addition to the fact that research in this area has failed to provide us with answers, is the fact that we have ignored the research that has been done in the teaching of English composition, thus denying ourselves an important source of information. The ESL student who is ready to compose, i.e., express his or her own thoughts, opinions or ideas is similar to the student in the regular English composition class. Thus, the results of experimentation in English composition classes have as much to say to the ESL teacher as to the English teacher and undermine many of the assumptions that they both hold in common. Research in the teaching of English has demonstrated not only how oversimplified past approaches have been, but is beginning to suggest the complexities that the writing process entails. The time has come to recognize the important ramifications that this research has for the teaching of composition in the ESL classroom.

If one were to look through the literature on the teaching of composition in second language classrooms, one would find a multitude of suggestions as to how to teach it. The various approaches are generally based on the experiences of the authors and their theories on what the teaching of writing entails. While much can certainly be learned from these experts and methodologists, it is disappointing to find that, except for one pilot study (Brière 1966) almost no research has been done in the teaching of composition to learners of a second language. Thus, the success of a particular method or approach may have been due to a number of factors that are only partially or minimally related to a particular technique, such as the level of intelligence, motivation or affective considerations. The point is that without research and some of the answers it could provide us, a teacher is faced with the practically impossible task of deciding which approach (and/or text) to adopt. This is not to say that he or she will not teach composition
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effectively; rather, he or she will probably do so only after experiencing the long and often frustrating process of trial and error.

More distressing than the lack of research being done, however, is the fact that we have ignored some of the answers that have been provided by research in the teaching of English. We have acted as if teaching composition to ESL students is something totally unrelated to the teaching of composition in regular English classes and have thus deprived ourselves, I believe, of much valuable information. It seems that many of the assumptions held by teachers of ESL parallel those of English teachers; teachers of both fields have made some erroneous conclusions as to what the teaching of writing is. But, while the field of English seems to be gaining from their research evidence, we continue to suggest unfounded, though well-intentioned, practices. What we have failed to realize is that by the time our students are ready to write compositions, that is, create and express their own thoughts and ideas in the second language, they need the same kind of instruction that students in English classrooms need. To believe otherwise seems to indicate that the student has really not developed competence in the second language, still requires a great deal of control and is therefore ill-prepared to compose. If, however, students in the ESL classroom are in fact ready to write, as defined above, we can learn a great deal from the research already carried out in the field of English; just as it has provided evidence undermining well-established theories on the teaching of composition in the English classroom, it has important ramifications for the ESL classroom as well.

Methodology on the Teaching of Composition in the Second Language Classroom

The literature on the teaching of composition in a second language seems to indicate that there is a consensus as to how writing should be taught: while grammatical exercises are rejected as having little to do with the act of writing, there is, at the same time, a great concern with control and guidance. Despite the agreement that learning to write entails actual practice in writing, this practice is often no more than the orthographic translation of oral pattern practice or substitution drills. There are those that are critical of these pseudo-writing exercises, encouraging the elimination of total control, thus coming closer to identifying what composing is really all about. These, however, are the exception. The majority of approaches emphasize and focus upon practices that have very little to do with the creative process of writing.

Maintaining that writing is a culmination of the other language skills and that composition is therefore dependent on the mastery of listening, speaking and reading, foreign language methodologists describe stages or sequences of exercises which theoretically bring the student from total control to freedom. Allen and Valette (1972: 217-238), Rivers (1968: 240-260), Finocchiaro (1958: 156-162), Chastain (1971: 220-238) and Billows (1961: 181-209) all indicate the necessity of these stages, warning of the danger of
asking students to write expressively too early. While I do not argue with these approaches in terms of the kind of preparation ESL students need, I take issue with the fact that the exercises described are identified with the skills of composing. Teachers are aware that their students must have a basic linguistic competence in order to write creatively. Advising them to provide interesting and meaningful topics during the “last stage,” that of free composition, is of little value.

Picking up this theme on the need for control and guidance, methodologists have devised particular exercises which, while not based on learning grammar qua grammar, are in fact based on the grammatical manipulations of models, sentences or passages. For them, writing seems to be synonymous with skill in usage and structure, and the assumption is that these exercises will improve the students’ ability to compose. Influenced by audio-lingual methodology, writing is seen as a habit-formed skill, error is to be avoided and correction and revision are to be provided continuously. Christina Bratt Paulston (1972) suggests the use of models and the manipulation of their patterns upon which to base one’s writing. Dykstra (1964) likewise provides a series of model passages which students are to manipulate according to a series of steps, Spencer’s (1965) manipulations entail the recasting of whole sentences following a single pattern, and Rojas’ (1968) drill type exercises of copying, completion and substitution clearly reflect concern with the prevention of error. Ross’s (1968) combinations and rearrangements of patterns are based on a transformational grammar approach, and both Pincas (1962) and Moody (1965) emphasize the need for rigid control by endorsing the habitual manipulation of patterns. Thus, while the teaching of grammar is expressly rejected by these methodologists as having little to do with writing, the kinds of exercises they suggest are based on the conceptualization that writing entails grammatical proficiency. Implicitly, grammatical facility means writing ability.

Taking issue with the notion that writing is orthographic speech and insisting that composition is not synonymous with producing correct responses, are those who recognize factors that have heretofore largely been ignored. Organization, style and rhetoric become the crucial aspects of skill in writing, but, here again, control and guidance are essential; drill predominates, but on a rhetorical level. Rather than sentences to manipulate, whole reading passages become the models that students are to differentiate and imitate. Kaplan (1967), pointing out the effect that cultural differences have upon the nature of rhetoric, suggests the study and imitation of paragraphs, Pincas (1964) creates a multiple substitution technique that involves habituation in the use of certain styles. Arapoff (1969) concentrates on the importance of discovering, comparing and imitating stylistic differences. Carr (1967) stresses the importance of reading, studying and analyzing the organization and logical arrangement of passages, and Green (1967) reiterates the practice needed in specific varieties of written language. While this group of methodologists approaches more closely what
writing, in the sense of creating, truly entails, they still, like the first group, insist upon control. Rejecting the notion that writing is the mastery of sentence patterns, they nevertheless put restraints on the composing process. Writing for the ESL student is still essentially seen as the formation of a habit. The imitation of various styles and organization patterns may be helpful for students who are still coping with the acquisition of language. This kind of practice, however, is hardly the expression of genuine thoughts and ideas.

It is obvious that there is a predominating concern with the quality of the students' output; because the students are attempting to compose in a language other than their own, control and guidance are paramount. Furthermore, it is felt that once the imitative stages are mastered, expression will somehow automatically take place. Opposed to this position are those who believe that the composing process necessitates a lack of control; rather than emphasize the need to write correctly, the proponents of this approach stress the need to write much and often. In other words, it is quantity, not quality, that is crucial. Erasmus (1960) claims that the greater the frequency, the greater the improvement, and Brière's (1966: 146) pilot study seems to indicate that, when the emphasis is upon writing often rather than error correction, students write more and with fewer errors. Povey (1969) reiterates this theme, underlining the importance of providing opportunities to say something vitally relevant.

It is no wonder, in the light of the foregoing discussion, that ESL teachers are confused and still searching for answers. They face the decision of having to choose one of several approaches. These approaches can be seen as points along a spectrum ranging from total control to total freedom:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Control</th>
<th>(Increase in Complexity)</th>
<th>Free Composition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>substitution,</td>
<td>imitation &amp; differentiation</td>
<td>frequent, uncontrolled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manipulation or transformation</td>
<td>of stylistic patterns</td>
<td>writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of sentences &amp; patterns</td>
<td></td>
<td>practice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While it is easy to take a middle of the road position and advocate that what is needed is a mixture of quantity and quality, with weight given to one or the other, dependent on the individual learners (Cave 1972), this hardly clarifies the issue. Some teachers will go on teaching composition as if it were a matter of correct grammatical usage. Others will insist that rhetorical considerations must be taken into account and thus will provide longer models to manipulate and imitate. And others still will claim that it is frequency of writing that will lead to improvement and fluency. While each position may have certain merits, each represents a rather narrow view of the writing process.

In our efforts to upgrade ESL instruction and provide more effective approaches, we have failed to recognize that we can learn from research that
has already been done in related fields, such as the teaching of English. After all, if ESL teachers can share the methodologies of foreign language teachers, why should they not likewise borrow from well-established approaches in the teaching of English composition? If we are dealing with students who are truly ready to express and compose, not ones who are still dealing with the patterns and structures of the language, we must rid ourselves of the belief that they need to be taught any differently than students learning to compose in regular English classes. Once we accept the notion that the two classroom situations are parallel, we can begin to learn from information which we seem to have totally ignored and which undermines many of the approaches that have been advocated.

Methodology on the Teaching of English Composition

Research in the teaching of English composition is still at a stage where findings are far from definitive and often contradictory. It has, however, provided enough evidence in some areas, areas that have important ramifications for the teaching of composition to ESL students. If we hope to make any progress, and if we are to halt the proliferation of different approaches and answers, none of which, I believe, are very satisfactory, we should begin to look at and learn from this evidence.

One such area is the issue of frequency of writing and how effective this kind of practice is. Brière and Erazmus, alluded to earlier, feel committed to the idea that one learns to write by writing. What, however, does research tell us about the factor of frequency? Can writing great quantities provide the practice necessary for improvement? If so, the role of the teacher seems to be reduced to one of assigning topics and correcting errors. Can this after-the-fact instruction really be called the teaching of composition?

The answers to these questions become quite apparent when one looks through the results of experiments that set out to demonstrate that frequency was crucial to the improvement of writing. Repeatedly, the research has indicated that frequency in and of itself is fruitless; mere practice in writing will not improve student composition. While this may sound rather obvious, a great deal of effort has been invested to prove just the opposite. The classic review of the research in the teaching of composition by Braddock et al. (1963: 35) alludes to some of these studies concluding that “it does not seem reasonable that doubling the number of aimless writing assignments which are then marked in a perfunctory manner would necessarily stimulate student to improve their writing.” A more critical review of recent studies of the effect of writing frequency on writing improvement by Robert Hunting (1967) reiterates this notion. Moreover, this review, concentrating on one experiment in particular, informs us that “practice which is merely frequent, unaccompanied by instruction or motivation, may hurt writing more than improve it” (Hunting 1967: 31). Other experiments substantiate that writing frequently can in fact have detrimental effects
Thus, in the light of this research evidence, we cannot help but agree that “English teachers... should not assign or elicit any writing for the purpose of developing composition unless the writing becomes the vehicle for functional instruction” (Hunting 1967: 39–40).

If the number of compositions written has no effect or even detrimental effect upon the quality of writing, and if there are other factors that are related to the improvement of writing, then the issue becomes one of determining what this “functional instruction” should be. Let us eliminate error correction from the outset since by instruction we mean the teaching that will prepare students to write, not the proof-reading on which teachers waste so much of their time and which probably has little effect upon the students’ ability to compose. When we look at the kind of instruction that has been recommended in the past, however, we find that it is not very much better than the grading of papers with red pencil marks. Just as the ESL approach to teaching composition has largely been based on grammatically-oriented instruction, the study of grammar and usage has long been synonymous with the teaching of composition in the field of English. One needs only to look at the great number of experiments seeking to establish the effect of grammar on the improvement of writing to realize that “for over a century teachers had been teaching grammar and expecting, indeed assuming, that it would help their students write better” (O’Hare 1973: 6).

The evidence of the research dearly undermines the case for grammar and thus has tremendous implications for the ESL teacher who provides extensive practice with the manipulation and imitation of patterns and even longer passages. While it is true that no direct teaching of grammar may be taking place, the ESL teacher is nevertheless assuming that these exercises are the key to unlocking the creative process. Extensive research, however, has shown us otherwise: over and over again, the study of grammar, whether formal or not, has been found to have little, no or even harmful influence upon the students’ writing ability.

At first, studies were carried out to demonstrate the futility of formal grammar study (see, e.g., Frognor 1939 and Kraus 1957). Harris’ classic study (see Braddock et al. 1963: 83) established for once and for all that the systematic study of traditional grammar has a “negligible or even a harmful effect upon the correctness of writing.” With the new approaches to grammar study, however, came new attempts to show their effects upon students’ writing ability. Thus, researchers influenced by Charles Fries sought to demonstrate the progress made by students receiving instruction based on a structural approach to grammar (see, e.g., Suggs 1961, O’Donnell 1963, Klauser 1964, White 1964 and Henderson 1967). Not surprisingly, the re-

1 While there has been some experimental support for the positive effects of writing frequency (see, e.g., Lokke and Wykoff 1948, Maize 1954, McCollly and Remstad 1963 and Wolf 1966), one should bear in mind that these results were most probably due to factors unrelated to the issue of frequency, such as the kind of instruction and learning activities provided, the process and method of correction or the criteria for evaluation.
results were contradictory and the question of instruction was left unresolved. Even when students were receiving practice in the recognition and manipulation of structures, rather than the formal study of grammatical terminology, writing ability was not affected. O'Donnell (1963: 26–27) took an important step in the right direction when he realized that, while a knowledge of grammatical structures may be an important factor, writing is a complex process and involves more than the manipulation and recognition of basic elements; it seems likely that the awareness of basic structures is essential to written composition, but it is obvious that such awareness is not always accompanied by proficiency in writing.

With the advent of a still newer grammar, researchers committed themselves to studying the effects of generative-transformational grammar on the writing ability of students. Kellogg Hunt (1970) explained how the knowledge of transformational rules would help students generate sentences, while Bateman and Zidonis (1966) investigated the effects of such grammar study. The experimental treatment led to an increase in the number of grammatically correct sentences, and the skill of writing was again being identified with correct sentence structure. Soon, however, evidence appeared contradicting the findings of Bateman and Zidonis (see, e.g., Wardhaugh 1967 and Fry 1971), and the whole notion of systematically teaching rules, even those of a newer grammar, came under attack (see, e.g., Lester 1967).

Rejecting the notion that transformational rules had to be learned, John Mellon's study (1969) involved the manipulation of transformations, that is, sentence-combining practice. He concluded that it was this process, rather than learning transformational grammar, that resulted in syntactic fluency. More importantly, in the light of this discussion, was the differentiation he made between syntactic fluency and the rhetorical skill of composing; he reminded us not to assume that facility in sentence-combining had anything directly to do with the complexities of organization and expression. It should be noted that Mellon's experimental group received systematic grammar study in addition to practice in transformational sentence-combining. It was really not clear, therefore, whether it was the practice alone that led to the observed improvement. Thus, O'Hare (1973) set out to prove just that, abandoning entirely the formal study of grammar. The results indicated an improvement in overall quality of students' compositions, thus leading O'Hare to conclude that grammar-free sentence-combining does in fact affect the rhetorical aspects of writing. While it may be true that the syntactic skills that the students had acquired provided them with more alternatives for expression, it does not seem likely that that skill in and of itself was responsible for the successful performances. As a matter of fact, though Mellon's group wrote more systematically mature sentences, their compositions were judged qualitatively inferior. It appears then that syntax and rhetoric are complementary yet separate aspects of the writing process, neither one being responsible for improvement in the other. To believe otherwise refutes that which evidence has already substantiated. More-
over, it allows us to continue in our futile search for the right grammar or the most effective practice, simplistic solutions to a very complex problem.

Where Do We Go From Here?

The results of the research in the teaching of composition has had its impact. In order to discover what writing really entails, instead of looking for pat answers, different kinds of questions are being asked. Rather than approach the issue from the “grammar side,” investigators are beginning to approach it from the “composition side,” forcing us “to rethink the problems involved” (Potter 1967: 20). Rather than ask how to teach composition, we are trying to discover what writing is, what it involves and what differentiates the good from the bad writer. Janet Emig (1971), Terry Radcliffe (1972) and others have already demonstrated how naive our past assumptions and how oversimplified our traditional models have been. We are beginning to abandon our simplistic approaches, consisting of either providing frequent assignments or grammatically-based practice. Our whole attitude toward what the writing act represents should drastically change; like British teachers and their approach, we should become more concerned with the individual’s purpose and desire for writing, while providing simulation, a minimum of interference and correction and some indirect instruction (Squire and Applebee 1969: 118-153). The act of composing should become the result of a genuine need to express one’s personal feeling, experience or reaction, all this within a climate of encouragement (Loban et al. 1961: 485–541). Once this has been established, and the fear of writing has been removed, students will have much greater facility with the other types of writing assignments they may be expected to do in school. Finally, teachers of writing, whether ESL or English, should continuously strive to provide that instruction which best meets the real needs and abilities of individual students. While this instruction might still entail some indirect teaching concerning particular structural problems, language study and rhetorical considerations, the primary emphasis should be upon the expressive and creative process of writing. The experience of composing could in this way have a purpose, that of communicating genuine thoughts and experiences. ESL students could begin to appreciate English as another language to use, rather than just a second language to learn.
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The Role of Vocabulary Teaching

Jack C. Richards

A consideration of the knowledge that is assumed by lexical competence is offered as a frame of reference for assessing vocabulary teaching. Linguistic, psycholinguistic, and sociolinguistic aspects of word knowledge are examined. These include word frequency, vocabulary growth in native speakers, collocation, register, case relations, underlying forms, word association, and semantic structure. Vocabulary techniques are discussed according to the way that they attempt to build up these aspects of vocabulary knowledge.

The teaching and learning of vocabulary has never aroused the same degree of interest within language teaching as have such issues as grammatical competence, contrastive analysis, reading, or writing, which have received considerable attention from scholars and teachers. The apparent neglect of vocabulary reflects the effects of trends in linguistic theory, since within linguistics the word has only recently become a candidate for serious theorizing and model building (Leech 1974; Anthony 1975). The present paper considers the role of vocabulary in the syllabus in the light of the assumptions and findings of theoretical and applied linguistics. A consideration of some of the knowledge that is assumed by lexical competence is offered as a frame of reference for the determination of objectives for vocabulary teaching and for the assessment of teaching techniques designed to realize these objectives. A word of caution is in order however.

The theoretical concerns of linguists and others who study language are of concern to syllabus design in two ways. Firstly, since such disciplines have as their goal, explanation of the nature of language, understanding of how language is acquired, and description of how language is used to carry out pragmatic functions in the real world, we can look to disciplines such as linguistics, psycholinguistics or sociolinguistics for a more informed understanding of such questions as; What does it mean to know a word? How are words remembered? What are the social dimensions of word usage? and so on. Inevitably such information will turn out to be vastly more complex than we might intuitively have supposed, yet will be tentative and inconclusive because of the changing state of knowledge and theory in the disciplines concerned. Such information cannot be translated directly into teaching procedures.

*Currently consultant on ESL materials to Oxford University Press, Southeast Asia, Mr. Richards was formerly on the Staff of the Regional English Language Centre, Singapore, and has taught in Indonesia, Quebec, and New Zealand. He is editor of Error Analysis (Longman, 1974) and co-editor with John Oller of Focus on the Learner (Newbury House, 1973).*
It may however suggest in a general way, the type of knowledge we expect of a learner, and by implication raise questions as to how such knowledge can be acquired through a teaching program. The development of teaching materials may also take place without direct application of a theoretical model, by reference to such factors as classroom effectiveness, learner interest, age of the learners, etc. What is the most desirable model theoretically may turn out to be the least effective in actual use, due to the role of extralinguistic factors. So, for example, while rote memorization may not be a justifiable strategy on theoretical grounds, there may be learners who enjoy and succeed in learning material through memorization.

A second level of application is in the evaluation or interpretation of results obtained. When problems or failures arise we may have to refer to a model or theory to see if it can offer explanation. Alternatively the results we obtain through practical application of a theory may lead to revision of the theory itself. These assumptions should be kept in mind in considering what follows, since a consideration of recent work in theoretical or applied linguistics does not necessarily lead to the discovery of new and exciting ways to teach vocabulary. Rather it provides background information that can help us determine the status of vocabulary teaching within the syllabus. Let us begin by considering a number of assumptions concerning the nature of lexical competence and then look at some of the implications that can be drawn from them as a guide to syllabus design.

**ASSUMPTION 1** The native speaker of a language continues to expand his vocabulary in adulthood, whereas there is comparatively little development of syntax in adult life.

A great deal of research has been carried out in recent years in the area of syntactic and semantic development in child language. Less attention has been given to vocabulary development, though this was extensively studied up to the fifties. Whereas in syntax the period of maximum development appears to be from about age 2 to 12, with only minor changes according to social role and mode of discourse taking place in adulthood, in vocabulary there is continued development beyond the childhood years, adults constantly adding new words to their vocabulary through reading, occupation, and other activities. The primary period for conceptual development however is early childhood.

When we try to translate this information into statistical figures we cannot be precise however, since measurement of vocabulary knowledge is difficult and only approximate. Watts suggests that the average child enters elementary school with a recognition vocabulary of 2000 words, that at seven this has reached some 7000 words and by 14 the child should be able to recognize 14000 words (Watts 1944). The vocabulary of adults has been variously estimated at between 10,000 for a non-academic adult to upwards of 80,000 for a professional scientist. College students are estimated to understand some 60,000 to 100,000 words (Mackey 1965: 173). These are
estimates of the number of words we recognize the meanings of from the total lexical range of the language, which may be upwards of 500,000 words (Watts: 55). Berry estimates that for spoken English the average person speaking on a telephone makes use of a vocabulary of only some 2000 words (Mackey: 173).

ASSUMPTION 2 Knowing a word means knowing the degree of probability of encountering that word in speech or print. For many words we also “know” the sort of words most likely to be found associated with the word.

The speaker of a language recognizes that some words are common and familiar while other words are rare, unfamiliar or even totally unknown to him. Our knowledge of the general probability of occurrence of a word means that we recognize that a word like book is more frequent than manual or directory while both these words strike us as more frequent than thesaurus. Given a list of words, with the exception of concrete nouns a native speaker can classify them into “frequent,” “moderately frequent,” “not frequent,” to a degree of accuracy reasonably close to their actual frequencies (Noble 1953; Richards 1974).

The speaker of a language recognizes not only the general probability of occurrence of a word but also the probability of words being associated together with other words. Knowledge of collocation means that on encountering the word fruit we can expect the words, ripe, green (= not ripe) sweet, bitter etc; that for meat we might expect, tender, tough.

ASSUMPTION 3 Knowing a word implies knowing the limitations imposed on the use of the word according to variations of function and situation.

Our knowledge of vocabulary includes the recognition of the constraints of function and situation on word choice. This is seen in our recognition of register characteristics. We adjust our vocabulary to suit the demands of the situation. The following register restraints are often recognized (based on Chiu 1972);

temporal variation We recognize some words as being old fashioned and others as belonging to contemporary usage. A looking glass to the Victorians is a mirror to us.

temporal variation What the British call a tap may be a faucet to an American.

social variation Middle class British people prefer to call a house, a home, and a woman a lady.

social role This influences the choice between personal name as in Hi John, or the formal term Good Morning Mr. Smith.

field of discourse Here we include factors which determine whether something will be described in the active voice (normal description)
or the passive voice (scientific reporting) and whether we will use the first person pronouns \(I\) or \(we\) or no pronoun.

This influences our choice of words that are suited to either the written or spoken mode. A chap or a fellow in speech is what a person or gentleman is in writing.

**Assumption 4** Knowing a word means knowing the syntactic behavior associated with that word.

Our knowledge of a word is not stored simply as a concept; we also associate specific structural and grammatical properties with words. The traditional division between vocabulary and structure is in fact a tenuous one, a fact that is recognized in our use of the term structural words for a number of frequent words in the vocabulary. Important information about the structural properties of words, which includes the types of grammatical relations they may enter into, is acquired by the learner as part of vocabulary learning. Recent accounts of language such as those proposed by Fillmore (1968), relate the structural behaviour of words to their semantic structure as reflected in case relations. A sentence in language is defined by a verb together with a number of cases, drawn from a limited set. The cases which are required in a particular sentence are determined by the verb of that sentence. The verb break for example, as Nilsen illustrates, contains the features \(O\) (I) (A). \(O\) means the verb requires an object; \(I\) and \(A\) indicate that it may take instrumental and agent case in addition. If there is an agent, the agent becomes the subject. If there is no agent, but there is an instrumental case, the instrument is the subject, and when there is neither an agent or an instrument the object becomes the subject. This is illustrated by Nilsen with the following examples.

1. Abdul broke the bicycle with a rock. \(+O\) \(I\) \(A\)
2. A rock broke the bicycle. \(+O\) \(I\)
3. The bicycle broke. \(+\) \(O\)

(Nilsen 1971)

What case grammar tells us is for a certain verb, the range of associated syntactic units required to realize the cases associated with that verb. In some instances case relations enable us to predict the syntactic properties of words. Farsi points out for example that factitive verbs “which indicate a process such that at the end of the process a new object comes into being which was not present at the beginning e.g. make, fabricate, construct, build, compose, draw, fashion concoct, create, can only be used transitively; they cannot occur intransitively; they cannot occur intransitively with the noun indicating the new resultant product as the subject of the sentence.” We cannot have as subject *a house constructed, *a chair made etc. (Farsi 1974).

**Assumption 5** Knowing a word entails knowledge of the underlying form of a word and the derivations that can be made from it.

When we learn a word we also learn the rules that enable us to build up
different forms of the word or even different words, from that word. With regular derivations, such as those for tense and person, the problems are not great. Walked, walking, walks are readily recognized as derived from walk. According to some linguists, (Chomsky and Halle 1968), we also derive solidity, solidify, solidly, solidness, consolidate, etc, from the underlying form solid. The semantic relationship to the underlying form is preserved by the English spelling system, so for example, despite the differences in pronunciation between the first two syllables of photograph, photographer, photographic, the first two syllables are spelled identically in each word. If the spelling system of English were to be revised to more closely approximate the spoken language these links between underlying forms and derived forms would be lost. Learning to be able to make such links is especially important in learning Malay, Indonesian and many of the languages of the Philippines. The learner will less frequently encounter the base form of the word than one of its many derivations and some training is required to be able to identify the base form, particularly when attempting to locate the meaning of the word in a dictionary. Hence when learning Indonesian, the learner would have to look up in the dictionary under bunga (flower) for berbunga, membunga, memperbungakan, and pembungaan.

ASSUMPTION 6 Knowing a word entails knowledge of the network of associations between that word and other words in language.

Words do not exist in isolation. Their meanings are defined through their relationships with other words and it is through understanding these relationships that we arrive at our understanding of words. Some of these relationships are seen in word association tests. When given a word or a list of words and asked to provide words or words as responses there is a great deal of uniformity among the way people typically respond. Here are some typical responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stimulus</th>
<th>Typical response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>accident</td>
<td>car</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alive</td>
<td>dead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>baby</td>
<td>mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>born</td>
<td>die</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cabbage</td>
<td>vegetable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>table</td>
<td>chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>careless</td>
<td>careful</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Deese 1965)

Such responses suggest a number of different ways in which associative links between words are organized. For example;

- by contrast or antonym: wet—dry
- by similarity or synonym: blossom—flower
- by subordinative classification: animal-dog
- by coordinate classification: apple—peach
- by superordinate classification: spinach—vegetable.

(cf. Slobin 1971)
The same word can of course be seen as linked to many different words through different associative networks. Giving is linked both to receiving and to taking. Old is linked to new and to young, good to bad, and to poor.

The responses to free association tests hence give a great deal of information about the psychological structuring of vocabulary in an individual and offer a way of investigating the syntactic and semantic relationships among words. Presumably knowledge of this kind is made use of in language use, in helping us choose a word and in finding the right word for the context.

**ASSUMPTION 7** Knowing a word means knowing the semantic value of a word.

One way of analyzing word meaning is to break words down into a basic set of minimal semantic features, different combinations of which produce different words. Examples of such features would be animate, living, human, non human, inanimate etc. A word such as man contains the semantic features + human + male. The word table is + inanimate + non human. These features impose restrictions on word usage. We can say the table was damaged but not, the table was hurt since hurt is only associated with animate subjects.

The meaning of a word in this sense is defined by its intersection along a number of attributes, or minimal semantic features. Roget's famous Thesaurus is an attempt to classify words into general semantic features of this kind. A different dimension of the semantic value of words is seen in words like famous, ashamed. There is built in value judgement in the word famous so we may say Churchill was a famous man, but not Hitler was a famous man. Effeminate, shy, sentimental are similar words of this category. The semantic value of many words can be determined by placing them on weighted semantic scales. The semantic differential technique investigates meaning in this way using sets of polar opposites. For example the word father could be evaluated on a set of terms in this way:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>happy</th>
<th>sad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hard</td>
<td>soft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slow</td>
<td>fast</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Jacobovits 1970)

In this way information both about the subjective values of an individual and the semantic structure of the lexicon can be studied. Use of an approach of this sort led to the Cross-Cultural Atlas of Affective Meaning in which a cross cultural study was made of reactions to a selection of words in terms of Evaluation (nice—awful, good—bad, sweet—sour) Potency (big—little, powerful—powerless, strong—weak) and Activity (fast—slow, dead—alive, nosiy—quiet), (Osgood 1964).

**ASSUMPTION 8** Knowing a word means knowing many of the different meanings associated with the word.

The assumption so far discussed suggest that meaning is a much richer
concept than we often assume, and this is reflected in the fact that dictionary entries for words usually list a great variety of different or related meanings for each word, showing how the word takes its meaning from the context in which it is used. Kolers observes:

word meanings do not exist in isolation in the reader’s mind like so many entries in a dictionary. What a word means to the reader depends upon what he is reading and what he expects to read, the phrase, clause or sentence in which the words appear. The meaning of a word, that is to say, depends upon the thought that it is being used to express and the context of its expression. Whether one reads unionize as a verb in chemistry or a verb in labor relations depends upon many things other than its spelling and its symbol—sound relations. Indeed, a very large number of words in a dictionary have multiple meanings, and for some words the definitions are contradictory. For example scan means to glance at quickly and to read in detail, and cleave to join and to separate. The reader, clearly, must construct a representation of what he is reading about if he is to appreciate the meaning of what he is reading.

(Quoted by Eskey 1973)

This emphasizes that words are not simply labels for things but represent “processes by which the species deals cognitively with the environment” (Lenneberg 1967: 334). The dictionary entries for a word try to capture the most frequent ways in which a word realizes a particular concept; however since this is always an active process of reconstruction, much of the way in which a particular meaning is formed cannot be recorded in the dictionary.

Implications

Let us now look at the assumptions proposed above and consider their implications for vocabulary teaching. Eight assumptions have been stated, namely:

1. The native speaker of a language continues to expand his vocabulary in adulthood, whereas there is comparatively little development of syntax in adult life.
2. Knowing a word means knowing the degree of probability of encountering that word in speech or print. For many words we also know the sort of words most likely to be found associated with the word.
3. Knowing a word implies knowing the limitations imposed on the use of the word according to variations of function and situation.
4. Knowing a word means knowing the syntactic behavior associated with the word.
5. Knowing a word entails knowledge of the underlying form of a word and the derivations that can be made from it.
6. Knowing a word entails knowledge of the network of associations between that word and other words in the language.
7. Knowing a word means knowing the semantic value of a word.
8. Knowing a word means knowing many of the different meanings associated with a word.
Considering just these assumptions about word knowledge we get a picture of the complex learning task that is required in acquiring vocabulary. To what degree can teaching strategies accommodate these assumptions?

Assumptions 1 and 8 suggest that beyond the elementary levels of instruction, a major feature of a second language program should be a component of massive vocabulary expansion. While we cannot specify precisely the number of words a learner at a specific level should be able to recognize and use, it is clear that a learner who is constantly adding to his vocabulary knowledge is better prepared both for productive and receptive language skills. Many language programs however assume that vocabulary expansion will be covered by the reading program. We can call this indirect vocabulary teaching, where vocabulary is acquired incidentally through the practice of other language skills. Mackey in his Language Teaching Analysis (1965) and Rivers in Teaching Foreign Language Skills (1968) deal with vocabulary teaching only as it affects reading. An exception to this approach is taken by Bright and McGregor who have a detailed chapter on direct vocabulary teaching in their Teaching English as a Second Language (1970). It is direct vocabulary teaching which is the focus here.

The need for a rapid increase in the learner’s recognition vocabulary, as implied by assumptions 1 and 8, is the motivation behind Barnard’s Advanced English Vocabulary (1971) which teaches a 3000 word vocabulary taken from a frequency analysis of university texts. The words are carefully defined and explained in simple English, with several of their important meanings given; they are then encountered in exercises and reading passages. The implications of assumption 3 are taken up in a range of courses books recently published which familiarize the advanced student with the vocabulary and language of particular registers (e.g. Lachowicz 1974; Mountford 1975). The most general register distinction that must be acquired of course is a feeling for the difference between written and spoken English. Schonell found that within the first 1000 words by frequency in a count of spoken English, 15 per cent were not present in the first 1000 words of written English (Schonell 1956). In the elementary stages of language teaching, the distinction between spoken and written English is minimized, and apart from occasional problems (such as the use of diligent in speech, which really belongs to the register of written English and report cards) there is little interference. The intermediate and advanced learner however, often inadvertently uses a word in his speech that he has acquired from reading, but which should be confined to a written register. An example would be the student who says I was most entertained by the film rather than something like I really enjoyed the film.

Lachowicz’s Using Medical English is an example of a course which teaches specialized vocabulary, dealing with the vocabulary of medicine for students of intermediate proficiency. It is also of interest in relation to assumption 6, since many of the vocabulary exercises are designed to practice discrimination between members of lexical sets. The following is part of an exercise of this type:
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In each of the following groups of words one word does not belong. The other words have something in common which excludes this particular word. Please underline the word that doesn't belong in the group.

1 swelling, lump, bump, mass, discoloration.
2 ribs, skull, spine, femur, bone, kneecap, hair.
3 stain, wart, blotch, discoloration, spot, mark.

etc

(Lachowicz 1974: 30)

K. W. Moody (personal communication) has described a similar type of exercise for establishing set discrimination:

Look at the following words.
foreman, operator, worker, supervisor, machinist

1. Which words in this list describe those who are responsible for the work of other people?
2. Which is the most general word in the list?
3. Which word says something about the kind of work done

Further work.
a. You should have two words as your answer to 1.
Which of the two would be the most likely in talking about work;
   i. in an office?
   ii. on the construction of a new building?
   iii. in a service station for motor vehicles?
b. In which of these kinds of employment could you use both the words you wrote in 1?
the army, a factory, the crew of an airliner, school teaching, the police.
c. Which words would be used for;
   i. A person who organizes the work of a group of typists?
   ii. A person in a factory who drills holes in pieces of metal?
   iii. A person who receives telephone calls in a large office?
   iv. The man in charge of a group of workers who are laying a telephone cable under a road?

Assumption 2 is dealt with in a number of exercises in Barnard (1971) and the rationale for collocation teaching is discussed in detail in Brown (1974) who analyzes exercises which can be used to give practice in the most frequent collocational groups of particular fields of writing, emphasizing for example, that intense is likely to occur with reference to heat, light, energy or pressure. The following is an exercise from Brown.

Choose the items that collocate most usefully with each verb. The number of lines left after each verb is a guide to the number of useful collocations possible.

1 to appeal ........................................ 5 to conclude ........................................
........................................................................ ..............................
........................................................................ ..............................
........................................................................ ..............................
2 to encourage ....................................... 6 to intend to ........................................
........................................................................ ..............................
........................................................................ ..............................
Assumption 4 deals with the syntactic properties of words. Nilsen has proposed that case grammar has important applications in language teaching and suggests that case grammar allows the teacher to point out the common case relationships across languages. He illustrates that particular semantic categories (e.g., such as verbs of motion) require basically the same case frame. Agent, Source, Path, Goal, and with transitive verbs, Agent, Source, Path, Goal, Object.

John flew from New York to Chicago via Philadelphia
  A          S          G          P
has the same case frame as
John bussed the football players from Ann Arbor to Detroit via Ypsilanti
  A          O          S          G          P

This example is intended to illustrate that two verbs of motion (fly and bus) have the same case framework except that the transitive verb requires OBJECT. The case frame (hence the syntax) of particular verbs is determined by their semantic categories (Nilsen 1971).

However Farsi points out that the grammatical capacities of verbs can-
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not always be determined by their case relations (Farsi 1974). There is a
great deal of lexical idiosyncrasy. For example we can compare the following
parts of semantically similar words with different syntactic properties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>heal</th>
<th>cure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The wound healed</td>
<td>* The patient cured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The medicine healed the wound</td>
<td>The medicine cured the patient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>calm down</th>
<th>soothe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>He calmed down</td>
<td>* He soothed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It calmed him down</td>
<td>It soothed him</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the insights of case grammar are useful we do not as yet have a
pedagogic grammar of English based on this approach. An understanding
of case relationships and their consequent implications for syntax may how-
ever help the teacher interpret and more adequately explain certain errors,
but there are many exceptions which even case grammar does not ade-
quately deal with.

Assumption 5 is dealt with through direct teaching aimed at recognizing
the basic forms of words when they are combined with different inflexional
and derivational suffixes. Praninskas found words derived from liberal had
a frequency of 46 occurrences across five different types of writing in the
university texts she examined (Praniskas 1972). In addition to the form
liberal she found liberalism, liberalize, liberalization, liberate, liberator,
literally. Rapid identification of the base form of words is needed as part
of an overall attempt to teach students how to infer meaning from words. A
considerable portion of Croft’s Reading and Word Study (1960) is devoted
to this, and familiarity with the latinate and greek inflections of scientific
terminology (cf. Flood 1960) should be dealt with in courses on scientific
English.

Assumption 6 suggests that words are stored or come to mind according
to associative bonds, and that learning may be facilitated when such bonds
are established. In a specific study of how second language learners store
vocabulary in short term memory, Henning found that in the earlier stages
of learning, words may be stored according to acoustic links (i.e. words which
sound similar are stored together) whereas later learners used a semantic
basis for storing words, storing words according to meaning links of the type
discussed under 6 above. Henning notes;

The implications for the teaching of vocabulary are that strategies of
encoding vocabulary in memory appear to change as a function of lan-
guage proficiency. Low-proficiency language learners, although a test
indicated they understood the meanings of the stimulus recognition items,
appeared to encode them in memory on the basis of acoustic and ortho-
graphic similarities rather than by association of meaning. Therefore
it would appear that they would benefit from selective listening, aural
discrimination, songs, rhymes, affix drills and other exercises that point
out similarities and differences of sound and spelling of words. For ex-
ample, it might prove more helpful for learners at that level to discover
the distinction between whether and weather than the distinction be-
tween whether and if. But learners at a higher level appear to encode vo-
vocabulary in memory primarily on the basis of meanings. At that level learners might benefit more from synonym and antonym games and exercises, paired-associate compositions in which lists of related words are given the learner from which he is to prepare written or oral compositions. It is hoped that through continual drilling and exercises of this nature the language learner will begin to recognize not only a larger inventory of lexical items encountered, but be able to identify the acoustic and semantic families from which they come, and thus more efficiently progress in language proficiency. (Hennings 1973)

Some of the implications of assumption 7 are discussed by Bright and McGregor when they write:

“In our first language we pick up strong emotional associations within the home. But a second language is normally learnt in the less passionate atmosphere of the classroom, where physical violence, for example, about whether this is mine or yours does not normally arise. The result is a lack of emotional involvement in the language and hence great difficulty in seeing any meaning other than plain sense. Obstinate is understood to mean no more than determined—the writer’s attitude of disapproval is missed.”

(Bright and McGregor p 30)

Vocabulary teaching thus involves showing how a word can take on emotional connotation in a particular context. Perhaps one of the most useful exercises to deal globally with many of the aspects of word knowledge implied in the assumptions above is the cloze exercise. Passages from which words have been deleted are filled in by the students. Subsequent classroom discussion of the different words offered allows the learner to acquire words in context and in relation to other words in the text and to the overall content of the passage, (cf. Plaister 1973).

Conclusions

It has not been my purpose hereto propose a classification of vocabulary teaching exercises. Most teachers will have their own preferred techniques for teaching the different aspects of vocabulary usage I have referred to. What I have tried to do however is to suggest that in preparing teaching materials we begin with a rich concept of vocabulary. The goals of vocabulary teaching must be more than simply covering a certain number of words on a word list. Then we must look to how teaching techniques can help realize our concept of what it means to know a word. As in all areas of the syllabus, our understanding of the nature of what we are teaching, should be reflected in the way we set about teaching it. Vocabulary has for some time been one area of the syllabus where this link between approach, method and technique has been neglected.
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Teaching Academic Vocabulary to Foreign Graduate Students*

Anne V. Martin

The foreign graduate student in an American university needs to exhibit a wide range of academic skills. To participate effectively in the research-oriented environment of the American university, he needs an excellent command of vocabulary—both technical and academic. A method of teaching academic vocabulary to the intermediate to advanced EFL graduate student is discussed. The term academic vocabulary is defined and compared to the terms technical, scientific, and sub-technical vocabulary. Criteria used for selecting academic vocabulary items are explained. The vocabulary is divided into three areas appropriate for teaching: the research process, analysis, and evaluation. Selected items and sample exercises for each area are given and broader applications in each of the four areas of language use are described.

Introduction

The foreign student attending an American university, particularly the graduate student working on an advanced degree requiring independent research must, like his American peers, know and use many academic skills. He is required to read about research in his own area and related areas; to listen to professors speak about their work or the work of colleagues; and often to write papers incorporating the research of others, to present written or oral evaluations of methods or results, and in many cases to present his own research findings. To successfully engage in these activities, the foreign student needs an excellent command of vocabulary—both technical and academic. The major purpose of this paper is to discuss the teaching of academic vocabulary, but first the term must be distinguished from several other terms.

Technical and academic vocabulary are not synonymous terms. Technical vocabulary is the specific vocabulary related to a particular discipline. Each field has a technical vocabulary. Specialized EFL books have treated a number of these (for example, the English Language Services Special English series; Finochiarro and McNally, Educator's Vocabulary Handbook). Some work has been done on “the English of science and technology” (Lackstrom, Selinker and Trimble 1973), but the emphasis has

* This paper was presented at the 1975 TESOL Convention in Los Angeles, California.

Ms. Martin, an instructor at the American Language Institute, University of Southern California, is co-author of Guide to Writing, Vocabulary, and Study Techniques (Prentice-Hall, forthcoming) and has developed university-level EFL curriculum in Panama and technical EFL materials for use in Iran.
been on structural and rhetorical forms unique to science and technology. Ewer and Latorre wrote *A Course in Basic Scientific English* (1969). They use the term science to embrace some of the social sciences as well as the physical sciences and thus come close at times to what I call academic vocabulary. Cowan (1974: 391) uses the term “sub-technical vocabulary” for high-frequency context independent words occurring across disciplines. Academic and sub-technical vocabulary appear to be equivalent terms. I prefer the term academic vocabulary because the words have in common a focus on research, analysis, and evaluation—those activities which characterize academic work. A sentence drawn from a recent issue of *Science* (11 April 1975: 117) illustrates the difference between technical and academic vocabulary:

> Recently, computations based on the use of simple vertical diffusion models in which the catalytic cycle of chemical reactions involving NOx has been added to the Chapman set have verified that, if NOx is present, the total \( O_3 \) content will be significantly reduced.

The technical vocabulary is obvious. The academic vocabulary items are: computations, based on, models, verified, and significantly.

Now that the term academic vocabulary has been clarified, a brief history of the development of my materials for teaching it is in order. The materials were developed and tested at Stanford University from 1971 to 1974 as part of the Intensive English and Academic Orientation Program (AESOP) (See Martin *et al.* 1973). Participants in the program are foreign students who plan to work on advanced degrees in a wide variety of fields. They generally have reached an intermediate to advanced level of proficiency in English but lack mastery of the academic skills they will need as students in an American university.

The academic vocabulary taught in the program was selected from several sources: (a) items which students submitted from their reading in their field; (b) items which instructors submitted, based on vocabulary problems students had in writing or speaking about some aspect of their field; and (c) items which occur frequently in journal articles. The vocabulary submitted was evaluated according to the following pedagogical criteria:

1. It should be unfamiliar to or incorrectly used by many students.
2. It should not only help the student recognize familiar items but also help him extend his knowledge to include unfamiliar items. Thus, wherever feasible, the vocabulary should be presented both structurally and contextually.
3. It should be useful to the student in all four areas of language use—listening comprehension, speech, reading comprehension, and writing.
4. It should reinforce and be reinforced by a wide range of essential academic skills including outlining, paraphrasing, taking exams, note-taking, writing papers, and giving seminars.
As the list of items meeting these criteria grew, certain patterns emerged. The items fell into three groups appropriate for teaching: (a) the research process, (b) the vocabulary of analysis, and (c) the vocabulary of evaluation. Teaching materials for each of these areas will be examined in detail below.

The Research Process

The vocabulary of the research process (primarily verbs and nouns) is essential for the foreign graduate student. The vocabulary is presented in a context which discusses the five steps of research: formulating, investigating, analyzing, drawing conclusions, and reporting results. Then the steps are listed, along with synonyms and possible activities within each step. A sample list follows:

- formulate (the problem) — define, examine, state
- state the hypothesis and expected results
- present the methodology
- plan, design the experiment
- simulate the situation, develop a model

Exercises on the vocabulary of the research process progress through four activities. First, the student learns derivational forms, e.g., simulate—simulation. Second, he restates sentences by using synonyms, as illustrated below:

a. The way in which the results are reported is very important.
b. The way in which the findings are presented is very important.

Third, the student demonstrates recognition of contextual use of the vocabulary by filling in the blanks in a research report. Excerpts from the list of possible words and the research report follow:

- analysis hypothesis
- calculated methodology
- experiments obtained
- gathered test out

Data was ______________ over a period of two years, the timespan which the researchers felt would be sufficient to ______________ their hypothesis. Early in 1973 they began a rigid ______________ of their data. They __________ the values for a graph . . . and found that they had __________ results which supported their __________

Finally, the student actively uses the vocabulary by writing or speaking about specific research or research methodology in his field.

The Vocabulary of Analysis

The second set of academic vocabulary, the vocabulary of analysis, includes high-frequency verbs and two-word verbs which are often overlooked in teaching English to foreign students but which graduate students need in order to present information in an organized sequence. Examples of these verbs are: consist of, group, result from, derive, base on, and be noted for.
The student encounters some of the verbs to be considered in a short academic context; an excerpt follows:

In ancient times Ptolemy was noted for his theory that the universe was composed of heavenly bodies which revolved around the Earth at their center. In the fifteenth century, Copernicus theorized that our solar system was made up of planets which revolved around the sun. Modern astronomy is based on this theory. . . . The data is expected to reveal how our solar system was formed.

A short reading of this nature not only provides a context for vocabulary of analysis but also provides a means of reinforcing some of the vocabulary of the research process, e.g., theorize, theory, and data.

Verbs of analysis are grouped in a number of semantic sets, along with a short sentence context. Parts of two sets follow:

- consist of
- be composed of
- contain
- be made up of
- cause
- make
- bring about

Exercises for verbs of analysis can take many forms, depending on the needs of the students. To practice passive and active constructions, the student can be asked to perform simple transformations, for example:

Change these sentences to passive:
1. The treatment brought about a behavioral change.
2. Three area reports make up the final report.
3. He based his decision on the group consensus.

Further practice in correct construction of the verbs is provided by means of a fill-in exercise. The student is asked to complete the sentence with the correct form of a given verb, for example:

1. (be noted for) Fleming _________________ his discovery of penicillin.
2. (comprise) Transportation of food _________________ a high percentage of the total cost.
3. (contain) His findings _________________ in the most recent issue of the journal.

In another exercise the student restates a sentence using other verbs. This exercise is useful in introducing or practicing the important academic skill of paraphrasing:

Rewrite the sentence using each of the verbs indicated.
The universe contains planets, neutron stars, comets, and other phenomena.

- consist of, make up, form

After practice in controlled construction and use of verbs of analysis, the
student is asked to write original sentences and finally to write an original paragraph or short composition in which he discusses a limited aspect of his field and incorporates some of the newly acquired vocabulary.

The Vocabulary of Evaluation

The discussion so far has focused primarily on academic nouns and verbs, but there is another area of academic vocabulary to which little attention has been paid—adjectives and adverbs. They are used with discretion in academic writing, as they often add an evaluative, subjective tone which detracts from the objective approach generally desired in research. However, evaluative words do have their place in reviews, critiques, and some reports. The foreign graduate student, like his American counterparts, will be called upon to read reviews and to evaluate and constructively criticize the work of others. Therefore, he needs to recognize and actively use academic adjectives and adverbs.

The student is introduced to evaluative vocabulary through a book review which does not contain any evaluative adjectives or adverbs. The student reads the review; then the instructor asks questions such as “What is the reviewer’s attitude toward the author as a writer? As a researcher? Is the review favorable or unfavorable?” The questions are difficult to answer because of the lack of evaluative words. The instructor then lets the student read a revised book review which contains evaluative adjectives. Discussion in class now focuses on what information each adjective adds to the review. An excerpt from a book review, first without and then with evaluative adjectives, follows:

The first section of the book is an examination of twentieth century research in the field. In the second section he elaborates his theory of primate socialization. Warren’s study is reading material for any scientist with an interest in primate behavior.

The first section of the book is an exhaustive examination of twentieth century research in the field. In the second section he elaborates his controversial theory of primate socialization. Warren’s coherent study is indispensable reading material for any scientist with an interest in primate behavior.

The student is now ready to learn selected evaluative vocabulary. There are three possible ways to present the words, and each method has its advantages and disadvantages. One approach is to divide words according to affixes. The student learns, for example, comprehensive, distinctive, exhaustive, pervasive and substantive together because of a common affix. This approach facilitates practice in related forms but makes it difficult to provide unified contexts. A second method is to present adjective opposites, for example, objective—subjective, implicit-explicit, inductive—deductive. Relatively clear-cut opposites and negative prefix pairs (e.g., significant-insignificant) lend themselves to this approach, but few opposites are precise antonyms. Thus the third method, presentation of sets
of synonyms, has the widest application for evaluative vocabulary. The synonyms approach does, however, require the instructor to answer questions about the differences of meaning between the synonyms. For example, valid, solid, rigorous, well-supported, and convincing all suggest a favorable amount of evidence; but it is not easy for the instructor to draw fine lines—or for the student to grasp the distinctions. Over a number of years, a combination of all three methods has been found to be useful in presenting approximately 150 high-frequency evaluative words to advanced foreign graduate students.

Exercises to practice evaluative adjectives will vary according to the method(s) used to present them. The student may be asked to give adjective forms for words in a list:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nouns</th>
<th>Adjectives</th>
<th>Verbs</th>
<th>Adjectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>detail</td>
<td></td>
<td>notice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reason</td>
<td></td>
<td>construct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>function</td>
<td></td>
<td>tolerate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sketch</td>
<td></td>
<td>pertain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In other exercises the student may be asked to rewrite sentences, using opposites or substituting synonyms. Also, he may be asked to fill in an appropriate adjective in designated spaces in a review. After extended practice and discussion of controlled sentences, the student is ready to write original sentences. A useful exercise is to have him use any two adjectives from a list in a single sentence. For example, he might choose to use feasible and stringent, producing a sentence like: Despite stringent financial demands, the first proposal is the most feasible. In another exercise, the student rewrites a review or critique; he can change a favorable review to unfavorable or vice-versa by substituting adjectives. A variation is to ask the student to rewrite a review using synonyms which create a more formal tone, e.g., he might replace a fairly large number of transistors with a considerable number of transistors or unnecessary experiments with superfluous experiments. As a final practice of evaluative vocabulary, the student may be asked to write a review of a journal article, a course evaluation, or a critique of a lecture.

**Conclusion**

The EFL student must integrate all three areas of academic vocabulary into the range of activities which he has to perform as a university student. The instructor can provide opportunities for meaningful application of the vocabulary; some of these activities have been referred to in the explanation of exercises for each vocabulary set. Broader activities include the following:

1. **Listening Comprehension**—Ask the student to take notes on an academic lecture or seminar and then to comment on the presentation;
2. **Speech**—As a short assignment, have each student speak about or evaluate research in his field, or for a longer assignment, have the
student prepare a seminar presentation which includes a summary and evaluation of research;

3. Reading Comprehension—Select an article of general interest which is research-based or have each student select an article within his field to read, evaluate, and discuss;

4. Writing—As a short assignment, have the student write about research he has done or read about, or for a longer assignment, have the student write a term paper which uses secondary sources.

Saville-Troike (1974: 1) states: “In teaching English to foreign students at the university level, we have been recognizing that our instruction falls short of their need. We have been leaving them inadequately equipped with the skills they need for coping with university-level instruction in English.” The foreign graduate student who has mastery over academic vocabulary, specifically the vocabulary of the research process, analysis, and evaluation, will be better able to participate effectively in the demanding, research-oriented environment of the American university.
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Contrastive Semantics in Vocabulary Instruction *

Don L. F. Nilsen

One of the important influences of structural linguistics on the teaching of foreign languages (including English as a foreign language) is the importance of linguistic context, and the resulting development of vocabulary materials in linguistic context exclusively. But the meanings of words are determined not only by how they relate to other words in particular sentences, but also by how they contrast with other words in various types of contrasting systems (hierarchies, cycles, matrices, processes, etc.) Context is viewed not as a way of providing the meaning of a word, but as a way of restricting the meaning to a small number of the total possible senses. Therefore, the development of the paradigmatic approach (vocabulary out of context in contrastive systems) is viewed as a prerequisite to the syntagmatic approach (vocabulary in context). This article attempts to show some of the ways that a paradigmatic approach to vocabulary instruction can be set up and used in bilingual or partially bilingual situations by working with a particular semantic area—English and Spanish clothing terms.

Some years ago, when I was at the University of Michigan, I was a member of the team set up to revise the University of Michigan ELI’s basic vocabulary text entitled Vocabulary in Context. I enjoyed this assignment and was convinced as to the validity of the methodology. As I worked on the text, I did not become less satisfied with the approach; however, I did begin wondering if there might not be an equally valid approach named something like “vocabulary out of context,” because it seems to me that a vocabulary item derives its meaning in two ways—first by means of the way it contrasts with other vocabulary items in a language, and second by the way it relates to other vocabulary items in a particular sentence. The first situation, whereby word meaning is a function of other words it contrasts with, is called paradigmatic. The second situation, whereby word meaning is a function of syntactic interrelationships among the words in a sentence is called syntagmatic meaning. Of course in a given context a word derives its meaning from both of these sources.

* This is a revised version of a paper presented at the 1975 TESOL Convention in Los Angeles, California. It is a report on a research grant conducted at Arizona State University during the summer of 1974. The author would like to thank Naomi Lindstrom, Maureen Ahern, Richard Yorkey, Henry Thomassen, and Alleen Nilsen for listening to his ramblings and for making comments and reactions which have significantly influenced the writing of this paper.

Mr. Nilsen, Associate Professor of English at Arizona State University, has focused on semantics in several publications, including Semantic Theory: A Linguistic Perspective (Newbury House, 1975). He is a member of the NCTE Committee on Public Doublespeak and a member of the MLA Bibliography Committee.
In the development of vocabulary materials, there would probably have been a balance of syntagmatically and paradigmatically controlled material if the structural linguists had not come along. They pointed out three important facts about lexical meaning: (1) That the same word can have very different meanings depending on the linguistic and social context into which it is placed; (2) That no word in any language has an exact equivalent in any other language; and (3) That no word is the exact synonym of any other word. These points are extremely significant and are as valuable today as they were when they were first formulated. Furthermore, they point up the importance of the syntagmatic approach to vocabulary instruction. But whether through the fault of structural linguists or through the fault of foreign-language teachers, or both, a related but faulty assumption was also made—that words do not have meaning outside of context. In actual truth, the opposite is the case. A typical word not only has meaning outside of context—it has too much meaning. A typical word in an unabridged dictionary has forty or fifty meanings, and it is the function of the context to determine which of these meanings is appropriate for a certain situation.

If words indeed are meaningful out of context, and if it is a function of the grammar of a language to place words into a linguistic context which is compatible with a limited number of their potential meanings, then it would seem that from both the research and from the pedagogical points of view we need to deal with the basic meanings of words before we will be very effective in finding out how the meanings are affected by putting words together in sentences, for by working out the syntagmatic meaning before we work out the paradigmatic meaning would seem to me to be putting the cart before the horse.

But what would a paradigmatically based vocabulary presentation look like? I would like to suggest that it would consist of hierarchies (like man, primate, mammal, vertebrate, animal, living, count, concrete, thing), of matrices (like kinship systems which plot such variables as generation, consanguinity, marriage, and sex against each other), of cycles (like the respiratory or circulatory system of the human body), of processes (like changing fuel into motion in an automobile engine), etc., because I feel that no word in any language exists in a vacuum, for the meaning of each word is a function of how it compares and contrasts with other words in various logical systems like those mentioned above. We could therefore add two maxims to the three maxims of the structural linguists stated earlier—(4) No word has the same meaning for any two speakers of a language, because the total lexical inventories of the two speakers will be different; and (5) A word will have a different meaning at two different times in the life of a single person, because his total lexical inventory is constantly changing. And there are corollary maxims, like (6) A person trained in a particular subject area will normally have a larger vocabulary in that area than will one not trained in that area, and many of the words
in this larger vocabulary will have more specific meanings to him than to the non-specialist. Therefore, if we are to develop a maximally contrastive paradigmatic system, it is essential to consult specialists. This will result in a maximally contrastive system, which can be used directly in determining word-meanings for specialists, and indirectly in determining word-meanings for non-specialists, indirectly in that for non-specialists the words which the non-specialist does not know must be deleted from the system before the contrastive meanings are determined.

At this point, let me attempt to illustrate what a paradigmatically based vocabulary presentation might look like in a bilingual reference dictionary by considering a particular semantic field, English and Spanish clothing terms, one of the many semantic fields that might have been chosen. In addition to clothing itself, this semantic area would also contain such related terms as those related to fitting and measuring, alterations, types of fabric, a tailor's or seamstress's tools, accessories, clothing care, types of prints and patterns, etc.

In an index the words would be alphabetized separately in English and Spanish. But rather than giving the definitions, as an ordinary dictionary would do, the page or pages would be given where this particular word is found. The English word and its Spanish equivalent (or near equivalent) would be found in the same place, very close to its synonyms, and not far from its antonyms and converses. The definition of the word is not given since definitions require much valuable space, but the meaning can be determined in two ways—(1) By how this word contrasts with other very similar words (many of which the searcher will know in either English or Spanish), and (2) By the lexical equivalent (or near equivalent) in the other language.

For our example of the semantic area of clothing terms, many features would be the same for all clothing terms. Clothing terms, like kinship terms, business terms, political terms, etc. are associated with human beings exclusively. Notice that this is not a whole-part relationship but is rather an association relationship. Humans are contrasted with apes, monkeys, chimpanzees, gorillas, etc. within the category of primates. Primates are contrasted with rodents, felines, canines, bovines, etc. within the category of mammals. Mammals are contrasted with birds, reptiles, fish, and insects in the category of animals. Animals and plants compose the category of living things, which are combined with non-living things to form the category of countable things, which are combined with non-countables to make up the category of things in general, as opposed to actions, states, processes, and qualities.

So the semantic field of clothing terminology is a part of many other, more abstract categories. But it also consists of many more concrete categories, such as fitting, prints, alterations, clothing care, fabric types, etc. mentioned earlier, and many other categories which will be considered below.

For example, clothing terms could be organized by location, ranging
from the top of the body to the bottom. For the head area there would be such matching pairs as beret-boina, hood-capote, hat-sombrero, cap-gorra, etc. for types of hats, and bandana-paño en la cabeza, hair ribbon-cinta, comb-moño, scarf-bufanda, etc. for other head gear. Of course the parts of a hat, such as visor-vizar, brim-ala, and crown-copa would also be treated here.

Then there would be the clothing terms related to the neck, such as necklace-collar, brooch-broche, bolo-tie-corbata de lazo, cross and chain-pendiente en cruz, etc.

Terms associated with the upper body would include a suspender belt-liquero, vest-veston, T-shirt-camiseta, etc.; and there would be special sections for arm wear, such as bracelet-pulsera, sleeve-manga, cuff links-gemelos; and for hand and finger wear, such as gloves-guantes, ring-anillo, thimble-dedal, and castinets-castañuelas. There would also be a special section for waist-wear containing such terms as belt-cinturón, draw string-atadura, gun belt-correa, and rosary-rosaria de cuentas.

Lower body wear would include levis-pantalones vaqueros, bermuda shorts-pantalones cortes, slack-panty, etc. and there may be a special section dealing specifically with such leg wear as garters, leggings, etc. Foot wear could be divided into three categories: (1) Hosiery, such as stockings-medias, socks-calcetines, etc.; (2) Shoes, such as loafers-zapatos holgados, wedgies-zapatos alturizados; and (3) Things that go over the shoes, like garters-sobre calzado, rubbers-chanclos, etc. Then of course there would be parts of a shoe, like sole-suela, heel-tacon, and arch-parte alta.

But the semantic features associated with clothing terms are not only a function of the body location. There are also other semantic features, like nightwear, as in pajamas-pijama, bathrobe-bata; and swimming wear, like swimming trunks-trusa, bikini-bikini; and underwear, like unmentionables-ropa interior, girdle-faja, petticoat-enaguas; and outerwear, like trench coat-abrigo de espia, overcoat-sobre todo, frock coat-casaca; and formal wear, like gown-vestido de noche, ensemble-ensemble, and tuxedo-smoking.

Either through setting up special categories or by using special lexical labels, most of the salient semantic features of the various vocabulary items can be indicated. The most obvious labeling would be for regionalism whereby, for example, a term is only used in Argentina, Peru, Mexico, etc. In addition, such pairs as wrap-nube, stole-estola, hiphuggers-pantalón ajustado, and blouse-blusa will be labeled as feminine words while fez-fez, football helmet-casco de football, and boxer shorts-jockey will be labeled masculine. Babushka, Indian head-dress, waistcoat, and lederhosen will be labeled as foreign; knickers, bloomers, spats, breeches, puttees, and bobby socks as old fashioned words; threads and duds as slang; chaps-chapas, and bolo tie-corbata de lazo as Western terms, etc.

By placing the English and Spanish expressions side by side it is easy to see which words are cognates, like jumper, pullover, sweater, jersey, blue jeans, short, leotards, sandals, mocassins, culottes, and Shamberg; and
which are false cognates, like mortar board-birrete, and cartridge belt-dobles cananas. This type of display will also allow the person to see how the lexical structure may be similar in the two languages as with pant skirt-falda pantalon, over coat-sobre todo, and elevated shoes-zapatos alturizados, or very different, as with wire-rim glasses as contrasted with gafas montadas en el aire, or slippers (based on the idea that you slip them on or that they slip along the floor) as opposed to zapatillas (little shoes), or halter (based on what a horse wears) as contrasted with portasenos. Various English-Spanish mismatches will also become obvious as where English pantyhose is equivalent to the simple Spanish panti, and English panties must therefore be called something else (in this case Spanish slip), and the English slip must have another name, so Spanish refago is used.

And finally, this type of display will show those places where a single word in one language must be glossed by a descriptive phrase in the other, as when beanie is glossed as sombrero a la cabenza or when a single word in one language has a number of near-equivalent glosses in the other, as when English bowler equals Spanish tongo, sombrero hongo, and sombrero melón, or when Spanish saya equals English obi, sash, and cummerbund.

But the most significant feature of this type of display is its efficiency. There are no sentence-long definitions, no citations, no explanations of pronunciation (which is very regular in Spanish, and somewhat regular in English when view morphophonemically), or etymology, and despite these omissions, the information communicated about the meaning of a word is much greater than in a typical dictionary (either bilingual or monolingual), and much greater than that in a syntagmatically based vocabulary book. Furthermore it allows the student to understand and develop sophisticated discourse related to his own particular interests and needs.

My plea, then, is for the development of this method of vocabulary display, not as a replacement for dictionaries, thesauruses, Berlitz-type materials, or syntagmatically controlled vocabulary texts, but as an extremely useful and long-overdue supplement.
Reviews


Mary Lawrence has written an excellent book in refreshing contrast to the more mechanically oriented texts available in the reading and writing field of ESL. As is stated in the preface, “the text focuses on three cognitive skills: the ability to make extrapolations; to manipulate and to impose order on data; and to synthesize data.” The student is called upon to use his existing knowledge and language learning strategies in approaching the lessons in the book.

The text is divided into eight units which are subdivided into four major sections with exercises: Reading, Conversation Practice, Writing, Extra Vocabulary and Writing Practice. The grammar within the readings and exercises is keyed to Robert Krohn’s English Sentence Structure. The exercises included under the above mentioned subdivisions are well thought out and teach or review very important skills necessary for the students’ reading and writing abilities. For example, under Reading, there are exercises involving reading for information, making inferences, generalizations, oral practice, logical questions, order, etc. Under Writing, there are exercises dealing with writing sentences, paragraphs, cause and effect, comparison and contrast, point of view, paraphrase, hypothesis, and mechanics (spelling, punctuation, capitalization). The Conversation Practice sections contain situational dialogues which can be used for discussion, role-playing, etc. as well as situations for which dialogues must be created. The Extra Vocabulary and Writing Practice sections have exercises which review vocabulary, spelling, and assign various types of compositions.

Some of the units contain subject matter which is of great value to the student about to enter an American university. For example, Unit 3 deals with the college library and contains some card catalogue exercises similar to those found in Chapter 7 of Richard Yorkey’s Study Skills for Students of ESL. However, the main thrust of the unit is order and classification. Examples of other important skills found in other units are such things as reading different types of graphs and filling out application forms.

All in all, this book is a very welcome and sorely needed one for the teacher of ESL, especially for those of us involved in preparing foreign students for university work in the United States. I feel that the presentation and practice of the thought processes which lead to writing are the best which I have encountered in a writing text since the publication of Mary Lawrence’s other book, Writing as a Thinking Process.

PAUL D. ROBERTS
English Language Institute
Oregon State University

MMC was written for use in beginning intensive English grammar classes for adults at the University of Pittsburgh's English Language Institute. But this book also has potential for application in non-intensive English programs.

Teachers and administrators in charge of selecting textbooks for EFL classes are faced with a great variety of material for use in varying circumstances. There are, however, relatively few books that are really satisfactory for teaching general competence in speaking, especially in the case of students with different language backgrounds. MMC, I am happy to say, meets almost all the selection criteria (Davison) I can think of for a program which teaches grammar with an oral emphasis to adults in the United States. The material in the book is well written and constructed. Information pertaining to the objectives of the text, age and level of students, suggested time allotted for completion of the book, specific instructions on how to use the text (in addition to a separate teacher's handbook), and specific approach and methodology to be employed, has all been taken into consideration and is explicitly stated.

Though MMC obviously has its roots in audio-lingual methodology and utilizes many of the same techniques in its exercises, it is a grammar book with a twist. With the organization of the exercises based on a practical system of classifying structural pattern drills in English (Paulston 1971), the student is led through a series of drills that increasingly transfers the burden of communication from the teacher and the materials to the student. The drills are labelled according to type, mechanical, meaningful, and communicative (M-M-C), and the patterns to be taught are presented in the drill sequence from mechanical through communicative. There are enough exercises in each lesson and for each pattern that when one finds the students are already somewhat familiar with a given pattern, it is easy enough simply to skip the drills marked as mechanical and go on to the meaningful and communicative exercises.

There are twenty-two lessons, each subdivided into several sections according to major teaching points. Each lesson roughly has the following outline:

- Dialogue (where new patterns are given in context)
- An outline of the patterns presented in the lesson
- Comprehension questions on the dialogue
- Vocabulary items (to be memorized before class)
- Section 1
  - Part A
  - Part B
    (Grammatical rules given in these sections are written with a min-
imum of linguistic analysis—the emphasis is on use of the rule and not the rule itself)

Section 2
Section 3
Summary Dialogue

The dialogues (including the summary dialogues) concern problems most international students meet during the initial part of their stay in the United States. They are, for the most part, interesting as well as informative. But the major part of each lesson is, as the author states, the presentation and drilling of patterns.

Though I find the organization of the material and the material itself to be excellent, there are some drawbacks in the layout of the text. The general appearance of the text is similar to a manuscript with a paper back rather than a published book. The bottom and right-hand margins are uneven from page to page, and the printing itself was evidently not well-planned. Thus, there are blank pages which are not labelled or numbered located at the end of a number of lessons so that the first page of each subsequent lesson can begin on an odd-numbered page. One other blank page is actually labelled “NOTES” and is numbered (342). A professional publisher could do wonders with this book.

MMC Out of Its Cultural Context

The use of MMC outside the context of the U.S. cultural setting raises a number of interesting problems. Khon Kaen University in northeastern Thailand provides a setting which contrasts greatly with the context for which the book was written. To begin with, students at KKU meet a total of five class hours per week instead of 16-20 as is found in most intensive programs. MMC is actually used in only three of the five hours plus about 30 minutes per week in the lab. This contrasts with what would probably be four or five hours per week for grammar classes with lab reinforcement every day in an institute situation. The type of teachers available is also different. (There are few native speakers). And motivational factors for both teachers and students differ from those usually found in intensive English programs in the U.S. English here is, at this time, a required subject for all incoming first-year students. The number of students per class is greater, 18-25 versus less than 12 in an institute. And finally, the educational system in addition to the philosophy of education itself is different.

Without going into detail for all the factors involved, the main points that the use of MMC has brought out are as follows:

(1) The dialogues, though highly relevant to the practical everyday needs of international students in the U. S., appear as abstract situations to KKU students. Most students here have never heard of credit cards, baseball, or thrift stores, to say nothing of daylight savings time! This is true for many teachers too, even those who have been abroad. Yet, in a general English course, not to teach
cultural facts, to my mind, does a disservice to English teaching even if one could avoid them. It is an open question for me as to where to draw the line on cultural items.

(2) There are numerous items within drills and even entire drills that assume the students are living in the United States. These items are not difficult to adapt to fit the local situation, but their presence gives the students (and teachers) the impression that the material is not suitable for their English needs. This is, of course, part of the “face validity” of the text and does not really say much about the usefulness of the material.

(3) MMC requires a style of teaching that is demanding of students and teachers. There are teachers everywhere who are accustomed to sitting behind a desk at the front of the room while students recite from their notebooks. Or worse yet, the teacher may read while students listen. Using MMC can be a discomforting experience to teachers of this sort since a continuing process of communication between teacher and student is required.

(4) For students who are accustomed to rote learning of paradigms, the use of MMC represents a radical change in approach to language teaching and classroom behavior. In the case of Thai students who traditionally, at least, pay respect and give honor to their teachers by being obediently silent, the effect of a changeover to a constant feedback system is dramatic. The students are thus obliged to adjust to a different kind of teacher-student relationship in which the respect is still there but is shown in a different way.

(5) It is the general consensus of the teachers here that the use of MCM actually helps the teachers themselves in their English language competency. One factor responsible for this is that only English is used in class. But there is another reason, and it seems to me to be a more important one. The teacher is put into a position where he must make repeated instant decisions on the grammaticality of student utterances (in meaningful and communicative drills). This is a feature of the techniques required when using the MMC text. In a fast-moving class the constant interaction and instant decision making on grammaticality may produce mental fatigue even with native speakers.

But for the non-native speaker there are instances when he will not be sure whether a given response is grammatical or not. As a result, there is pressure on the teacher to be thoroughly prepared before he walks into the classroom. The few native speakers in the English Department here are continually asked about the grammaticality of this or that question or response. This is somewhat of a problem for the classroom and the MMC material, but it is the kind of problem that is welcome.

In conclusion, the use of MMC in our program has so far been a successful and rewarding experience. Given the very special operating circumstances at KKU, I feel confident in saying that MMC, with relatively few alterations, has potential for non-intensive classes in overseas programs as well as in intensive and non-intensive programs in the United States.
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Those interested in mechanical drills, structures with limited vocabulary, integrated lessons, and grammatical explanations, and those who believe we learn language by memorization and practice may want to investigate these books further. However, if you think that language learning is more than linguistic calisthenics, if you believe that one is more likely to learn to say something one feels compelled to say rather than what a book says one should memorize, you may not want to investigate these books further.

Each of the 17 lessons in the textbooks contains the following:
— a listening drill which requires students to identify individual sounds.
— a reading passage about people in Centerville in Book 1 and about the Martinez family in Book 2.
— yes/no, either/or and question-word fact questions to test recall of the reading passage and provide opportunity to practice words and patterns in the passage; about one out of ten questions requires inferences rather than the facts.
— a series of three exchange dialogues containing patterns in the reading passage.
— at least two pages of grammar notes.
— one page of sketches to be used as the basis of drills.
— drills on the pictures including memorization, repetition, substitution and transformation drills.
— fill-in written exercises to test recall of the reading passage.
— situational practice in which suggestions are made on how one can ask students to use patterns introduced in the reading and practiced in the comprehension questions, memorization exercises, and drills.

Each of the lessons in the workbooks contains the following:
— sentences which are to be manipulated through re-writing.
— blank lines for students to write labels referring to teacher utterances, e.g., teacher: Is this a book? student: (expected to write the word question)

        teacher: This is a book. student: (expected to write the word statement)
The instructor's manual contains the following:
— the plan of the books.
— suggestions for using the books.
— an outline of the content of the lessons.

I would not want to use the reading passages in these books with my classes because I do not find them at all compelling. The people named in the readings are not characters; they are just names. They exhibit no emotions, have no foibles, no involvements, no arguments—not even any acne problems.

Just as the characters in the readings are bereft of life, so too is the language they use and the language presented in the dialogues based on the structures in the reading passages. Here are some sample conversations:

A. Excuse me.
B. Yes?
A. What is this?
B. It's a shirt.
A. Is that a shirt, too?
B. No it isn't. That's a dress.
A. Oh. Thank you very much.
B. You're welcome. (page 2)

A. How did Jerry go to school yesterday?
B. He walked because his house is near the school.
A. What did he study at school?
B. Oh, a lot of things: history, geometry, French, art.
A. What did he do after school?
B. He walked home, cleaned his room, and listened to some music. (page 158)

Even if the dialogues were more realistic, no situations in which these exchanges could be used are suggested; no information is given about the level of speech used, or the types of facial expressions or gestures that might accompany these lines. But no situations can in reality be suggested nor can any gestures be described since these are not possible dialogues. They are simply abstractions spoken in this case by A and B. No real people would speak them so A and B are appropriate in an ironic way.

In drills, we might not expect gestures, situations or level of language to be noted in any way. But it would seem not too much to ask that even in drills, where there might be a place for abstracted language, we could expect that sentences would be presented that someone might say. Here are some sentences students are to learn:

1. Mrs. Hill is a woman. (page 56)
2. I am going to stand up. (page 195)
3. Open your book.
   What did you do?
   I opened my book. (page 169)
4. The coffee is brown. (page 89)
5. These are bathtubs. (page 28)
6. Is he a doctor or a lawyer?
   He's a doctor. (page 7, Instructor’s Manual)
7. I am Sam Anderson. I am a farmer. I have a lot of strength, but I don’t have much education. (page 114)

In the first example above we are told that “Mrs. Hill is a woman.”; in contrast to what, we are not told. In the second example a student is announcing the fact that he is going to stand up. To whom would one announce such information? If one had had a broken leg, one might say “I am going to stand up” after some period of rest. But one must search one’s imagination a great deal to discover when one could use this announcement. The exchanges about opening the book in example three are possible only in a practice exercise, it seems to me. If one were able to utter the sequence in a drill, what evidence is there that the parts of the sequence practiced could be uttered correctly in an appropriate situation? In example four, we are told that “The coffee is brown,” but is this coffee brown in contrast to some other coffee that is not brown? If we were working in a store that sold bathtubs, toilets, sinks, etc. and had been instructed to announce the names of the items to customers we might use the sentence “These are bathtubs.” But once again, one has to stretch one’s imagination to the fullest to find situations in which one could utter some of the sentences practiced in the text. The insistence by the author in the Instructor’s Manual to have students answer all yes/no and either/or questions with full forms seems most unnatural. Example six could be answered with “a doctor” just as correctly as with “He’s a doctor.” How is a student who is forced to use only long answers to learn the difference between short and long answers? In example seven the student is to pretend that he is Mr. Anderson. What actor could pretend with these lines? What kind of person would say them in the first place and why would an ESL student want to learn to say them?

Though great care has been taken in limiting the structures and vocabulary in the reading passages, dialogues and drills, to the point where the bulk of them are inane, the grammar notes are written with little control of any kind. The Instructor’s Manual reminds the teacher that little time should be spent on grammar; students do not have copies of the Instructor’s Manual. One wonders what the students are expected to do with the copious grammar notes written with so much more complexity than the structures taught in the textbook itself.

The textbooks contain lessons in which structures are introduced gradually and in a logical progression (page 2, Instructor’s Manual). They contain limited vocabulary and are designed to reinforce previous lessons. All are designed “to give students a really sound foundation” (page 2, Instructor’s Manual).

Perhaps, if we were teaching solid geometry or how to build a house, solid foundations would be critical. But language is a medium used to express rage and happiness, imaginative ideas, information we care about
and cultural conventions such as comments about the weather. And lan-

guage has meaning only in contexts important to its users.

Access to English presents English as if it were a subject to be studied,
set apart from life. It would provide a fine model for teaching a dead lan-
guage. Why publishers in the '70's continue to support books that ignore
the insights which sociolinguists, teachers with common sense, psycholin-
guists, and British methodologists have been presenting to the field for
decades is hard to understand. A textbook published in the '70's should
be different from one published in the '40's in ways other than the num-
ber of square inches per page. I do not believe that any professional who
is aware of the field of second language teaching would believe this book
was published so recently. Everything in the book, except the date itself,
suggests very early attempts to develop materials based on the belief that
language is habit and can be learned by memorization, drill and reinforce-
ment. For those who believe in this type of teaching, Access to English is
appropriate.

JOHN FANSELOW
Teachers College, Columbia University

My attention has been called to an article in the March 1975 issue of the TESOL Quarterly by Professor Karl C. Diller, entitled “Some New Trends...” The article asserts that some widely accepted practices of language teaching are or should be rejected, claims a scientific basis for such rejection, and announces that several newly developed (and startlingly diverse) teaching procedures hold promise of significant improvement of language teaching.

We are not told what foreign language Professor Diller teaches or has taught, nor at what level (beginning or intermediate or advanced), nor to what age-group (secondary school or college). In his discussion language teaching appears to be considered with little if any distinction between the various stages of learning or the various ages of learners-two sovereign factors, one would think, in any study of methodology.

The picture of the methods Professor Diller would reject is accordingly a strangely blurred and undifferentiated one. He appears, for example, to be unaware that competent teachers regard a procedure of “mimicing, memorizing, and pattern drill” as appropriate for the very first stage of the acquisition of foreign-language pronunciation and some of the basic sentences patterns, and wholly inappropriate for later stages. And he disregards, or is unaware of the corollary that obviously this stage must be longer for young learners than for older learners. (Professor Diller, by the way, follows the common but erroneous custom of speaking of “the audio-lingual method,” apparently unaware that the term “audio-lingual” was originally proposed by Nelson Brooks to describe the fundamental characteristic of human language, in contrast with what might analogously be called “video-manual.” More recently, if properly used, the term applies not to any method but only to certain materials developed early in NDEA days in the Office of Education at taxpayers’ expense and then marketed by one commercial publisher.)

Professor Diller proclaims that everybody knows that “the speaker of a natural language can construct an indefinitely large number of sentences
which have never been heard before”; but he deduces from this ability a
d Doctrine that a non-speaker of a language somehow becomes a speaker of it
without passing through stages of forming relevant reliable habits of pro-
nunciation and grammatical patterning.

It is a truism that the burden of proof is upon one who advocates
abandoning accepted doctrine and procedure in favor of something new.
That advocacy is in need of support by evidence and sound logic. It is a
common failing of apostles of one or another variety of Transformation-
Generative doctrine to assume the validity of their beliefs as given, and try to
put holders of widely held views and users of successful practices on the
defensive.

Professor Diner’s article illustrates this tactic. Instead of reasoned argu-
ment, he appeals to his authority: “The rationalist-cognitivist theories of
Noam Chomsky have undermined the empiricist-behaviorist basis for mimi-
cry, memorization, and pattern drills as language teaching methods. . . .
Chomsky has shown that a language is characterized by rule-governed
creativity.” Four “main headings” of the Chomsky 1966 paper are listed
by Professor Diller in a footnote as “four aspects of linguistic theory which
he feels should have great importance for the language teacher.” Professor
Diller does not report that Chomsky frankly admitted at the beginning of
his paper that he was not “an expert on any aspect of the teaching of lan-
guages.” Later in the paper Chomsky wrote: “I will not try to develop any
specific proposals relating to the teaching of languages—as I mentioned be-
fore, because I am not competent to do so.” In the last paragraph of his
cpaper Chomsky warned the reader: “Once again, I would like to stress that
the implications of these ideas for language teaching are far from clear to
me.” Throughout the paper, Chomsky used such formulas as “it seems, it
seems to me, I think,” thereby displaying a humility appropriate to an
outsider addressing an audience of experienced practitioners (the Northeast
Conference on the teaching of foreign languages).—The appeal to such a
properly modest non-authority is not a convincing argument.

A four-line paragraph on page 66 of Professor Diner’s article is not easy
to analyze, but it seems to embody at least one petitio principii and one
magisterial pronouncement: “A renewed appreciation of the importance of
grammar in language learning is following the acceptance of the fact that
language is not merely a matter of conditioned habits, but rather, is char-
acterized by rule-governed creativity. Experimental justification for this
has been found.” (In a letter of 28 October 1975 Professor Diller tells me
that in the second sentence “this” refers to “appreciation” and not “fact.”)—
There is no attempt to resolve the apparent paradox of “rule-governed crea-
tivity” nor to describe the procedures of the experimentation. In a later
passage (page 67) Professor Diller asserts that “grammar is coming back
into its own in language teaching, now that linguists accept the importance
of rule-governed creativity in the normal use of language.” There is no back-
ing for the assumption that grammar had been banished from language
teaching or disastrously neglected by teachers and textbooks.
Professor Diller’s arguments and descriptions are not easy to formulate accurately, since they lack clear distinctions between procedures of the initial phases and the requirements for teaching in all stages of a total program. Naturally he can castigate and deplore; i.e., he can pummel his straw man. Of course no one in his senses could ever suggest that the procedures proper for the first month of a high-school course or the first fortnight of a college course should constitute the sole methodology of a foreign-language program. That would be as asinine as practicing scales and arpeggios as the sole preparation for the performance of a Brahms rhapsody; but it would also be foolish to try to perform Brahms without previous digital exercises.

The Diller article displays superficiality or an irresponsible forensic style. In two passages Professor Diller quotes from earlier writings of mine in a way that betrays either inability to read or a disingenuous intent to mislead.

In May 1948 I gave a talk to teachers on “Meanings, habits, and rules.” In 1948, “grammatical rules” meant “prescriptive instructions to a learner to select specific forms or constructions in order to use correctly the language being studied.” My talk was a defense of realistic and scientific description of the grammatical facts against traditional prescriptivism. It had nothing to do with the notational transformationalism or theories of generative grammar; all that was, in 1948, still a decade in the future. In that context, I said: “We have told the freshman why the unhappy speaker of French or Spanish or German or Tibetan has to go to all this cruel and unusual trouble in order to talk: It is because of the rules of the language. We know what these rules are. We know that a ‘rule’ of a language is the analytical statement of one of the habitual aspects of that language. We know that the habit is the reality and the rule is a mere summary of the habit.” Professor Diller quotes only “the habit is the reality and the rule is a mere summary of the habit”—and for Professor Diller the term “rule” has cult meaning according to which a language is “rule-governed” and the rules refer to a historical event (a sound change) or one of the stages in the processes whereby a Platonic pre-utterance (in the inaccessible “deep structure”) is transformed into a real spoken or written act of communication (at the “surface structure”). But Professor Diller does not know or prefers not to mention the difference between the established and the neologistic use of “rule.” Once again, the burden of proof properly rests upon a would-be innovator, in matters of terminology as well as substance. To be sure, Professor Diller could not be expected to have known at first hand the theory and practice of foreign-language pedagogy in the first half of the twentieth century. But an expert on the subject—one who has published a book and articles about it—can be expected to have familiarized himself with the state of the art in the not too remote past. It would have been in order to learn about it through research and consultation with his older mentors before lifting a sentence from a 1948 context as though it were part of a controversy of the 1960s.

The other use of a quotation from a writing of mine is not easy to excuse as due to unfamiliarity with the historical situation. Professor Diller
describes the “mimicry, memorization, and pattern drills methods” as “ideally suited to teachers who did not really know the language they were teaching but were only able, as Freeman Twaddell said, ‘to pronounce correctly and with proper grammar just those sentences and constructions which the pupils are learning and practicing.’” This quotation is lifted from a context in a Teacher’s Edition of an elementary German textbook, to be used with learners in their teens. It was part of a comment on the requirement that the teacher’s role at this beginning stage is not one of conversational fluency but “oral accuracy, the ability to pronounce correctly and with the proper grammar just those sentences and constructions which the pupils are learning and practicing. Teachers with exceptional conversational fluency will have to restrain themselves to keep within that part of the German language which their students are to practice. For purposes of the classroom at any given hour, the sentences and constructions the students are learning are the German language.” To present that comment as though it were a description of “teachers who did not really know the language they were teaching” is a misrepresentation which can scarcely be a product of innocent inability to read.

These two samples cast serious doubts on the standards of scholarship in “Some New Trends.”

Some of Professor Diner’s new trends involve, he says, “meaningful practice” and “are compatible with rationalist-cognitivist theories of language.” (We are not told at what level and for what age-group or in what class sizes these teaching/learning procedures are employed.)

In one of these methods “the teacher is silent 90% of the time”; in another “the teacher (or tape recorder) talks 100% of the time.” In “the silent way” (where the teacher is silent 90% of the time) his 10% non-silence is apparently spent “talking about cuisiniere rods. These rods, or algebricks, as they are sometimes called, are small wooden blocks of different colors and lengths. In a thirty-minute demonstration I saw students learn four colors and three numbers in Japanese and be able to say such sentences as ‘Take a red rod and three blue rods and two yellow rods and give them to me.’”—We are not told whether this was a review (in whole or in part) or the learners’ first contact with the lexicon and the grammatical patterns. We are not told the size of the class, nor the age of the learners. We are informed only that a half hour was spent either reviewing or introducing 4 color names + 3 numerals = 7 vocabulary items; the sentences consisted of two imperative linked with the conjunction “and.” This corpus of the foreign language was the reward for a half-hour of commentaries on the manipulation of wooden blocks.

Another method has the merit, for Professor Diller of guiding students in their “learning language without acquiring any speech habits at all.” It begins with displays of pictures in quadrants of a placard or chart, and “the learner’s only overt behavior is his choosing of the one picture in a quadrant of four which corresponds to the meaning of each utterance . . . For the first utterance there is only one picture, a pencil, and three blank
spaces, as the voice says “bleistift.” But after that there is always a contrast.”—Presumably the other three quadrants were judiciously filled in to supply the contrasts with pictures of visible identifiable objects. We are not told about the pictures of verbs and prepositions and sentence adverbs.

Several other “methods” as Professor Diller expounds them are equally improbable. In one, the student spends 70% of his time listening, 20% speaking, 10% reading and writing during the first semester; the teacher speaks exclusively in imperatives. In another, “students sit in a circle and talk to each other in the foreign language about whatever they are concerned to communicate”—a “method” not ideally adapted to use in a classroom of 20-35 teen-agers.

I do not find that Professor Diner’s article has lightened the burden of proof on those who would reject procedures with a record of considerable success in the classroom in favor of methodologies based on theories of very dubious relevance to classroom teaching and learning. The article appears to ignore the realities of age-group differences; it—intentionally or carelessly—misrepresents the familiar strategy of progressively changing teaching procedures to parallel a learner’s progress toward control of a foreign language. The alternatives praised by Professor Diller as pointing the way toward “improving the teaching of foreign language” are either inadequately described by Professor Diller or are inapplicable to classroom realities to the point of freakishness. I should expect practical language teachers in high school or college to find the article confusing or downright unbelievable; they will hardly find it helpful.

W. F. TWADDELL
Brown University

On Twaddell’s Attempt to Reverse Some New Trends: A Reply

It is clear that my article reviewing “Some New Trends for Applied Linguistics and Foreign Language Teaching in the United States” (1975) has angered Freeman Twaddell. One key to his remarks is the objection that “apostles of one or another variety of Transformation-Generative doctrine... assume the validity of the beliefs as given, and try to put holders of widely held views and users of successful practices on the defensive.”

Twaddell states that “It is a truism that the burden of proof is upon one who advocates abandoning accepted doctrine and procedure in favor of something new. That advocacy is in need of support by evidence and sound logic.” Twaddell and I would agree that his position was the “accepted doctrine” 20 years ago. In fact, I discussed the consensus of that period in my article. But what is the “accepted doctrine” today? The 18 years from Chomsky’s Syntactic Structures to 1975 were half a lifetime for me, and for 1975’s college freshmen this was an entire lifetime. Surely there has been enough “evidence and sound logic” but forward in these years (including my own book, Diller 1971) to allow one simply to report the trends which show that the doctrines of 20 years ago are no longer fully accepted.
Before commenting on some of Twaddell’s minor points, I would like to discuss two major problems I have with his “critique”: (1) the treatment of the Twaddell quotes (or how Twaddell misquotes Twaddell); and (2) the ad hominem nature of many of his arguments.

1. Twaddell objects to the way I quoted him when I stated that mimicry-memorization and pattern drill were methods “ideally suited to teachers who did not really know the language they were teaching but were only able, as Freeman Twaddell said, ‘to pronounce correctly and with proper grammar just those sentences and constructions which the pupils are learning and practicing.’” Twaddell provides some additional context in the “critique,” and suggests that I am making a malicious “misrepresentation which can scarcely be a product of innocent inability to read.” But Twaddell suppresses the embarrassing immediate context of his quote. His original statement was:

This oral practice is very different from a “direct method” or “conversational” approach, which would demand of the teacher the kind of conversational fluency that comes only with long and continuing experience in using German in a wide variety of situations with many different people.

[Implication #1: Twaddell’s oral practice does not require teachers with great conversational fluency.]

What is needed for the course is oral accuracy, the ability to pronounce correctly and with proper grammar just those sentences and constructions which the pupils are learning and practicing. (This “Manual” and the text materials are built up so that in the very process of directing the students’ practice the teacher’s own control of those sentences and constructions is reinforced and confirmed.)

[Implication #2: Teachers who haven’t mastered first year German can improve while teaching it from this book.]

Teachers with exceptional conversational fluency will have to restrain themselves to keep within that part of the German language which their students are to practice. (Rehder, Thomas, Twaddell, and O’Connor, 1962).

[Implication #3: Teachers who really know the language might even be at some slight disadvantage in using Twaddell’s textbook.]

Do teachers really know a language in which they have limited fluency and in which they do not adequately “control” even the sentences of first year German? Is it a misrepresentation, then, to say that this book was designed so that it could be used by teachers who do not really know the language?

The other quote, used in a brief sketch of Empiricist-behaviorist learning theory, was that “the habit is the reality and the rule is a mere summary of the habit.” As one of my sophomores put it, this quote was the “topic sentence” of a section of Twaddell’s paper on “Meanings, Habits, and Rules” (1948). As such, the sentence stands alone quite well. In his “critique” Twaddell is again misleadingly selective in providing additional
context. Twaddell’s argument in “Meanings, Habits, and Rules” is that naive students mistakenly pay attention to rules and mistakenly regard grammatical habits as meanings. He says, “We have to learn to ignore that which is habit in the new language.” The learner, he says, “is hypersensitive to the habitual aspects of a new language; he sees meaning and choices where for the native speaker there is no meaning or choice.” When “the innocent freshman” asks how speakers of other languages can perform such “prodigies of split second choosings from among intricate arrays of grammatical forms,” Twaddell says:

Alas, we have given him the explanation. We have told the freshman why the unhappy speaker of French or Spanish or German or Tibetan has to go to all this cruel and unusual trouble in order to talk: It is because of the rules of his language. We know what these rules are. We know that a “rule” of a language is the analytical statement of one of the habitual aspects of that language. We know that the habit is the reality and the rule is a mere summary of the habit.

When Twaddell leaves out the “Alas” part of the quote, it almost seems as if Twaddell himself has accepted the explanation that “It is because of the rules of his language.” But with the “Alas” left in, it seems clear that the first “we” (not italicized) refers to the mistaken members of the teaching profession, and the second “we” (italicized) refers to Twaddell who knows better.

Twaddell furthermore objects that I mean something different by “rule.” Of course I do. That was the point in using the quote. I speak of rule-governed creativity and of the fact that the rules of grammar are psychologically real. For me grammatical habits are the automatized use of rules. But for Twaddell the habits are the reality and the rules are equated only with what I would call the “formulations” of rules. (cf. Diller 1971, chapter 3).

2. Ad hominem. It sometimes seems as if Twaddell’s main reason for discussing the quotes is not to set the record straight but to discredit this author who is alleged to have either an “inability to read or a disingenuous intent to mislead.” It is as if he wants to make the new trends go away by beheading the messenger who brings bad tidings.

I am not a logician, but I can say “All men are mortal. Socrates is a man. Therefore Socrates is a mortal.” Is the same argument more authoritative if said by a logician such as Aristotle? Twaddell questions my practical experience as if it mattered: “We are not told what foreign language Professor Diller teaches or has taught, nor at what level...” But the TESOL Quarterly reviews manuscripts for publication with names of the authors removed. An argument should stand on its own merits.  

1 Since Twaddell apparently believes in authority, however, and not in the ad hominem fallacy, perhaps I should say that I have been involved in teaching English as a Foreign Language for 13 years, and in five of those years I was teaching EFL full time (1 year in a bilingual school in Canada, and four years when I was in charge of the EFL program at Harvard). Furthermore, I have studied 10 foreign languages in formal settings with teachers who used a wide variety of methods.
At one point Twaddell goes beyond even plausible ad hominem argument onto very shaky ground indeed. He says, “But an expert on the subject—one who has published a book and articles about it—can be expected to have familiarized himself with the state of the art in the not too remote past.” Twaddell might have done well to check out the book itself which is actually very much an historical document and in which I refer to Twaddell himself at least 9 times.

Then Twaddell says that it would have been in order for me to have learned about the recent history of language teaching “through research and consultation with [my] older mentors before lifting a sentence from a 1948 context as though it were part of a controversy of the 1960s.” In the first place, I specifically used the quote in describing the situation before 1960. Secondly, I am old enough to have been part of that recent history. My undergraduate linguistics courses were all in pre-Chomskian descriptivism. My first teaching experience in an intensive course in English as a Foreign Language was also before I had studied generative grammar. The textbooks had me using mim-mem and pattern drill until half-way through the course when I decided that the method was bankrupt and I relegated the text material to the language lab. Thirdly, not only was my book originally a Harvard dissertation (with 51 pages of bibliography and at least two “older mentors” as advisors), I also corresponded with Twaddell when I was writing the dissertation, and spent a whole day in his office examining the textbook series which he edited. It is not that Twaddell merely forgot about our contact of 9 years ago. When he wrote to me two months ago announcing his intention to write a “brief hostile riposte” in response to my article, I reminded him of my previous consultation with him. I find it incredible that he can then suggest in his “critique” that I have not done research or consulted with older mentors.

3. Three minor points. (A) Twaddell is understandably sensitive about the way mim-mem and pattern drill has come to be referred to as the “audiolingual method.” His competitor managed to co-opt the name for the Audio-Lingual Materials (ALM), while Twaddell’s textbook series was struck with the less euphonious “Aural-Oral Sequences.” Actually, I, too, dislike the way mim-mem and pattern drill has taken over the terms “Audio” and “Lingual,” since it blurs the distinction between that method and other methods, including the direct method, which also use the audio and lingual modes.

(B) Twaddell faults my article for ignoring “the realities of age-group differences.” Of course there are age group differences; I have discussed them in my paper “Is there an ‘Optimum Age’ for Foreign Language Learning?” (1972). But it is much easier to adapt direct methods to different age groups because they use meaningful practice of the language instead of mechanical drill. Age differences thus become a much less serious issue from a methodological point of view. It is on the levels of technique and content that we must take age differences most seriously.

(C) Why does Twaddell reject out of hand as freakish such methods
as Asher’s Total Physical Response (which has gotten better results in less time with less work than conventional control classes have) (Asher et al. 1974), or Winitz and Reeds’ “Rapid Acquisition of a Language (German) through the Avoidance of Speaking” (1973) in which students can learn fifty words an hour? Probably the answer is partly that these methods emphasize listening ability and acquisition of knowledge instead of acquisition of a set of speech habits. In fact, the Winitz and Reeds method shows that people can learn to understand a language before they acquire any speech habits in the language at all.

The rationalist theory of language learning associated with generative grammar has re-opened the door to the direct method and has fostered various new language teaching methods, some of which will prove in the long run to be better than others. It seems inappropriate for Twaddell, a good empiricist, to be making a priori pronouncements against these methods without being willing to experiment or to examine new evidence.
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Karl C. Diller

Ney and Diller on Miquotes
It may well be that Diller’s interpretation of the Chomsky (1966) article is the authoritative one and it may also be that Ney (1974) errs in writing that “He (Chomsky) had also stated that his theories are largely irrelevant to the teacher of foreign languages” (p. 197). But, if this is so, the incorrect interpretation comes from the following statements by Chomsky (1966: 44):

My point simply is that the relevance of psychological theory to acquisition of language is a highly dubious and questionable matter, subject, to much controversy and plagued with uncertainties of all sorts. . . . Turning to linguistics, we find much the same situation.

REFERENCES
“Much Controversy”

I would agree with Ney and Chomsky that the relevance of psychological and linguistic theory to language teaching is “subject to much controversy” (this controversy is surely demonstrated by recent exchanges in the TESOL Quarterly Forum). But none of us—including Chomsky—has said that his own theories “are largely irrelevant to the teacher of foreign languages.”

Karl C. Diller
QUERY: In an earlier issue reference was made to a number of efforts since the middle of the past century to win acceptance for a new personal pronoun that would mean what the awkward phrase he or she means. In the section devoted to “Editorial Opinion” in the issue of the English Journal that appeared about the same time, the form s/he was suggested as such a pronoun, and the newspapers have since told of support for this form in the State Education Department of New York. what other forms have been suggested? And what are the advantages and disadvantages of each?

RESPONSE: The following androgynous third-singular personal pronouns have turned up in the past two or three years without anything that could be called research:

thon
heer, himer; hiser, hiser's
hesh, herm; hirs
tey, tem; ter, ters
s/he
il; ils; ilself

Along with the basic nominative or common-case forms, inflected forms are listed here where possible. Lack of space prevents any attempt at a full history of these proposed pronouns, but something should be said of the history of thon, hesh, and il at least. Thon was proposed in 1958 by Charles C. Converse, a musician and composer, lawyer, and writer, a convenient account of whom is to be found in Baker's Biographical Dictionary of Musicians (5th ed., 1972). Converse's thon was formed by a merging of that and one but was given the vowel sound of own. It gained listings in dictionaries publishing as late as 1949 at least. Hesh, rhyming with leash, was first employed in 1958 (and is still being employed) by Max S. Marshall, a microbiologist and writer one account of whom is to be found in Contemporary Authors (1965). Writers and editors have of course suffered most from the lack of an accepted he-or-she pronoun.

Unlike the other proposals for the needed new pronoun, il was not constructed by combining or closely imitating existing pronouns; instead, purely grammatical and phonological considerations were assigned primary importance. Among the consonant sounds not at present employed in the English
personal pronouns, /l/seems exceptionally suited to such employment. When stressed, /l/is to be pronounced like /ill/; in such a sentence as this should stop /l/, unstressed /l/is to be pronounced like the /le/ of topple, just as in this should stop her unstressed her is pronounced like the /er/ of stopper. One of the great strengths of the personal pronouns is that in most of their uses they are inconspicuous. Like it, you, and the nouns, /l/ uses a single common-case form where heer, hesh, and tey have distinct nominative and objective forms; like it, he, and the nouns, /l/ has a single possessive form. It is noteworthy that /l/ was proposed, in personal correspondence, by Dwight L. Bolinger, whose work on English language and general linguistic theory is both voluminous and universally respected, and who recently served as President of the Linguistic Society of America.

Actually any new pronoun of this type would be more useful if it were to mean what the phrase he, she, or it means, not just what the phrase he or she means. Such a pronoun could readily replace informal they in situations such as that illustrated in the following sentence:

If either a party or a politician wishes to survive, they must use the political process resourcefully.

(R L)

QUERY: Is ago used correctly in I got to Tokyo in November, but Professor Sakamoto had left two weeks ago. And what is the construction within such units as two weeks ago?

RESPONSE: For contemporary American practice at least, the use of ago in this sentence is apparently nonstandard. This judgment is based on (1) the opinions of an admittedly inadequate number of students of the language who have been consulted, (2) the judgment expressed in Wilson Follett's Modern American Usage (1966, p. 55), and (3) the definition given in the more permissive Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary (1973), "earlier than the present time."

The November of the visit to Tokyo spoken of in the sentence we are dealing with belongs not to the present but to the past. The situation is a little different in the following sentences:

Roberto arrived two weeks ago last Tuesday.
We settled in Cuernavaca three years ago last August.

Here ago means "earlier than a past time clearly related to the present." And instead of a past time clearly related to the present, we sometimes have a future similarly related.

Classes started a week ago tomorrow.

The construction found in two weeks ago is variously analyzed. In Otto Jespersen's highly respected Essentials Of English Grammar (1933, pp. 313-314) ago is described on the basis of its history as a past-participial form derived from the older form agone, and sequences such as two weeks ago are analyzed as sequences such as all things considered and all told
are analyzed. More recent analyses simply classify ago as an adjective or an adverb. Perhaps the most defensible analysis is that which treats two weeks ago and two weeks before (later, etc.) as modified-and-head units within which adverb heads are modified by what precedes them. This analysis is accepted, for example, in the Quirk-Greenbaum-Leech-Svartvik A Grammar of Contemporary English (1972, p. 281). In two weeks ago last Tuesday we can consider that the head word ago is also modified by the phrase that follows it, last Tuesday. More precisely, last Tuesday modifies the whole preceding phrase two weeks ago, much as in the new house the determiner the modifies not just house but new house.

(QL)

QUERY: In Suzette Haden Elgin's A Primer of Transformational Grammar (1975) we are told that Transformational grammar can do some things traditional grammar cannot. Is this true?

RESPONSE: The three examples Professor Elgin has selected to support her claim (pp. 21-22) certainly are not convincing. Anyone who really examines the best traditional grammars will have little difficulty finding the syntactic differences in pairs such as long-outworn John is easy to please and John is eager to please dealt with thoroughly. Thus in his treatment of “infinitive clauses” in the volume of A Grammar of Late Modern English devoted to “The Composite Sentence” (2nd ed., 1929, p. 764) H. Poutsma points out that the implied subject of an infinitive is sometimes indefinite, as in where ignorance is bliss, 'tis folly to be wise, and is sometimes suggested by something elsewhere in the sentence, as in to see Steerforth walk before us, arm in arm with Miss Creakle, was one of the sights of my life, where the possessive my can suggest the subject of the infinitive see. Poutsma's grammar is one of the classics; it is amazing that linguists should generalize about traditional grammar year after year and ignore Poutsma. Among recent traditional grammars, Ralph and Dorothy Long's System of English Grammar (1971) gives reasonably full attention to the implied “subjects of infinitival clauses” (pp. 126–127). As for the formation of yes-or-no questions, this certainly has been well described in numerous non-Transformational materials. It may be that Transformationalists are doing more with meaning relationships than traditionalists have done. But as they know very well, they have only scratched the surface.

Incidentally, Ms. Elgin begins her account of Transformational grammar by appealing to the “intuitive feeling” of the “native speaker” for support for the division of the elephant kicked over the lantern into the elephant and kicked over the lantern. This is the old subject-and-predicate division taught in the school grammar of the past, and is not satisfactory to analysts who treat predictor verbs as central in clauses, including clausal sentences. It would be difficult to prove that anyone is born convinced of the correctness
of the kind of division Ms. Elgin advocates here, and that the influence of
the old school grammar is not still at work.

(RL)

QUERY: In the January, 1975, issue of College English (p. 312) we are
told that at the Annual Business Meeting for 1974 the members of the
National Council of Teachers of English there present passed a resolution
affirming “the students’ right to their own language—to the dialect that
expresses their unique personal identity,” but stating the responsibility of
their teachers to provide opportunities for students to learn the conventions
of “what has been called written edited American English.” What lies
behind this resolution?

RESPONSE: A special issue of the NCTE journal College Composition
and Communication (Fall, 1974) gives at length the point of view of those
whose activities culminated in this resolution.

Underlying the resolution we have a strong (and completely laudable)
feeling that teachers of English must treat the spoken English of their
students with respect, however strange it may sometimes seem to them.
Students should not be heckled; what they need is to hear standard spoken
English used comfortably and naturally by people they like, and to want
to be able to use such English themselves.

Written English is a very different matter. The 1974 CCC resolution
on which the NCTE resolution was based (given on pp. 2–3 of the Special
Issue mentioned above) includes the statement that “language scholars long
ago denied that the myth of a standard American dialect has any validity.”
Part of the difficulty here is with the word standard, and can be dealt
with a little later. In 1950 Robert A. Hall published a still-influential (and
highly recommended) book to the first edition of which he gave the title
Leave Your Language Alone! In this volume Professor Hall denied that
there is any such thing “as good and bad (or correct and incorrect, gram-
matical and ungrammatical, right and wrong ) in language.” In the February,
1975; issue of Language Sciences (p. 12) Professor Hall still insisted that
“the idiolect is the only linguistic reality” and that “grammaticality or any
sort of correctness except the schoolbook type simply does not exist.” The
“schoolbook type,” of course, Professor Hall condemns. We cannot ignore
the point of view Professor Hall and others have expressed forcefully.

But apparently the great majority of “language scholars” working with
modern English have accepted the concept of what we can persist in calling
a “standard” for contemporary American English-and very similar “stan-
dards” for English as it is used in other parts of the English-using world.
It is noteworthy that the universally respected British Quirk-Greenbaum-
Leech-Svartvik A Grammar of Contemporary English (1972) deals at length
(pp. 16 ff.) with “standard English” of various types.

Used of varieties of English, the word standard seems to have become
offensive to some, somewhat as the word man has become offensive in some
of its long-established uses. Perhaps the occasional coupling of standard with substandard is responsible for this, at least in part. Certainly the word substandard should be avoided. Standard and nonstandard, however, seem to be about as good a pair of terms as we are likely to come upon. Surely they are preferable to right and wrong, good and bad, correct and incorrect, grammatical and ungrammatical. The trouble, of course, comes with the negative members of these pairs: nonstandard seems, on the face of it, less likely to offend than wrong, bad, incorrect, and ungrammatical.

It seems unlikely that edited would be paired with unedited. And do not both these terms suggest that acceptable written English normally involves the attention of editors? We must not underestimate the importance of editors, in everything from newspapers to books; but surely not all standard written English has benefited from their advice.
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If you have recently completed a research report, conference paper, monograph, bibliography, substantive information analysis, etc., or have prepared innovative instructional materials, maximize the effect of your findings by submitting them to ERIC/CLL. Documents should be sent in duplicate with a 200-word abstract to

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON LANGUAGES AND LINGUISTICS  
CENTER FOR APPLIED LINGUISTICS  
1611 North Kent Street  
Arlington, Virginia 22209  

CAL: ERIC/CLL SERIES ON LANGUAGES AND LINGUISTICS
Copies of A Selected List of Instructional Materials for English as a Second Language: Elementary Level and A Selected List of Instructional Materials for English as a Second Language: Secondary Level by Maybelle D. Marckwardt, and A Selected List of Instructional Materials for English as a Second Language: College Level by Robert P. Fox are still available free of charge from User Services, ERIC/CLL, 1611 N. Kent St., Arlington, Virginia 22209. Number 28
in the series, A Bibliography of American Doctoral Dissertations in Linguistics: 1965–1967 has just been published. It is also available from User Services, and contains a number of entries relating to English as a second language.

RECENT ERIC ESL ACCESSIONS

Unless otherwise indicated, the following ERIC accessions, announced in Resources in Education, may be read in their entirety from microfiche at one of the ERIC library collections or ordered from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service, Computer Microfilm International Corporation, P.O. Box 190, Arlington, Virginia 22210. Prices and ordering instructions are specified under each ED entry in RIE. ERIC/CLL will be pleased to provide upon request a list of the ERIC collections and sources of data base search services in each state as well as lists of ERIC/CLL publications.


The document describes a project designed to help the Asian adult bridge the language and cultural gap through a two-pronged approach to the problem: the development of curriculum materials designed to deal with the specific phonological and structural problems of the Chinese, Filipino, Japanese, and Korean students; and the sponsorship of in-service sessions for the purpose of giving the ESL teachers a better understanding of the socio-cultural and linguistic backgrounds of their students. The document is organized into three major sections: a progress report, a description of in-service training sessions, and instructional materials. Three in-service training sessions are described: (1) socio-cultural-economic backgrounds of the Chinese, Filipinos, Japanese, and Koreans; (2) the linguistic backgrounds of the Japanese and Koreans; and (3) the linguistic backgrounds of the Filipinos and Chinese. The instructional materials section provides phonological charts, structural charts, and a sample lesson. The lessons are situationally oriented, structurally sequenced, and designed to develop oral communication skills as well as reading and writing skills appropriate to the beginning level student. (Reports of the program through August 15, 1974 are available in ED numbers 103 704–6.)


It is believed that by focusing on the problems of advanced learners of ESL, implications can be drawn for issues in second language teaching and testing in general. Considerations are offered on the influence of structural linguistics and transformational generative linguistics as well as language acquisition theories on teaching and testing methodology. Tests which are a result of these ideas are criticized as overlooking considerations of validity, efficiency, scope, and meaningfulness. Wilkins' "notional syllabus" is suggested as a model of language testing whereby communicative tasks form the basis of what is termed "functional language analysis." For the employee who needs to use English in his job, language performance objectives should be based on job tasks, which require vary-
ing levels of language proficiency. A hierarchy of communicative functions, adapted from Fine and Wiley, is drawn up as a basis for further investigation into the nature of functional foreign language proficiency.


The purpose of the American Samoa program, Upgrading Language Abilities (ULA) funded under Title I Elementary Secondary Education Act, is to raise the English language proficiency of educationally deprived high school students to the point where they can successfully compete with native speakers in an English medium educational system unhindered by inadequate abilities in English. All four high schools in American Samoa are involved in ULA. There are about 1700 students in the program, 36 teachers and 34 classrooms. Each high school has a teacher resource center for the ULA program. ULA students receive 90 minutes of instruction daily in addition to their other classes. The scope of ULA encompasses several broad areas: classroom instruction for second language speakers, curriculum development peculiar to Samoan students, special instructional materials for Samoa, and teacher training. Teachers are involved in continuous inservice training to increase their competencies to teach students who speak English as a second language.


This manual is designed for the use of ESL students in the language laboratory. The manual consists of 30 lessons, each between 5 and 10 minutes in length. Every fifth lesson, beginning with lesson 10, is a review lesson. The emphasis is on punctuation. For a 15-week course, the materials are designed to be used twice a week during the regular language laboratory session. The instructor should be prepared to devote 10 to 15 minutes to each lesson, including correction time. The students should be able to correct their own errors and chart their own progress, and therefore minimal teacher supervision is required.


Fluency First is a Canadian instructional program in oral English as a second language for illiterate adults. This manual is intended for instructors in the program. Part 1 describes the program's development, its objectives, and student placement. Part 2 discusses the program methodology. Part 3 deals with class organization, instructor qualifications, and the role of mother language and target language in the classroom. In addition, courses entitled Skills of English, Communication in English, and Preparation for Reading and Writing are discussed in detail. Appendices include information on: Fluency First and basic literacy courses; phonemic notation; contracted forms; sound exercises; irregular verbs; grammar items; selected topics and words in the program; and reference books useful to the instructor.

This paper describes the history and development of a program of college preparation and language study for Spanish speakers at Canada College in Redwood City, California. The first step was to draw the local Spanish-speaking population to the college; this was done through a Latin festival. The second step, an assessment of educational needs, resulted in an ESL program designed specifically for Spanish speakers. Following the success of this program, courses were established which could be taught bilingually in Spanish. Further curriculum innovations included secretarial courses and Spanish for Spanish speakers. Plans for the future include bilingual/bicultural teacher training and vocational training.

Currie, William B. European Syllabuses in English as a Foreign Language. (Paper presented at the University of Toronto Conference on Second Language Teaching Methodology, May 1975.) 26 pp. ED 107 152

This paper attempts to characterize what seem to be key movements in the teaching of EFL at various levels in Europe. These movements reveal that semantic approaches to language teaching are widespread. Recent research into the effectiveness of teaching methods has demonstrated how difficult it is to show whether audiolingual or cognitive code approaches are effective. A strong movement toward semantic syllabuses has developed partly as a consequence of this, and work undertaken through the Council of Europe has concentrated on this since 1969. The characteristics of these syllabuses are that they aim to provide language structure which will be effective in communication situations, and attempts are being made to specify an inventory of (1) those structure necessary for control of the fundamentals of English, French, Spanish, etc. (up to “threshold level”) and (2) those notions which a speaker would require to handle defined language exchanges. An interesting relationship may be traced between these semantic syllabuses and traditional rhetoric. A further link exists between the logic of speech acts and “notional” inventories. Examples of semantic syllabuses in use in Europe are drawn from adult English teaching and certain elementary school projects.
Announcements

The tenth annual TESOL Convention will be held in New York City at the Americana Hotel, March 3–6, 1976. Georgetown University’s School of Languages and Linguistics will sponsor its 27th Annual Round Table Conference March 11–13. For more information, please write or call: Dr. Clea Rameh, Chairman, Georgetown University Round Table, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C. 20057; Tel: (202) 625-3021.

Other meetings of interest to TESOL members:

Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, April 1–4, New York City.
Annual Meeting of the Linguistics Association of Great Britain, April 3–5, Edinburgh, Scotland.
Central States Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, April 22–24, Detroit, Michigan.

Publications Received

12. Error Analysis in the Classroom. Patricia B. Powell.
16. Listening Comprehension in the Foreign Language Classroom. Terence Quinn and James Wheeler.
CATESOL: Occasional Papers, No. 2, Fall 1975. California Association of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.

*Idiom* 6, 1, Fall 1975. The New York State Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages and Bilingual Educators Association.


*Language Learning* 25, 1, June 1975.


*Passa* 5, 1, June 1975. Special Issue: Individualized Instruction. Central Institute of English Language, Bangkok.


PUBLICATIONS AVAILABLE FROM THE TESOL CENTRAL OFFICE

Reference Guides . . .


Other TESOL Publications . . .


Program of the Ninth Annual TESOL Convention, March 4-9, 1975, Los Angeles. Contains 95 abstracts of papers presented at the Convention. 183 pp. Paper. $1.50 to TESOL members; $2.00 to non-members.

Program of the Eighth Annual TESOL Convention, March 5-10, 1974, Denver, Colorado. Contains the abstracts of papers presented at the Convention, and art from the Southwest, 159 pp. Paper. $1.00 to TESOL members; $1.25 to nonmembers.


Series of papers delivered to ESL teachers at the Lackland Air Force Base, Texas, in 1974. All xerox, paper.
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"In Search of a Method," Clifford Prattor. Paper delivered at the 1974 MEXTESOL Convention. Xerox, 10 pp. $0.75.

From other publishers . . .

Back Issues of the TESOL Quarterly
(1967) Vol. 1 #2,3,4. $1.00 each number
(1968) Vol. 2 #1,2,3,4. $1.00 each number
(1969) Vol. 3 #1,2,3,4. $1.00 each number
(1970) Vol. 4 #1,2,4. $2.00 each number
(1971) Vol. 5 #1,2,3,4. $2.00 each number
(1972) Vol. 6 #1,4. $2.00 each number
(1973) Vol. 7 #1,2,3,4. $2.00 each number
(1974) Vol. 8 #1,2,3,4. $3.00 each number
(1975) Vol. 9 #1,2,3,4. $3.00 each number
Total for All Volumes, 1-9. $89.00
ORDER FORM

TESOL

Date ____________________

455 Nevils Building
Georgetown University
Washington, D.C. 20057

Please ship to: _____________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________

ZIP ____________________
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_____ Check, cash, or money order for $_________ enclosed (POSTPAID).

_____ Please bill me (a postage charge will be added to orders not pre-paid).

_____ I am a TESOL member.

Please Make Checks Payable to TESOL.

Prices include postpaid surface mail. Please remit sufficient extra postage for first class or airmail delivery. Prices subject to change.
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Bilingual Educators, Present and Future

STUDY IN PUERTO RICO
AND EARN 12 CREDITS TOWARD
THE A.M. DEGREE

JULY-AUGUST 1976


For details, call or write:
Helen J. Kelly, Director
Office of Off-Campus Programs
School of Education, Health, Nursing,
and Arts Professions
New York University
23 Press Annex, Washington Square
New York, N.Y. 10003; (212) 998-2896

Requests concerning advertising should be directed to:

AARON BERMAN
Department of Foreign Languages
Sonoma State College
Rohnert Park, California 94928
Telephones: (707) 887-7371
(707) 795-2351
ESL Texts and References from Newbury House:

- **ENGLISH I: A BASIC COURSE FOR ADULTS.** Donka Schmidt-Mackey. Meeting immediate needs of newcomers to the language. Learner's Book only $2.75
- **A FIRST BOOK IN COMPREHENSION, PRECIS, AND COMPOSITION.** I.G. Alexander. Consolidating the advanced beginner's achievements. $1.95
- **IDIOMS IN ACTION.** George Reeves. A stimulating workbook utilizing situational dialogues. $3.95
- **INTERMEDIATE COMPREHENSION PASSAGES.** Donn Byrne. Accelerating self-confidence. $1.95
- **TECHNIQUES IN LANGUAGE CONTROL.** Richards & Gibson. Introduction to “Every Man's English.” $10.95, paperback $5.95
- **FROM SUBSTITUTION TO SUBSTANCE.** Paulston & Bruder. Goldmine of model grammar patterns. $5.95
- **ADVANCED ENGLISH VOCABULARY.** Helen Barnard. Five progressive workbooks beyond the first 1,000 words. Each $4.95, Teacher's Guide $1.50
- **READING YOUR WAY TO ENGLISH.** Susan Fitzgerald. Selections from outstanding writers for progress & grammar review beyond 2,500 words. Three books each $4.95
- **DEVELOPING READING SKILLS.** Markstein & Hirasawa. Twelve good approaches for advanced classrooms. $4.95
- **EFFECTIVE TECHNIQUES FOR ENGLISH CONVERSATION GROUPS.** Julia M. Dobson. Developing confidence plus competence. $3.50
- ** PATTERNS OF ENGLISH PRONUNCIATION.** J. Donald Bowen. A student guidebook, with emphasis on informal, colloquial speech. $6.95

Visit us at Booth 26!

ALSO SEND FREE BROCHURES ON NEWBURY HOUSE BOOKS ABOUT

- Linguistics
- Psycholinguistics
- Sociolinguistics
- Bilingual Education
- Language Pedagogy

Mail to:

NEWBURY HOUSE PUBLISHERS, Inc.
68 Middle Road • Rowley, Massachusetts 01969
Language Science • Language Teaching • Language Learning
Your Professional Organization Announces...

three new volumes to help you keep in touch with the developing profession

On TESOL 74
Ruth Crymes and William E. Norris, editors
23 selected papers from the Denver TESOL Convention by
Arapoff-Cramer  Gomez  Milon  Saville-Troike
Burruel  Greenbaum  Ney  Schumann
Cohen  Iwataki  Nilsen  Strevens
Di Florio  King  Oller  Taska
Dobson  Larsen  Puhl  Wanat
Duque  Lee  Rodrigues
Finocchiaro  Marckwardt  Salimbene

edited by Leslie Palmer and Bernard Spolsky
Under the heading of Test Development are five papers on Techniques, four on Oral Tests, and five on Specific Test Instruments. Part II—Theory and Interpretation of Language Tests—includes two papers on Validation, three on Sociolinguistic Aspects, and two on Cultural Considerations. The closing article deals with Trends in Second Language Testing.

compiled by Charles Blatchford
A directory, including program descriptions, of teacher training programs in the ESL field in the U.S. and Canada.

All three available from TESOL, 455 Nevils Building, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C. 20057
New Directions in Second Language Learning, Teaching, and Bilingual Education

Edited by Marina K. Burt and Heidi C. Dulay

CONTENTS:

- Organizational Policy: TESOL and Bilingual Education
  J. E. Altis, A. Peña

- Second Language Acquisition
  H. C. Dulay/M. K. Burt, A. K. Fathman, S. Krashen/C. Madden/
  N. Bailey, B. P. Taylor, J. C. Richards, H. D. Brown

- Research on Teacher Behavior and Curriculum
  R. L. Allwright, J. O. Gary

- Bilingual Education: Issues in Program Planning
  J. C. Lovas, R. Jacobson

- Regional Dialects in Bilingual Education and ESOL
  A. A. Valencia, E. Acosta-Bolén, J. P. Milon

- Nonverbal Communication in the Classroom
  C. J. Nine-Curt, H. M. Taylor

- Human Relations, Affect, and Communicative Competence

- General ESOL Teaching Techniques
  J. B. Olsen, G. Scott, B. K. Taska, R. Skirble

- Teaching Specific Aspects of English
  F. A. Cartier, D. Larsson

- Teaching Writing Skills
  L. A. Arena, P. J. Angelis, F. M. Schumann

- Teaching Reading Skills
  J. A. Elias, V. F. Allen, R. L. Cathcart

- New Developments in Testing
  L. F. Bouton, J. W. Oller

380 pp.

ORDER FROM: TESOL, 455 Nevils Bldg., Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.
20057.

$5.00 for TESOL members, $6.50 for non-members.
NEW RELEASES
FROM REGENTS
PUBLISHING CO.

The Proud Mexicans
by Robert Decker and Esther Tiscareño Márquez

The Proud Mexicans is an unusual collection of biographical sketches of sixty Mexicans who have contributed significantly to the growth of Mexico. It is written in clear English and in a crisp narrative style.

Each one of the biographies has been selected for variety, historical value, and cultural significance. Patriotism, courage, devotion, creativity, and perseverance are illustrated through the lives of soldiers, clergymen, statesmen, and humanitarians. Special attention is given to the heroes of young people and to the early struggles of Mexicans who achieved fame later in life. Also included are the stories of many who rose from poverty to become defenders of the oppressed and leaders of their people.

Word Games in English
by Dwight Spenser

This book is intended for word game enthusiasts who want to improve their vocabulary in English and therefore increase their conversational skills. An outstanding feature of Word Games in English is the variety of games and activities the students can choose from. Some of these mind-challenging activities include anagrams, hidden animals, mixed-up musical instruments, and scrambled words, to name just a few. In addition, students are not limited to any one particular section; they are free to skip around and pursue their individual interests. It is an interesting and absorbing way to reinforce skills in English vocabulary.

Little Stories for Big People
by Sol Gonshack

These mini-stories, designed for low intermediate to advanced students of English, are amusing, emotion-centered vignettes that have universal appeal. Charmingly illustrated, these stories present the humorous side of life through natural, conversational English. New vocabulary and idiomatic expressions are stressed. Each anecdote is followed by questions for discussion that encourage students to talk about their own experiences in English.

Write for additional information

REGENTS PUBLISHING COMPANY, INC.
2 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., 10016
MOTIVATION! COMPREHENSION! COMMUNICATION!

All this and more with New Horizons in English from Addison-Wesley

A six-level series of texts, tapes, teachers' guides, and workbooks which gives speakers of other languages a totally new perspective for learning English.

Lars Mellgren and Michael Walker, with editorial assistance from John Upshur, created New Horizons in English with a most important goal in mind — keeping teenage and young adult students interested. Mellgren and Walker are the authors of over fifty English textbooks used by more than 4 million students around the world. With this dynamic and innovative new series the authors demonstrate how important motivation, comprehension, and communication are.

Teachers need to motivate: A new supplement of this series is the NEW HORIZONS IN ENGLISH PICTURE SHOW. The twenty-four imaginative cards in the “Picture Show” are designed to encourage oral response and stimulate free speech production from students. Teaching strategies for each visual are printed on the back. Students can also work in pairs or small groups for more oral practice.

Students and Teachers need to comprehend: New Horizons contains contemporary dialogues using everyday English and imaginative illustrations which help to clarify meaning. A “spiraling” approach is used throughout the series. This is a built-in review and reinforcement mechanism whereby English is taught in small steps with continual review. The NEW HORIZONS IN ENGLISH SCOPE AND SEQUENCE CHART graphically illustrates this teaching method and enables teachers to plan their courses of study.
Students need to communicate: Students move quickly from mechanical to meaningful language practice. A unique amount of communicative activities distinguishes New Horizons from other programs. Students are given the opportunity to express opinions and feelings about themselves and their world.


EXPLORING ENGLISH — The first title in this new series is a guided composition book by the authors of New Horizons. It is for beginning to intermediate level students.

READING . . . PLUS — High-interest, low-level topics complete with a variety of language exercises.

CARTOON READERS — Contemporary topics in a cartoon format by the authors of New Horizons. The innovative illustrations are designed to appeal to young readers.

For full details and sample copies of the books and demonstration tape, teachers are invited to write to:

Samuel B. Warren,
Marketing Director,
Special Projects
International Division
Addison-Wesley

/**
ADDISON-WESLEY PUBLISHING COMPANY, INC.
Reading, Massachusetts 01867
Offices: Menlo Park, California • London • Amsterdam • Don Mills, Ontario
Manila • Singapore • Sydney • Tokyo
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Regents introduces

English For Careers

These books acquaint students with particular vocational or professional areas. Each gives a broad introduction to the use of English in a specific field, without being a complex training manual.

The books in this series are designed for students at the high intermediate or advanced levels in English. The ENGLISH FOR CAREERS series familiarizes these students with the new vocabulary, using the structural patterns they already know, and improves their ability to communicate in English on subjects that are totally relevant to their career objectives.

Each unit begins with a glossary of special terms used in a specific vocational area. The glossary is followed by an exercise which tests the students' comprehension and gives practice in the new vocabulary. In the reading, these new terms are used again within a contextual frame of reference that is interesting and informative. Each reading is then followed by questions for comprehension and discussion. The exercises at the end of every unit consist of problems and situations that students may encounter in actual work. In these drills, students use both the specialized vocabulary and other new words within familiar structural patterns.

A great deal of successful language learning comes from experiences the students find personally significant.

THE ENGLISH FOR CAREERS series is the means by which students can apply their English language skills to career-oriented, high interest content.

TITLES FOR 1976 PUBLICATION

The Language of:
- Air Travel in English:
  - Ground Services
- Air Travel in English:
  - In-Flight Services
- The Petroleum Industry in English
- Computer Programming in English
- International Finance in English:
  - Money and Banking
- The Air Force in English
- The Army in English
- The Navy in English
- Tourism in English
- Hotels in English
- Restaurants and Catering in English
- Hospital Services in English
- Accounting in English

(additional titles to be released in 1977)

For full information write:

REGENTS PUBLISHING COMPANY, INC.
2 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y. 10016
This Publication is Available in MICROFORM from...

Xerox University Microfilms
300 North Zeeb Road,
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106
(313) 761-4700

PLEASE WRITE FOR COMPLETE INFORMATION
4 keys to language mastery for your ESL students

1. Foundations for Teaching English as a Second Language: Theory & Method for Multicultural Education
   by Muriel Saville-Troike, Georgetown University
   Providing practical strategies for classroom instruction plus specific problem-solving techniques, this new book equips ESL teachers with the basic psychological, linguistic, and cultural information they need to teach effectively in bilingual, multicultural programs, and the regular classroom at all levels.
   January 1976 200 pp. Paper $4.95

2. Developing Listening Comprehension for ESL Students: The Kingdom of Kochen
   by Ted Plaister, University of Hawaii
   Through lectures and exercises about the mythical kingdom of Kochen, this book gives students practice in understanding lectures, and taking notes and exams. It trains them to extract pertinent information from lecture-language, covers a wide variety of subject matter, and can be used in a one or two semester course with intermediate to advanced students.
   January 1976 288 pp. Paper $3.95

3. Yesterday and Today in America: Intermediate ESL Reader
   by Anna Harris Live, University of Pennsylvania
   Presents 48 short, high-interest readings on distinctively American topics for ESL students. Arranged in historical sequence and in order of language advancement, each reading is accompanied by explanations and exercises that help students develop competency in the use of English and become familiar with American background — from Ben Franklin to ecology.
   August 1976 260 pp., Cloth $5.95

   by Jean Prianinkas, University of California, Berkeley
   Particularly useful for ESL students who plan to study in American colleges, this book provides an intermediate level review of all the grammatical patterns of English to prepare students for more advanced reading and writing of English. Contains many contextualized classroom exercises to provide students with practice in the conventions of written English.
   Ready 352 pp. Paper $6.95


New from Prentice-Hall
THE MOST WIDELY ACCEPTED SERIES OF TEXTBOOKS IN THE AMERICAS
FOR THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH AS A SECOND/FOREIGN LANGUAGE

More than 4,000,000 copies in print

Used by Binational Centers in every capital city in Latin America

A series of nine, graded texts featuring valuable techniques proven to be effective, plus nine supplementary Student Study Booklets, incorporating the most recent developments in the small-group approach. This approach, pioneered by this Institute, is now used in all of our classes (8,500 students per bimester -- 14 years of age and above). A "package" course with all necessary complementary materials.

$2.40 per text A Student Study Booklet is included free with each text
$3.20 Comprehensive Teacher's Guide for Books 1-8
$2.00 Diagnostic analysis, Books 1-9
$26.80 plus mailing charges: total value of set

Instituto Mexicano Norteamericano de Relaciones Culturales, A. C.
Hamburgo 115, México 6, D. F.

Please send me:

_____ Special introductory offer

Enclosed is bank draft for $13.40.

_____ Free Catalog

Address: ____________________________
SEE ALL THE EXCITING
1975 COLIER MACMILLAN MATERIALS
AT BOOTHs 13 AND 14

ON SPEAKING TERMS: Conversational English for Advanced Students.
By Jimmy G. Harris and Ron Hube

FUN WITH ENGLISH: Puzzles and Word Games. By Philip Hauptman and Jack Upshur

HARD TO LEARN THAT ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE BLUES:
A Stereo Record or Cassette. By Laurie Wellman and Donald R. H. Byrd

NO HOT WATER TONIGHT: An Elementary Reader for Adults.
By Jean Bodman and Michael Lanzano

NEW LIVES IN THE NEW WORLD:
Original Stories by Non-Native Speakers of English.
Edited by Dan Allen and Richard Hall

TWENTIETH CENTURY AMERICAN SHORT STORIES:
Nine Unabridged Classics. Edited by Jean A. McConochie

TOURISM: BOOK I: Charters, Tours, and the Package Deal. By Vivien Worsdall

AND LEARN WHAT'S COMING IN 1976

FORESTVILLE TALES. By Aaron Berman
A reader consisting of eight folktales from different countries for elementary school-aged students of ESL. The stories are told in words and pictures.

SPECIAL ENGLISH FOR TOURISM: BOOK II. By Vivien Worsdall
Students interested in pursuing a career in the multilingual tourism industry will welcome this latest addition to this series of books and tapes.

SPECIAL ENGLISH FOR BUSINESS. By Sharon Abrams and Hugh Wales
Basic business practices and vocabulary presented in easy-to-follow dialog format.

ESL SONG ALBUM #2. By Donald R. H. Byrd and Laurie Wellman
Ten new songs for beginning students of ESL. Music gives your class the chance to relax and learn without a textbook.

LET'S WRITE IT RIGHT. By Donald R. H. Byrd and Gloria Gallingane
The authors have developed a unique system to take the mystery out of good writing skills.

COLLIER MACMILLAN INTERNATIONAL, INC.
866 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022
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THE JILAP INSTRUCTIONAL SYSTEM

The JILAP System is an elementary (K-4) teaching and learning system of individualized instruction designed

1. to teach English to learners for whom English communication skills are especially difficult. It is designed for learners of English as a second language, for learners of English as a second dialect, and for learners who do not succeed with traditional English language programs;
2. to prepare the professional teacher with the classroom management and organizational skills necessary to conduct an open, decentralized, and individualized classroom;
3. to provide the professional teacher with classroom instructional materials that are specially designed to make individualization possible.

The JILAP System is the way in which the learners, the teacher, the materials, and the classroom interact with one another. The System is characterized by the multiple roles that each of these plays to achieve the overall goals of JILAP, which are:

1. For the learner: To learn how to learn; that is, to become self-directed in learning; to learn to make choices that are appropriate and consistent with that learner's abilities, styles of learning, rates of learning, preferences, and interests. To become an effective listener, speaker, reader, and writer of English.
2. For the teacher: To become a professional teacher; that is, to become a manager of learners and learning, rather than a dispenser of knowledge. To manage effectively an individualized language classroom.

The JILAP System is packaged in four stages. Each stage consists of a Management Program, an Oral English Program, a Reading Program, and a Writing Program.

JILAP is presently installed in Title I, Title VII, and ESAA programs from coast to coast. The reactions from teachers and school administrators point to a major breakthrough in literacy and language learning. To avail yourself of detailed information on the JILAP Pre-service Training Course and on the JILAP classroom materials, fill in the coupon below and send it immediately to: JACARANDA PRESS
872 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge, Mass. 02139

To: JACARANDA PRESS 872 Massachusetts Ave. Cambridge, Mass. 02139
☐ Kindly send me detailed information on the JILAP Instructional System.
☐ Kindly have a Jacaranda representative call on me the week of __________

Name & Title ____________________________
Institution ____________________________
Address ________________________________ State __ Zip __
Tel. no. ________________________________
IT'S A DOUBLE ANNIVERSARY!

TEN YEARS FOR TESOL—
TWELVE FOR THE
COLLIER MACMILLAN ENGLISH PROGRAM

Collier Macmillan and TESOL have had a long and fruitful association. For twelve years, we have brought you diverse English as a second language teaching materials. For ten years, we have looked forward to attending TESOL meetings, where we have the opportunity to meet with you and hear your suggestions and opinions firsthand. We know what you want. Whether you are looking for a basic program or a supplementary aid, we are sure you will find what you need in the Collier Macmillan English Program.

And we're not standing still. The Collier Macmillan English Program is ongoing and expanding to fulfill the requirements of those who are learning English as a second or foreign language—for school, business, or pleasure.

You can learn about the exciting new materials we're publishing. Send us your name and address—we'll put you on our mailing list. You'll get information on new projects as well as Inter-View—our quarterly newsletter that provides a forum for the exchange of your ideas on teaching English as a second or foreign language.

Fill out this form and bring it to Booth 13 or 14. Or mail it to:

COLLIER MACMILLAN INTERNATIONAL, INC.
866 Third Avenue
New York, New York 10022

☐ Please add my name to your mailing list for Inter-View and information on new materials.
☐ Please send me your catalog.

NAME

INSTITUTION

ADDRESS