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Formal and Informal Linguistic Environments in Language Acquisition and Language Learning

Stephen D. Krashen

While some studies indicate that adults can efficiently utilize informal linguistic environments for second language acquisition, other studies suggest that the classroom is of greater benefit. This conflict is resolved in three ways. Evidence is presented to support the hypothesis that informal and formal environments contribute to different aspects of second language competence, the former affecting acquired competence and the latter affecting learned competence. Second, a distinction must be made between informal environments in which active language use occurs regularly and those in which language use is irregular. Finally, data is presented suggesting that the classroom can be used simultaneously as a formal and informal linguistic environment, a result that is consistent with reports of success with language teaching systems that emphasize active language use.

The question of the optimal linguistic environment for the adult second language student has been approached empirically in the last few years in a number of studies. It is a question of obvious importance to the teacher and language student and has also become a matter of concern to the psycholinguist interested in the nature of primary linguistic data, or linguistic input necessary for language acquisition to occur.

In these studies, two sorts of linguistic environments are contrasted; artificial, or formal environments, found for the most part in the classroom, and natural, or informal environments. Krashen and Seliger (1975) have noted that all language teaching systems utilized for the adult use activities in which linguistic rules are presented one at a time and in which some sort of feedback (error correction and/or error detection) is present. Other features of formal instruction (e.g. deductive presentation of rules) are not common to all teaching methods and, while their presence may sometimes be catalytic, are not necessary for learning to take place. Krashen and
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This paper is limited to the question of second language syntax. For recent data relating to the question of linguistic environment and acquisition of phonological competence in adult second language, see Suter (1975).
Seliger also note that these features (rule isolation and feedback) do not seem to be present in informal environments. Seliger also note that these features (rule isolation and feedback) do not seem to be present in informal environments.

Several studies, which will be considered in some detail below, suggest that adults can not only increase their second language proficiency in informal environments, but may do as well or better than learners who have spent a comparable amount of time in formal situations. Other studies present evidence that seems to indicate that “exposure” has little or no effect on increasing adult second language proficiency. In the literature review that follows, it will be argued that these studies are not definitive. Even taken as a group, they do not settle the issue of whether adults are able to acquire language in informal situations with any real efficiency. Following the survey, new data and a new model of second language competence will be presented, and it will be argued that formal and informal environments make contributions to different aspects of second language competence.

We are thus considering two hypotheses:

1. The informal environment can be efficiently utilized by the adult second language learner.
2. Formal study, or its essential characteristics, is significantly more efficient than informal exposure in increasing second language proficiency in adults.

**Review of Literature**

Upshur (1968) compared three groups of ten adult ESL students enrolled in a special summer session for law students at the University of Michigan. The first group, who scored highest on the entrance test (Michigan Examination in Structure), attended seminars and classes during the seven week period that were conducted in English, but had no extra ESL classes. The second group, who scored lower on the entrance test, also attended law classes and had one hour daily of ESL in addition. The third group scored lowest on the pre-test and had two hours of ESL daily in addition to law classes. At the end of the summer, an alternate form of the pre-test was given. While all three groups showed some improvement in performance, Upshur’s statistical analysis revealed “no significant effects on language learning attributable to amount of language instruction,” and concluded that “foreign language courses may at this time be less effective means for producing language learning than the use of language in other activities.” This is a strong version of hypothesis 1.

Upshur’s conclusion appears to be consistent with his data. Krashen and Seliger (1975) suggest, however, that motivated second language students...
are able to provide themselves with the essential ingredients of formal instruction without going to class. Rule isolation can be done by recourse to a text or by asking informants about grammar, while feedback is available when helpful friends correct the learner. Without extensive probing of the private lives of those involved in the study, however, this alternative explanation is untestable. Nevertheless, it may be true.

Mason (1971) is also interpretable in these two ways. In this study, certain foreign students at the University of Hawaii were allowed to follow regular academic programs without extra ESL, despite the fact that their English placement scores indicated that they should be enrolled in English for foreign student classes. Post-tests given at the end of the semester showed no significant difference in increase in English proficiency between those excused from ESL and controls who took the required ESL classes. This data is again consistent with hypothesis I, but other explanations are available, including the “self-study” hypothesis described above, which is consistent with hypothesis II.

Carroll (1971) studied the second language proficiency of American college seniors majoring in foreign languages (French, German, Russian, Spanish). About 25 per cent of the total population of senior language majors that year (N = 2,784), were given form A of the MLA Foreign Language Proficiency test in their language. Carroll’s major finding was that, on the average, foreign language majors performed rather poorly: The median score on the MLA corresponded to a Foreign Service Institute rating of 2 plus (out of 5) (between “limited working proficiency” and “minimum professional proficiency”). Of more interest here is the relation found between attainment and measures of time spent in different linguistic environments. A strong relationship was found between time spent abroad (in the country where the target language was spoken) and test performance, with those who reported a year’s study abroad doing best, followed by those who reported a summer abroad or a tour. Both of these groups outperformed those who had never been in the country where the target language was spoken.

A significant relationship was also found between test performance and the extent to which the target language was used in the students’ home. (Native speakers of the language majored in were excluded from the study.) Those reporting frequent parental use of the target language had higher scores than students who reported occasional use, and this latter group outperformed those whose parents did not or could not speak the target language at home. These two findings (time abroad and parental use) are consistent with hypothesis I but could fit hypothesis II: Use of the language at home may have increased motivation to study, and time spent abroad may have meant more formal study and/or more chances for self-study, as well as increased motivation to learn formally.

3 The listening sub-test alone was used in this and subsequent analyses, as intercorrelations among sub-tests was high.
Hypothesis II also receives independent support from Carroll's study. It was found that those who started foreign language study early (grade school) achieved better scores. Those who studied the target language in high school did better than those who started in college (German majors were an exception to this). This relationship was independent of that found between proficiency and time spent in informal environments. Carroll notes that “the simplest explanation of this finding is that the attainment of skill in a foreign language is a function of the amount of time spent in its study.” (p. 136). The following series of studies also argue for hypothesis II.

Krashen and Seliger (in press) and Krashen, Seliger, and Hartnett (1974) claim that when the effects of “exposure” and formal instruction are compared, it is reliably the case that more instruction means higher proficiency, while more exposure does not necessarily mean more proficiency in ESL. Both studies compared instruction and exposure by matching pairs of foreign students for one of these variables and seeing whether the student who excelled on the other was more proficient in English.

The measure of the amount of formal instruction was simply the students’ report of the number of years he or she had studied English in a school situation. No questions were asked concerning factors such as the methodology used, the presence or absence of a language laboratory, how often the class met, the amount of time the student devoted to his studies, or grades received.” In Krashen and Seliger (in press), exposure was defined as the product of the number of years the student reported having spent in an English speaking country and how much English the student said he spoke every day (on a scale of one to ten). In Krashen et al. (1974) students were asked to indicate years spent in an English speaking country and also to indicate how much English they spoke each day (on a scale of one to four). Subjects with the same number of years spent in the country where English was spoken and the same report of speaking were considered to have the same exposure score.

Student samples differed somewhat. In Krashen and Seliger, subjects were registered in an intensive, 20 hour per week institute designed to prepare foreign students for study in American colleges. In Krashen et al., subjects were enrolled in a part-time extension program; these students were, on the average, older, and many were permanent residents or citizens of the United States. The measure of proficiency used in the first study was teacher ranking (which correlated significantly with local placement tests), and in the second study the Michigan Examination in Structure was used.

In the first study, six out of 14 pairs of students matched for years of formal study of English were consistent with the hypothesis that more exposure meant more proficiency; that is, in only six cases did the student with more exposure show a higher ranking than his partner with less. Similarly, in the second study, more exposure was associated with a higher score in only 10 out of 21 cases, which is consistent with the hypothesis that exposure has no consistent effect on second language proficiency. When
students were matched for exposure scores, however, it appeared to be the case that more instruction did indeed mean more proficiency. In the first study, this was true of seven out of nine cases, and in the second it was true of eight out of eleven cases, which in both studies was statistically significant.

Krashen, Jones, Zelinski, and Usprich (in press) arrived at similar results. Placement test scores for 116 students of English as a second language in an extension program were correlated with students’ reports of years of formal study and years spent in an English speaking country. The results (table one) confirm the conclusions of the studies described above: years of formal instruction reported is a better predictor of English proficiency than is time spent in an English speaking environment. While exposure, here simply the report of years spent in an informal environment with no estimation of how much the S used the target language, was shown to have a significant effect, it accounted for relatively little of the variation in test scores.

Discussion of Literature Survey

The last three studies described above (Krashen and Seliger, in press; Krashen, Seliger, and Hartnett 1974; Krashen, Jones, Zelinski, and Usprich, in press) provide explicit support for hypothesis II. These three studies, however, share a feature that prevents them from being convincing counterexamples to hypothesis I. “Years spent in an English-speaking country” need not be equivalent to time spent in a meaningful informal linguistic environment. There is an important difference between the measures used in the Upshur, Mason, and Carroll studies and in the measure used in the Krashen et al. series. In the former group of studies, we can be fairly certain that the second language student was involved in real and sustained second language use situations. Upshur and Mason’s subjects were university students who were taking courses taught in English. In addition, they

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Correlation with years in an English speaking country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michigan (Exam. in Structure)</td>
<td>.18 p &lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition</td>
<td>.22 p &lt; .025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloze</td>
<td>.24 p &lt; .01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Correlation with reported years of formal ESL study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michigan (Exam. in Structure)</td>
<td>.50 p &lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition</td>
<td>.34 p &lt; .005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloze</td>
<td>.47 p &lt; .001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* From Krashen, Jones, Zelinski, and Usprich (in press).
were also probably taking part in the social life of their respective schools. Carroll’s “year abroad” students were also highly likely to have been engaged in real communicative use of the language, as their primary purpose for going abroad, in most cases, was to have additional opportunities to converse with native speakers of the language they were studying. In the Krashen et al. series, we have much less knowledge of just how much or what percentage of time was spent in real and sustained language use. In the first two of the three Krashen et al. studies, the exposure measure included a self-rating of how much English the subject spoke each day, but as Krashen and Seliger (in press) point out, this estimate may not have been true of the entire time the S spent in the second language environment: Some may have spent a fair amount of time in the United States before attempting to use English regularly. In the third study of this series, only “years in an English speaking country” was considered. A significant number of subjects who did not use the language regularly may have affected the results for the sample. Thus, the Upshur, Mason, and Carroll subjects appear to have been involved in an intensive, daily, and often demanding second language environment. The Krashen et al. subjects may have varied much more with respect to the amount of real communicative use they made of their second language.

While the characteristics of utilized primary linguistic data (termed “intake” in recent years) have not been determined in detail, mere “heard language” is probably insufficient input for the operation of a language acquisition device at any age. The difference between “heard language” and “intake” is emphasized in Friedlander, Jacobs, Davis, and Wetstone (1972), who examined the linguistic environment of a child who at 22 months was judged to be nearly as fluent in Spanish as she was in English. The child heard Spanish primarily from her father. This input, according to Friedlander et al., made up only 4 per cent of the child’s total “heard language” but was 25 per cent of the language directed at the child. This confirms the hypothesis that the relevant primary linguistic data is that which the acquirer is actively involved with: The total linguistic environment is less important.

The results of the studies reviewed here can all be considered as consistent with hypothesis I. The Upshur, Mason, and Carroll studies are direct evidence, while the Krashen et al. series may be interpreted as showing that acquisition from the informal environment requires regular and intensive language use. Hypothesis II, however, also receives no counter-evidence from any of the studies. The correlations between years of formal study and proficiency found by Krashen et al. are reliable and are consistent with Carroll’s interpretation of his data. The “self-study” reinterpretation of Upshur’s and Mason’s results, as well as Carroll’s “year abroad” and “home use” data, remains a plausible, but difficult to test, explanation.

In the following section, it is proposed that modifications of hypotheses I and II are correct: Formal and informal environments contribute to
second language competence in different ways, or rather, to different aspects of second language competence. To support this hypothesis, a new model of second language competence will be described, and an attempt will be made to give a clearer picture of second language testing. Finally, some new cross-sectional data will be considered. These data eliminate certain alternative explanations presented in the literature survey and confirm several hypotheses presented above.

The Monitor Model for Adult Second Language

Language acquisition in children proceeds by a process which is called acquisition (henceforth a technical term). If the child is allowed the necessary input during some critical period, complete competence in the target language (first or second) appears to be inevitable (Lenneberg 1967; Krashen 1975a) Explicit tutelage is unnecessary (Cazden 1965; Fathman 1975) and acquisition proceeds along fairly predictable stages, governed by strategies common to all acquirers approaching all languages (Slobin 1973; Ervin-Tripp 1973; Krashen, Madden, and Bailey 1975).

Most adult second language teaching methods assume that adults do not acquire, but depend wholly on conscious learning (also a technical term from here on). There is, however, some suggestive evidence (other than that presented in the literature survey in this paper) that adults are able to acquire language to at least some extent. An example of this evidence is Braine's study (Braine 1971). In his study, subjects attended to and repeated sentences in an artificial, meaningless language. After such exposure, it was found that many subjects were able to discriminate “grammatical” from “anomalous” sentences with a high degree of accuracy. It is of great interest that many of the subjects who could perform this task were unable to state the grammatical principles involved. Rather, they reported that they relied on whether a given sentence “sounded right.” It is plausible that in these cases language acquisition was occurring not language learning, stimulated, perhaps, by the fact that the linguistic environment was basically that of attending to primary linguistic data and not the rule isolation and feedback that characterizes formal language learning.¹

I have argued elsewhere (Krashen 1975b; Krashen and Pon, in press; Krashen, Sferlazza, Feldman, and Fathman, forthcoming) that adult learners “supplement” their (usually) imperfectly acquired competence by means of consciously learned linguistic knowledge in a definite way: Conscious linguistic knowledge acts only as a “monitor,” altering the output of the acquired system when time and conditions permit. This “intrusion” generally takes place at some stage prior to the actual utterance. Second language performers with highly developed monitors are thus able to out-perform their acquired competence when conditions allow this conscious knowledge to intrude (e.g. when sufficient processing time is available or when not distracted).

¹ Other arguments supporting the hypothesis that adults are able to acquire are presented in Krashen (1975b).
A full justification of the monitor model will not be attempted here. An important argument that supports the monitor model is, however, relevant to the question of the relation of formal and informal environments to second language proficiency, and will be briefly summarized. It appears to be the case that certain tests of English as a second language yield “natural” difficulty orders for adult learners, that is, on these tests adults and children learning English as a second language agree with respect to which structures are easy and which are hard. Bailey, Madden and Krashen (1974), using adult students of ESL, successfully extended Dulay and Burt’s (1973) finding of a similar difficulty order for eight grammatical morphemes in English. In both studies, groups of subjects had the same difficulty order regardless of first language (see also Dulay and Burt 1974), and the order found for children and adults was very similar. Fathman’s (1975) finding that children with different first languages show similar difficulty orders for 20 sub-tests of the SLOPE test of oral English proficiency was also extended to adults (Krashen, Sferlazza, Feldman, and Fathman, forthcoming). Again, no difference was found between different first language groups, and the difficulty order found for adults was not significantly different from that found for children. The testing instruments used in both these studies (The Bilingual Syntax Measure and the SLOPE test) apparently tap only the acquired system in adults, as sufficient processing time was not available for monitor use. This explains the similarity seen across acquirers of different ages, as similar principles govern acquisition in all cases. When extra processing time is available, however, the consciously learned grammar is utilized as a monitor, and we see less agreement between learners of different ages and linguistic backgrounds. Larsen-Freeman’s important study (Larsen-Freeman 1975) showed this, as did our pilot (Krashen, Sferlazza, Feldman, and Fathman, forthcoming).

Acquisition and learning may provide a fundamental distinction in tests designed for adult second language students. Tests that require rapid responses (usually but not necessarily oral), in which self-correction is either not allowed or possible, tap primarily acquired knowledge, while “slower” tests (usually but not necessarily written) allow the intrusion of conscious knowledge of the target language and thus tap both acquired and learned competence. (Note that it is difficult to measure learned or conscious knowledge directly. One would have to subtract “slow” test results from results on tests that allowed monitoring.) This distinction may be more basic than the “discrete-point-integrative” division that is often made. Note that a common argument for the validity of integrative tests is their high degree of concurrent validity, namely, their correlation with discrete-point tests. What this shows is that both kinds of tests are measuring the same thing. Integrative tests, like the cloze (see Oller 1973) are for many reasons a valuable addition to our supply of measures, but, when they allow a fair amount of processing time (like the cloze and composition) they involve the same aspects of second language competence as discrete point tests do.
Contributions of Formal and Informal Environments

It is not simply the case that informal environments provide the necessary input for acquisition while the classroom aids in increasing learned competence. The re-interpretation of the Krashen et al. series as well as the Friedlander et al. data described above suggests, first of all, that informal environments must be intensive and involve the learner directly in order to be effective. One might then distinguish "exposure-type" informal environments and "intake-type" environments. Only the latter provide true input to the language acquisition device. Second, it seems plausible that the classroom can accomplish both learning and acquisition simultaneously. While classwork is directly aimed at increasing conscious linguistic knowledge of the target language, to the extent that the target language is used realistically, to that extent will acquisition occur. In other words, the classroom may serve as an "intake" informal environment as well as a formal linguistic environment.

Since acquired knowledge contributes to performance on all second language proficiency tests (see discussion above), even those (the majority) that allow monitoring, it is therefore no surprise that studies show increased achievement with contextualized drills (Jarvis and Hatfield 1971; Oller and Obrecht 1969). Similarly, reports of great success with new language teaching systems that provide a great deal of active involvement of the student (e.g. Gattegno's Silent Way, Asher's Total Physical Response Method, Newmark's Minimal Language Teaching System, and Winitz and Reed's Method; see Diller, 1975, for discussion) also confirm the hypothesis that acquisition and learning can proceed simultaneously.

Both of these points are illustrated and confirmed by new data on proficiency and linguistic environment using the SLOPE test with adult learners of English. The subject pool was the same as used in Krashen, Sferlazza, Feldman, and Fathman, described above: Sixty-six subjects were tested, with thirteen first language groups being represented. Some had studied English intensively while others had encountered English only in informal environments. Table two shows the relationship between overall SLOPE scores and measures of exposure. Despite our findings that the SLOPE, as administered, is primarily an acquisition measure (because it yielded a "natural" difficulty order and allowed no monitoring time), no relationship was found between the measure of exposure and SLOPE scores.

### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Years in English speaking country</th>
<th>Years of formal English study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLOPE scores</td>
<td>( r = .014 ) ( p = \text{ns} )</td>
<td>( r = .42 ) ( p &lt; .001 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Partial correlations were used, as years in English speaking country and years of formal study were correlated, \( r = -.24 \), \( p = .01 \). Ordinary correlations were computed, however, and were quite similar to those reported above; for SLOPE and exposure, \( r = .003 \), and for SLOPE and formal study, \( r = .40 \).
These results confirm the suspicions voiced above about using “exposure-type” measures of informal linguistic environments, and underline the claim that active involvement is necessary for acquisition to take place. Thus, if the SLOPE is a test of acquired competence only, it must be concluded that the question asked in the Krashen et al. series is a measure of time spent in “(exposure-type) environments only, and this apparent counter-evidence to hypothesis I disappears entirely. No studies in the literature survey, however, are counter-evidence to the hypothesis that an “intake-type” informal environment may be quite efficient in increasing adult second language proficiency.

The significant correlation in table two between years of formal instruction and SLOPE scores supports the hypothesis that the classroom can be of value, and in fact generally is of value, in language acquisition as well as in language learning.

While all studies described here are consistent with a revised version of hypothesis II, that in general formal instruction increases second language proficiency, none of the studies gives evidence to indicate that “learning” does indeed take place in formal situations in addition to acquisition. Note that “learning” occurs in the Upshur and Mason studies only under the “self-study” hypothesis, while in the Krashen et al. series the evidence for learning is the positive correlation between years of formal study and proficiency. The SLOPE data indicated, however, that the classroom second language experience may also influenced the acquired competence, and we thus have no direct evidence that learning takes place at all. The hypothesis that the classroom contributes to acquisition only is sufficient to predict all the data covered above, as all proficiency tests, according to the monitor model, involve some acquired competence.

There is, however, evidence that learning exists and does, in most cases, increase proficiency. Our pilot data (reported in Krashen, Sferlazza, Feldman, and Fathman, forthcoming) indicate that increasing response time, which supposedly allows consciously learned knowledge to intrude and alter responses, causes an increase in overall scores in the SLOPE test. An interesting case of an advanced ESL performer (Krashen and Pen, forthcoming) also supports the hypothesis that learning exists and may increase performed accuracy by supplementing the acquired output. Our subject performed nearly perfectly in situations where monitoring was possible but made “errors” in casual speech. She could, however, correct nearly all these errors and could also describe the grammatical rules she broke. This suggests that consciously learned competence was involved in those situations in which she made less errors.

**Conclusion**

For the child, only acquisition is possible. Thus, “intake” informal environments are sufficient. The class can at best provide only additional intake, and it appears to be the case that when children have access to rich
intake environments, extra classes in second languages are not necessary (Fathman 1975; Hale and Budar 1970).

The Upshur, Mason, and Carroll studies are consistent with the hypothesis that intake informal environments can be quite beneficial for adult second language acquisition, and the distinction between intake and exposure type informal environments disallows the Krashen et al. series as counter-evidence to hypothesis I. The ineffectiveness of exposure type environments is confirmed by the lack of relationship between reports of time spent in the country where the target language was spoken and the results of an “acquisition” proficiency test. No studies provide counterevidence to a modified version of hypothesis II: Formal environments are also beneficial. The need to decide between the original formulations of hypotheses I and II is obviated by an independently justified model of adult second language competence in which intake informal environments and formal instruction make different sorts of contributions to second language competence.

Table three summarizes the implications of the literature survey and SLOPE data in terms of the monitor model. Both formal and informal linguistic environments contribute to second language proficiency but do so in different ways: An intensive intake informal environment can provide both the adult and child with the necessary input for the operation of the language acquisition device. The classroom can contribute in two ways: As a formal linguistic environment, providing rule isolation and feedback for the development of the monitor, and, to the extent language use is emphasized, simultaneously as a source of primary linguistic data for language acquisition.
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The Habit of Perception in Foreign Language Learning: Insight into Error from Contrastive Analysis

Janet Ross

Languages signal different meaning distinctions through their grammatical units as well as through their vocabulary items. Many errors in a foreign language result not merely from inaccurately learned grammatical items or structures formed on the basis of the learner's native language. They may, instead, represent failure to understand the meaning distinctions indicated in the grammar of the new language that are not marked by a specific form in the native language, or failure to choose habitually the correct form to represent the meaning even when the distinction is understood. For example, the native speaker of English may "know" the concepts expressed by the Spanish subjunctive, yet fail to indicate them in every case by use of a subjunctive form when using Spanish.

A task of the learner of a foreign language is thus to perceive the new meaning distinctions marked in the grammar of the language he is learning and then form the habit of indicating such distinctions when using the language. In other words, he must think in terms of new conceptual units. A task of the language teacher is to devise material to help the learner do this, so that habits of perception and indication of meaning distinctions as well as production of new grammatical forms and vocabulary items become automatic.

Teachers of a foreign language are concerned with the types of errors that their students make and the possible reasons for such errors. There are those who tell us that language learning is habit formation, or a type of conditioning, and imperfectly formed habits cause error. (Skinner 1957; Lado 1964) This premise is the basis of the audio-lingual method, with its emphasis on repetition, especially of segments that differ in their formation from those of the native language, where habits of expression in the old language may interfere with expression in the new. (Fries 1945; Lado 1957) Others contend that language learning is a cognitive process, dependent on understanding. (N. Chomsky 1965; Fodor and Katz 1964; McNeill 1966; Bever 1970) Studies of child language development seem to indicate that a child does not learn merely by imitating the parent. In fact, it is often difficult to get him to imitate exactly. He may be born with a perceptual ability apparently peculiar to the human species that allows him to perceive not just differences in concrete objects—shapes, forms, and the relationships between them, or other impressions he can get through his senses—but also differences in abstractions, which he associates with verbal forms. As he matures he be-
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comes capable of making finer and finer differentiations in his perceptions, that is, to identify finer distinctions in meaning and to handle a larger number of abstractions in more complex arrangements. (Lenneberg 1967; C. Chomsky 1969; Ervin-Tripp 1973). Learning a new language, then, depends on use of this perceptual ability.

Both habit and cognition may play roles in aspects of language learning; yet neither one alone accounts for the complexity of the process by which one learns to use a second language accurately—that is, not only to use vocabulary items and grammatical structures that are correctly formed, but to use them in contexts where they are appropriate. The acquisition of this skill depends on an aspect of foreign language learning that I believe is not always sufficiently emphasized, an aspect that a type of contrastive analysis points out. Transformational grammarians tell us that languages are essentially alike in that they have a universal deep structure, or underlying semantic-syntactic base. (Chomsky 1965; Fillmore 1968; Di Pietro 1971) That is, they all consist of utterances showing such essential relationships as actor-action, object-condition, event-time of occurrence. They indicate through their vocabulary and grammar meaning distinctions that can be perceived by all mankind, but differ in the ways these distinctions are expressed and in the concepts that are marked or made explicit by grammatical forms. My thesis is that a task of the learner of a new language is to perceive the new meaning distinctions that the language signals, especially those marked by special grammatical units, and then form habits of thinking in terms of these distinctions. We might say that he is forming new habits of perception as he learns to think in terms of new conceptual units.

Concepts that are expressed by grammatical features in a foreign language that are not present in one’s own are perhaps more readily apparent than those in the native language that the foreign language does not have. For example, the native English-speaking student of German, French, or Spanish must perceive concepts expressed by the subjunctive that are largely unmarked in English, as the distinctive English subjunctive forms have for the most part disappeared. The English speaker can learn the subjunctive forms in these languages through memorization aided by pattern practice. He can also perceive the distinction in meaning indicated by the Spanish verb in the sentences, “I collect butterflies which have blue wings,” in which “have” is expressed by tienen, the indicative, to state an actual fact, and “I am looking for butterflies which have blue wings,” which uses the subjunctive tengan to express a contingency. But he may have trouble in transferring this understanding to use in a new context because he has not formed the habit of noting and marking by a special grammatical form the distinctions in meaning which the native speaker has internalized by living with the language. Another problem for the English-speaking learner of Spanish or Portuguese is understanding and then remembering to indicate the distinctions in meaning indicated by the verbs ser and estar, both of which are rendered in English by to be. A special problem in learning Japanese is the system of subject
marking. The particles wa and ga placed after the noun both indicate the subject, but the situations in which ga is chosen rather than wa are extremely difficult for the English speaker to grasp.

In English, the conceptual basis for use or omission of the article is a persistent problem for most non-native learners. For Spanish, French, or German learners the problem is not great, as the concept of specifying by use of an article exists in these languages, although the lack of an article before “non-count” non-definitized nouns may cause error. The native speaker of a language such as Persian (Farsi), however, must learn to think in terms of quite different concepts in regard to noun marking, as must the English speaker who learns Persian. Persian has a system of pointing out nouns by the use of a suffix /i/. For example:

I saw a man. (mard-i expresses man + pointing marker)
The man that I saw . . (mard-i expresses man + pointing marker)

The relative clause, my Iranian students tell me, indicates the specificity in the second case and a differentiation in the pointing marker is not needed. But when the subject under discussion is known to both speaker and listener and thus needs no designation, the suffix /i/ on the noun is not necessary. Thus there is no common basis for comparison of Persian and English, as the concepts being expressed through the grammar are not congruent.

Another problem in English is the meaning of the passive voice. English may express the result of an action performed by an agent by the use of the passive, as in the sentences:

The window was broken by the boys.
The book was written by a famous author.

A condition or description is indicated by a similar verb form, but without the prepositional phrase:

The window was broken.
The customers were satisfied.

Here the past participle has the force of an adjective. A stative verb, however, whether transitive or intransitive, also expresses a condition, but cannot take the passive form. Sentences such as:

* An accident was happened.
* A secret was contained by the box.

are impossible in English. In contrast, Persian, Japanese, and German use different passive forms for the result of action caused by an agent and for a condition. In Persian, stative verbs indicating condition have the same form as the passive that indicates a condition or situation. Thus to the Persian the English sentence, *“An accident was happened,”* seems a normal pattern by analogy with his own language.

English verb forms for tense and aspect likewise cause problems. The distinction between action happening at the moment or continuing over a
period of time, indicated by a form of be and a present participle, as opposed to permanent condition, indicated by the present tense, is a feature of English grammar that perhaps is not paralleled exactly in another language. French has a passé composé that is similar in form to the English present perfect, yet does not correspond with it exactly in meaning.

The frequency of error when the native and foreign languages mark different meaning distinctions through their grammatical forms is indicated in a thesis recently completed for the Master of Arts degree by one of my students from Afghanistan (Ebrahim 1975), who analyzed errors in a group of compositions written in English by students in her university in Kabul. Of 220 errors, 150, or 68.4% of the total, seemed to result from failure to observe the distinctions in meaning indicated in English grammar: that is, failure to use the appropriate grammatical structure to express the meaning in a particular context. She felt that 46% of these 150 form-meaning association errors stemmed from the fact that the same meaning distinctions were not observed in the grammar of her native language, Dari. In other words, although the Dari speakers had been taught the English grammatical forms and what they meant, they were thinking in terms of meaning distinctions marked by the grammar of their own language. Below is a summary chart of the types of errors and percent attributed to interference.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Errors in a Group of English Compositions Written by Afghan Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect form to indicate meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrectly formed word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammatical structure incorrectly formed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An important point is that 68.4% of the errors dealt with meaning distinctions, which touch the deep structure of language, while only 31.6% (20.4% + 11.2%) concerned surface phenomena alone. Furthermore, while 46% of the meaning-distinction errors were attributed to interference in comparison with 44% of those dealing with surface forms, 31.4% of the total number of errors represented interference from differences in meaning distinctions marked by the grammars of the two languages, in comparison with 5.2% attributed to differences in surface formations.

Interference between languages because of habits of indicating different meaning distinctions does seem to exist, and there is no simple method for overcoming it. The solution seems to require more than pattern practice, as
such drills do not generally put the structures into a larger context and thus provide opportunity for perception of the meaning differentiation which is the basis for the choice of form. It requires more than explanation, as “knowing” or perception of the meaning expressed by a form does not guarantee the ability to make the correct choice automatically when using the new language, when a person is in the habit of thinking in terms of other meaning units, or perhaps does not really feel the necessity of indicating distinctions that his own language does not express. A non-native user of English can perhaps explain what principles govern the use or omission of the English article. Sometimes, in fact, he may give a better explanation than the native, though he may make errors in use. On the other hand the native speaker of Persian “knows” when to add the suffix /i/ to a noun and when not, and the Japanese chooses the particle ga rather than wa as a subject marker even though he may have trouble explaining to a non-native the reason for his choice. The perception of the meaning distinctions may be at a sub-conscious level in one’s native language, and it is difficult to verbalize about the differentiations. However, since choice is involved, some cognitive process, not mere habit, seems to be in operation.

This paper will not attempt to present specific exercises to form habits of thinking in terms of new meaning distinctions, but some general types of procedures seem called for. New conceptual units and their associated forms need to be presented, not just in contrast with the native language, but in contexts that will reinforce the distinctions within the language being learned. Much of our effort in foreign language teaching in recent years has been directed to output. Perhaps there should be more attention to input, both in quantity and kind. This could mean increased use of short selections for reading and listening that illustrate intensively a few points at a time. The reading and listening might take place more than once, to allow for “internalization” of form and meaning before the student practices the forms or uses them in a guided communicative situation, perhaps first by answering questions on the passage or discussing it in such a way that he repeats structures from it in a meaningful context. Opportunity then needs to be provided for using the structures in similar contexts. The child in learning his native language has a period of input before he uses the language forms. The adult, because of maturity, should grasp more easily the concepts that the forms differentiate, especially when the structures and meanings are systematically presented. He may, however, find it harder to form habits of thinking in terms of the concepts he has identified and of indicating them when using the language, perhaps because habits are formed more easily early in life and because his already ingrained habits of thinking in his own language interfere.

This paper has not considered interference in pronunciation that comes from habits of producing sounds in a manner different from that required by a new language. But, to summarize, it is the new perceptions demanded by the grammatical structure of the new language that are important sources
of error in learning a foreign language, at least after the forms themselves
and the vocabulary items have been mastered. We have noted the 31.4%
of errors that were found in one study to result from interference in as-
associating form and meaning correctly as compared with the 5% that repre-
sented using structures that paralleled the native language. The percentage
of form-meaning errors could be expected to be larger to the degree in
which the new language differs from the native in the concepts marked in its
grammar. Along with this interference in thinking in terms of new meaning
concepts may be a certain resistance to indicating a differentiation that is
not made in the grammar of one’s own language. If one’s native language
does not designate countability by the use of an article with a noun as in
English, or the distinction between permanent condition or state at the
moment as indicated by the verbs ser and estar in Spanish, the foreign lan-
guage student may think, “Is this distinction really important?”

In studying a foreign language one must learn the surface forms and
vocabulary units. But a person who has really mastered a language other
than his native one has gained an understanding, consciously or subcon-
sciously, of the meaning distinctions made by the language forms, and then
developed the habit of thinking in terms of these distinctions so that he
chooses the correct form automatically. Learning to think in terms of new
conceptual units is not an easy task. Language instruction should provide
for automatizing the perception of meaning distinctions as well as the pro-
duction of the words and structures.
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Phonological Variability in Pronunciation
Instruction: A Principled Approach*

Wayne B. Dickerson

Variability is in the nature of an ever-changing language. The language teacher cannot responsibly dodge variability but must arrive at a realistic strategy for coping with it. Such a strategy is outlined here. Its realism is derived from an understanding of sound change in language and of the language-level (as opposed to dialect-level) goal of the student.

Sound change has affected the phonemic inventory, the phonemic word classes, and the phonetic composition of phonemes in every dialect. The teaching strategy developed here acknowledges such sound changes and uses this information to promote the student's language-level goal. This is accomplished by avoiding the dialectal dogmatism which arises out of the phonemic approach to teaching. In place of the phoneme is the language-level concept of contrast unit. In the contrast approach to pronunciation, the teacher eliminates from instructional materials all instances of variability in phonemic inventory and phonemic word classes, that is, all phonological variability. But the teacher does nothing to eliminate or modify his or her allophonic repertoire, or phonetic variability, although tolerance in accepting known variants is encouraged.

In recent years ESL teachers have become increasingly aware of the fact that there is a wide range of acceptable variation in pronouncing standard English. We hear both [hwat] and [wat] for what, both [rut] and [ruwt] for root, both ["adəlt] and [ədəlt] for adult. This awareness has been fostered in large measure by the writings of a small number of researchers such as Allen (1973), Bowen (1963), Davis (1972), Labov (1970, 1971), McDavid (1958), Marckwardt (1963), and Shuy (1967), and by the widening availability of dialect and sociolinguistic courses in teacher training programs. Coming into focus are these facts: (1) Each native English-speaking teacher has a facile control over enormous variability; (2) there is even greater variability in the language beyond that which we ourselves control; and (3) our students bring into the classroom exhibits of English variability picked up from past learning, in addition to the variability resulting from their own acquisition process. In the pronunciation classroom, then, three sources of language variation converge: the teacher, the subject matter, and the learner. From responsible teachers arises the inevitable question: How can I cope with these sources of phonological variability in my pronunciation?

* The author is especially indebted to Lonna Dickerson, Rebecca Finney, and William Pech for their generous and constructive criticisms of an earlier version of this paper.
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class: Do I teach [hwat] or [wat], or neither, or both? Should I use my pronunciation of root and adult or what my textbook suggests? Should I accept from my students only what I model or should I allow variant pronunciations? Is inconsistent production acceptable, or is it better to insist on only one pronunciation whether or not it is mine? The question of phonological variability in the classroom is addressed here particularly as it relates to the regional dialects of English.

The Phoneme as the Instructional Target

In ESL texts, the object of pronunciation instruction is to teach the student to distinguish the phonemes of English orally and aurally. The phoneme, however, is not neutral as to dialect. As Weinreich (1954) and Smith (1968)—both dialectologists—have tried to show, a phoneme is a dialect-specific unit, because it is the sum of its dialect-specific allophones and their distributions. As the allophones differ from dialect area to dialect area, so do the phonemes. That is, a phoneme labeled /aw/ and containing the allophone [ew] is a different phoneme from the one labeled /aw/ but consisting of [aw] and [aw], and both are different from the /aw/ phoneme which has the allophone [a-w]. Thus, while all three phonemes are used in their respective dialects for the words now and brown, the phonetic variability underlying the phonemes makes each different.

Besides differing in their allophones, dialects also differ in the number of phonemes they have and the words which contain the phonemes. That is, besides phonetic variability, there is phonological variability from one region of the English language community to the next. An ESL text which presents a phoneme not shared by other dialects (e.g., /hw/) is exhibiting its regional bias. The same judgment of dialectocentrism can be leveled against the text which drills a phoneme (e.g., /j/) with words pronounced differently elsewhere (e.g., garage, corsage).

Although it is undoubtedly unintentional, the unchecked phonemic (i.e., dialect-oriented) approach to materials promotes a particular dialect of English. It raises one dialect above other equally acceptable dialects and suggests, if only implicitly, that English everywhere is like that dialect. For the sake of the student who will be exposed to many dialects and many different sets of phonemes, the question should be raised: Is the phoneme really the appropriate target for pronunciation instruction?

The Contrast as the Instructional Target

The answer to this question must be, no; the target lies at a level above the dialect, above the phoneme. The point that Weinreich, Smith, and others have emphasized is that there is a language-level structure which unifies all English dialects. That structure requires that each dialect provide a way to make a certain minimum number of vowel, consonant, and suprasegmental contrasts. To meet this requirement, each dialect makes the contrasts using its particular phonemes, constructed from its particular allophones. The task
of the student, then, is to learn the language-level structure of contrasts. For example, the student should be able (1) to discriminate aurally among the vocalic contrast units in *beast, baste, best, bust, boast, boost*, etc., regardless of the dialectal origin of the speaker, and (2) to produce orally these contrast units without necessarily being dependent on the phonemic rendering of one and only one dialect. To promote aural discrimination, the advice of Bowen (1963) stands: In every way possible, expose the student to different varieties of standard English. To promote oral production, materials must be developed which do not restrict the student to a single dialect.

Unfortunately, the idea of a contrast unit as target will not find immediate acceptance in ESL pedagogy, because the phoneme is so well established. Proponents of the phoneme will argue that it is still an adequate instructional goal. Two of their main arguments are discussed below.

The first argument for the phoneme as target attempts to recognize dialect differences. The text writer can say simply that he accepts another dialect of standard English as a valid model equal to his own. Then, in class the teacher can use his or her own phones to represent the phonemes of the text. That is, a text listing *half, dance, and path* under /æ/ allows the teacher to use the allophones [a] “broad a” or [æ], depending on his or her dialectal background. This approach, implicit in many texts, is an attempt to redefine (and, thus, to misdefine) the phoneme by raising it to the pan-dialectal level—the level of the contrast. One problem with this approach, however, is that there are more than allophonic differences from dialect to dialect. There are also differences in the inventory of phonemes and in the words which contain the phonemes. Another, more serious problem will be discussed below. In short, this approach, which starts with one dialect and permits allophonic substitutions, is not adequate.

The second argument for the phoneme as target can be made in conjunction with the argument cited above. In order to recognize dialect variation and, at the same time, preserve the phonemic basis of a text, the author may go beyond simply encouraging allophonic substitutions. He may, in fact, go so far as to draw attention to regional differences in phonemic inventory and illustrating words. At present, however, as Allen (1973) notes in his survey of materials, there is very little awareness of the permissible variation in standard English pronunciation among text writers; this is indicated by their drill materials and by the absence of commentary on variability.

Not only is such commentary largely absent, but even where present, it is not properly used. In some cases, dialect differences in phonemic inventory and example words are acknowledged but ignored, thereby preserving the author’s dialect. In other cases, the differences are noted and the author simply encourages the teacher to use his or her own dialect (allophones, inventory, words). As an example, in one text where the authors’ low-vowel inventory contains the /ɔ/-/o/ contrast, the advice to the teacher whose inventory has only /a/ is that the /a/-/ɔ/ contrast should nevertheless be
taught (Nilsen and Nilsen 1971:xii): “In teaching a contrast which he does not practice and cannot discriminate, the instructor might prefer to rely instead on an assistant to whom the contrast is natural.” The authors ignore the fact that the contrast is variable by insisting on their preferred usage. They follow the advice of Bowen (1963) that this contrast should be taught in ESL classes. But another textbook author, one whose low-vowel inventory has no /ə/, states that the /a/-/ə/ contrast “is the only nonobligatory contrast provided in the drills” (The Institute of Modern Languages 1963: iv). The author is suggesting that the teacher use what he or she is accustomed to. In either case, the phoneme is preserved, either the author’s or the teacher’s. And also preserved is the narrowness implicit in the phoneme—the dialectocentrism of the author or the teacher.

In sum, there is no place for the phoneme in pronunciation materials, unless the student wishes to learn the teacher’s particular dialect. This may indeed be the case of the student who wants to master only British RP (Received Pronunciation). But for the majority of students whose objectives are not so narrow, the phonemic approach is an inefficient way to learn language-level contrasts. Time wasted in teaching nonuniversal contrasts and in correcting acceptable variants is time unfairly stolen from the student who might otherwise be working on ways of making essential contrasts. In short, it is not enough to design a text which simply makes it easier for each teacher to promote his or her own dialect. Needed instead is a text which employs dialect information in a principled way to teach language-level contrasts, not phonemes. Such an approach is presently being used at the University of Illinois and is outlined in the following section.

Teaching the Contrast through the Phoneme

As we have seen above, it is not the job of the pronunciation teacher to promote his or her dialect over other legitimate varieties of English pronunciation. However, the reality of the teaching situation is that the teacher’s only resources are the phonemes in his or her dialect. The central question of this section is: How can the teacher use his or her own phonemes to teach the necessary contrasts but, as much as possible, without insisting on his or her dialect to the exclusion of others? How should the teacher’s phonemes—their number, allophones, example words—enter into lesson materials?

Phonemic Word Classes

Phonemic Word Classes. Since the phoneme is central, the teacher must understand more about his or her phonemes than simply how they are defined. It is important to see the phoneme as the result of past and ongoing change in the language. This point of view will lead to a statement of teaching priorities which arises directly out of the nature of sound change.

As previously discussed, the sound systems in the many dialects of English are shaped by a language-level “master plan.” The master plan consists basically of contrast units (identified below by double slashes, // //).
The past and ongoing history of sound change, however, has had, and continues to have, three effects on how dialects implement the master plan, that is, how they represent the contrast units. Two of the effects have already been noted briefly. The first is the dialectal difference in the allophones which make up the phonemes representing each unit. The second is the dialectal difference in the number of phonemes in a dialect, as sound change merges and divides the phonemes. Besides these two effects, there is a third which warrants special consideration.

The third effect of change is related to the words in each dialect which display the phonemes. Each contrast unit at the language level is found in a set of words. That set can be called a contrast unit word class. At the dialect level, a phoneme also appears in a set of words. We can refer to those words as a phonemic word class. The contrast unit has been stable for many hundreds of years. However, certain words in the contrast unit word class have been so affected by change in the various dialects that the phonemic composition of the words has been altered. When this happens, the words move from one phonemic word class to the next. The movement, however, is not random; it is governed by environment—the vowels, consonants, and stress patterns surrounding a particular phoneme. Such environmentally governed movement is the third effect of change on the sound system.

To illustrate, we can take the lax vowel unit /i/, as in fit and fist. Members of the /i/ contrast unit word class fall largely into two configurations, iC# and iCC (where C=consonant and #=end of word). In many dialects, the presence of a postvocalic /r/, as in fir and first, has the effect of centralizing the vowel. That is, in those dialects, words with the /i/ before a final or preconsonantal /s/ joined the /s/ phonemic word class. An opposite movement occurring in some dialects tenses /i/ word class members which have a postvocalic back-velar nasal, as in sing, think. Such words from the /i/ word class moved to the /iy/ word class in the dialects participating in this change.

These, then, are movements of /i/ word class members under the pressure of sound change operating in discrete environments. Environments and their representative words which no longer share a common pronunciation with other /i/ word class members can be referred to as outbound. They are, however, outbound only for the dialects in which the above changes are in operation. Since these movements have not affected all dialects, the environments (and words) are variable. Other outbound movements have spread throughout the language community. When the change is complete, we refer to these environments (and words) as invariant or nonvariable. An example of an outbound movement which has become invariant is the change which affected words in the /i// word class which end in /nd// or /ld//, like mind (but not mint or mink) and wild (but not will or wilt). These words left the lax vowel category and joined the /ay/ word class in one dialect after another until the change had touched all dialects. They are now part of the /ay/ word class.
If all the variable and nonvariable outbound environments are excluded from //i//, what remains is a core of words which in all dialects are pronounced alike with whichever phonemes are used to represent the //i// contrast unit. Although the //i// core has been steadily growing smaller as a result of past and ongoing change, the number of words pronounced like the core has not diminished. Included in that number, in addition to the core, are inbound items from other contrast unit word classes.

The words criminal and divinity illustrate a set of nonvariable inbound words from the //ay// word class. Once they had the tense vowels still heard in the words crime and divine. But stressed tense vowels in the third syllable from the end laxed or shortened at one time moving criminal and divinity and hundreds of others from the tense category to the lax category. This happened in all dialects, so that the words are now nonvariable members of the //i// word class. However, not all inbound environments are nonvariable. For instance, under the influence of postvocalic //r//, words in the tense //iy// unit laxed, sending words like fear, beer, here, in many dialects, to the //i// phoneme word class. And words from the //e// word class having a postvocalic nasal consonant as in pen, hem, length, have been raised to join the //i// word class in many dialect areas. Since these movements are not universal in the language community, the environments and words are variable.

To summarize the point of this section, we can answer the following question: What constitutes the phonemic word class of each of the teacher’s phonemes? A phonemic word class is the set of words in the teacher’s dialect which are pronounced with the allophones of a single phoneme and consists of the core of a contrast unit word class, variable and nonvariable inbound words from other contrast unit word classes, and perhaps a few exceptional words which always seem to be left over after a sound change. This, then, is a look at the phoneme and its word class from the point of view of language-level contrasts. The crucial question is: How should this information about phonemes be used in writing drill material? Clearly, the answer to this question involves a consideration of priorities.

Variable and Nonvariable Environments

Whenever the teacher uses a word in a minimal pair list, a dialogue, a reading, or elsewhere, in order to elicit a pronunciation from the student, the teacher is ipso facto insisting on a particular pronunciation for that word. If the word is phonetically variable across dialects, this insistence is dialectocentric and should be avoided. Ideally, then, the words used in drill material should be chosen from words which are invariant across dialects. But which are they?

Setting up Priorities. The above data on //i// will be useful to illustrate priorities in selecting drill items. Important here is the concept of a variable (as opposed to nonvariable) environment in which sound change operates. In (1) are lists intended to help the student distinguish between
/i/ and /e/, representing an obligatory contrast. From the above commentary about //i//, we notice that the first two items under /i/ are part of the core. That is, they fall into the lax configurations, iC# and iCC, and their environments are not among those affected by sound change. The same is true of the first two items under /e/. These and similar words are good drill items for use across the English language community. The last two items under /i/, however, are not everywhere pronounced /i/; in some places //i// before a back velar nasal is /iy/. This, then, is a variable environment. Also variable are the last two words under /e/. Before a nasal, /e/ in some dialects is /i/. In order to avoid being dialectally narrow, the teacher should retain only the core words in this drill; words with variable environments should be removed. To retain the variable items would force the teacher to correct the student who says [bliyɪk] and [sɪnd], even though these are standard English pronunciations. Not to correct them makes their presence useless in a drill which aims at promoting particular contrasts. Such useless items (and environments) are marked with an asterisk in (1) and in the discussions which follow.

(1) /i/ /e/
tip let
fist rest
*blink *send
*wing *empty

Now suppose that the teacher, in his or her dialect of English, has /iy/ for //i// before a back velar nasal, and /i/ for //ei// before nasals, and /iy/ for //iy// before //r//. For this teacher, the lists in (2) exemplify the /iy/ and /i/ phonemes perfectly. However, to use such items would betray a regional bias as inappropriate for ESL materials as that found in the lists of (1). The only words universally acceptable under /i/ are the inbound items, typical and hidden, which once belonged to a tense category (cf., type, hide) but have categorically laxed throughout the language community.

(2) /iy/ /i/
*tingle typical
*drink hidden
*dear *tempt
*cheer *penguin

It is now possible to state the priorities for drill content which can be used by the teacher to teach the important language contrasts without being dialectally rigid. In (3), the nonvariable environments of the core and inbound items are more useful for the language-level goal of the student than the variable environments found among some inbound items. Falling into this latter category (B.1), are most instances of vowels followed by //r//.

(3) A. Nonvariable Environments
1. Core items
The simple principle in (3) which places language-level generalities above dialect-level uniqueness requires illustration. In what follows, the priorities are spelled out in the discussion of several contrast units.

**Priorities at Work.** The insertion of a y-onglide before certain //uw// words (particularly those spelled <u(C) V, eu, ew >) is notoriously variable. *Tune, duty, news,* are heard with and without the onglide, e.g., [tyuwn] and [tuwn]. The situation, however, is not chaotic. The obligatory presence, absence, and the optional presence of the onglide is strictly governed by environment. The y-onglide is obligatorily present after silence, labial and velar consonants, and //h//, as in (4)a. It is obligatorily absent after alveopalatal consonants and //r//, as in (4)b. After dental and alveolar consonants, //θ, t, d, s, z, n, l/, the onglide may be present or absent depending on the dialect area. In (5), only the +y category (obligatory onglide) is important to deal with explicitly in class. The absence of the onglide after alveopalatals and //r// seems to occur naturally.

\[(4)\]
\begin{align*}
a. & \text{use, fuse} \\
& \text{abuse, accuse, chew}
\end{align*}
\begin{align*}
b. & \text{-junior, abuse, French }
\end{align*}
\begin{align*}
& \text{compute, argue, rude}
\end{align*}
\begin{align*}
& \text{music, huge, true}
\end{align*}

\[(5)\]
\begin{align*}
A. & \text{Nonvariable environments} \\
& +y \text{ after silence, labials, velars, h + uw}
\end{align*}
\begin{align*}
& -y \text{ after alveopalatals, r + uw}
\end{align*}

**B. Variable environments**
\begin{align*}
& \pm y \text{ after dentals and alveolars + úw}
\end{align*}

In (6) are teaching lists for initial, medial, and final //s//. The words in columns (6)a and (6)c are part of the core, as is the first item of (6) b. The remaining words in (6)c are inbound from other word classes. They are pronounced like the core because their suffixes create environments in which palatalization may occur. (Palatalization is a shift of alveolar consonants (t, d, s, z) to the alveopalatal position (c, j, s, z).) In the case of devotion and official, the environment is an alveolar consonant (c f., devote, office) followed by an //i// (retained in spelling but elided in pronunciation)

\[1\] The variable pronunciation of words like huge as [hyuw] or [yuw] illustrates a variable environment of the //h// unit, namely, //h// + yuw.

\[2\] The geographic distribution of this and other change patterns is unknown in many cases. Furthermore, the patterns often do not fit neatly onto a map (Bailey 1973). For the approach elaborated here, the fact of variability among speakers of standard English is more important than the location of this pronunciation or that, because the fact of variability is sufficient reason to eliminate an item or contrast from drill material.
followed immediately by an unstressed vowel. This environment is summarized in (7)a. Here, palatalization is obligatory; there are thousands of words of this sort. The environments seen in officiate and judiciary are the same as above except that the vowel following /i/ is stressed, as indicated by the mark ' in (7)b. In this environment, palatalization is variable. That is, standard English speakers say either [s] or [s] in judiciary. With either pronunciation, the /s/ is pronounced, not elided. A statement of teaching priorities for //s// is in (12).

(6) a. ship b. rushing c. mash
    shell devotion brush
    shut official dish
    shop *officiate bush
    shoe *judiciary leash

(7) a. //Alveolar consonant/ + i + V
    b. //Alveolar consonant/ + i + V

(8) A. Nonvariable environments
    1. Core: like words in (6)a and (6)c
    2. Inbound: (7)a

*B. Variable environments
      (7)b

The examples in this section illustrate how the priorities in (3) above are to be implemented. The most efficient way to teach English contrast units is to fill the drills with words in which the whole language community uses the units and to omit those words which are phonetically variable in the community. The omission of environments will result in no shortage of material of an invariant sort. However, the omission does raise a fundamental question: What if the student has difficulties at precisely the points which have been omitted? The question is answered in the next section.

The Range Drill

The implication of the teaching priorities just described is that the teacher will accept [pen] or [pin] for pen, ["tyuwzdiy"] or ["tuwzdiy"] for Tuesday, [i"nisiiy'eyt"] or [i"nisiiy'eyt"] for initiate, and [ker] or [keo:] for care (postvocalic, word-final //r//). These are instances of variable environments for which there is a range of permissible variation in standard English. These environments are not drilled in the lesson materials. Even so, it can be expected that the work on nonvariable environments will carry over to the variable environments. If not, past learning may carry over. For example, the student who has had British instruction will no doubt have a low

---

*The [s] which is palatalized to [z] arises in several ways. In the case of devotion, the //k// becomes [s] by spirantization before //i//, and then is palatalized to [z]. The //s// of official and officiate is simply palatalized. In judiciary, the //k// (cf., judicatory) becomes [s] by velar softening before //i//, and then is palatalized.
vowel other than [æ] for words with //æ// followed by a voiceless fricative or //n//, such as bath, pass, can’t. That pronunciation should stand; it is standard English for that variable environment. However, to be sure that an acceptable pronunciation is being used in variable environments, the teacher should check each student’s production at the end of work on a particular contrast unit.

If it is found that a student says [peyn] for pen or [bowld] for board, a range drill is in order. All of the work done with nonvariable environments uses what we may call target drills, because they encourage the student to hit a fairly narrow target. A range drill, on the other hand, encourages the student to move his or her production into the accepted range but without necessarily hitting one and only one target within this range. This approach corrects the student away from non-English, but allows the English production which the student finds most natural.

Let us suppose that a range check of a student’s production of postvocalic, preconsonantal //r// turns up words like [bowld] in stead of [bowad] or [bowrd], after postvocalic //r// has been learned satisfactorily in nonvariable environments (that is, prevocically, e.g., red, and intervocically, e.g., irony). The teacher should identify the problem for the student in terms such as these: “You are having difficulty with //r// before consonants, as in board. There are several acceptable ways to pronounce //r// in this position, such as [bowrd] or [bowad], but you are not using any of these pronunciations. I want to help you say this sound in an acceptable way.” Then, the range drill proceeds on an individual basis, because chorus work makes it difficult to hear who is within the range and who is not. In drills and in correction, the teacher uses his or her own normal pronunciation of //r// in the variable environment. Any production from the student which falls into the English range, however, will be accepted even if it is different from the teacher’s.

One question which might arise from this approach is the following: Is it not true that a student who is allowed to say some words like a Texan, others like a Midwesterner, and still others like a Britisher will have such inconsistent pronunciation that intelligibility will be impaired? This is a false fear. In the first place, as must now be obvious, the teacher uses his or her own allophones in teaching. All the contrasts drilled in invariant environments are drilled with the consistency which the teacher brings to the task. In the second place, the teacher’s consistency has its limitations. No single person is consistent in pronunciation because each is party to the ongoing change in the language. Furthermore, the more educated the teacher, the less dialectally consistent his or her classroom pronunciation becomes. In the third place, the most important part of communicability is that the English contrasts be made with English sounds. If the listener could not adjust to dialect differences, there would be no communication across regional dialects. But all speakers regularly exercise their capability to make such adjustments rapidly. That ability works in favor of the nonnative speaker. In short, the
question of dialectally consistent production is not an issue at all. There will be more intelligibility problems created by the process of language learning (interference, false analogy, etc.) than are created by a dialectally mixed pronunciation.

Variable and Nonvariable Contrasts

All of the vowel and consonant contrast units discussed above are obligatory for English. Each dialect makes them in some way. Dialects, however, are not limited by the minimum number of contrasts and may use contrast units not found uniformly throughout the language community. These are variable contrast units which arise from the processes of sound change.

In the classroom, the teacher's approach to variable contrast units is the same as the approach to variable environments, namely, nonvariable contrasts have a higher priority for classroom time and energy than variable contrasts. The extension of this principle from environments to contrast units will be illustrated with one vowel example and one consonant example.

Variable Vowel Contrast Units. The low-vowel sector of the vowel chart is replete with dialectal differences. One of these was mentioned above—the presence or absence of //o//, a variable contrast unit. In some dialects, there is a distinction between /a/ and /o/, e.g., don-dawn, while in others, all the words in the two categories are pronounced alike, often with a phonetic variant somewhere between [a] and [o] and often with no lip rounding at all. The variability principle says that a contrast unit not used by all standard English speakers is variable and is therefore dispensable for teaching purposes.

Since //a// is not dispensable, the principle asserts that it is important to teach this contrast unit with words which are pronounced with the unrounded vowel in both the /a/-only dialects and the /a/-/o/ dialects. That is, words which may be pronounced with a rounded vowel should not be used for teaching //a//. It is crucial, then, to identify these latter words in order to avoid them in the lesson on //a//.

The dialects which make the /a/-/o/ distinction draw on a number of sources to compose their /o/ word class. One source is the old //o// word class seen in words like law, daughter, august and generally identifiable by the <aw> and <au> spellings seen in these examples. Another source is the old “short o” word class which contributes words in which a voiceless fricative or a voiced back velar consonant follows //o//, as in off, boss, moth, long, dog. A third source of words is the //æ// word class. Old English words with //æ// followed by //l//, as in ball, talk, joined the /o/ word class, as did most //æ// words with a prevocalic //w// and a postvocalic //r//, as in war, quart, thwart. A more careful specification of the postvocalic //l// environment in which //æ// becomes /ə/ would be the following: //ælC((V){ə})//.
the contributions to the /ə/ word class of a variable contrast unit, //ə//, and several inbound environments. They make up the bulk of this word class.

After omitting the variable words above, the richest source of words for //ə// drills is the contrast unit //ə//. Excluding the environments discussed above and those with postvocalic //r//, most of the other environments are invariably preceded by /ə//. This leaves literally hundreds of common words, such as clock, lot, stop, blond, rob. However, caution is necessary for //ə// followed by //l//. The process which changed //i// to //ay// in words like wild, find affected //ə// more extensively. All words with final postvocalic clusters consisting of a geminate //l// or //r// and a stop joined the //ow// word class, e.g. poll, cold, bolt. Doll is the only common exception. Among nonfinal //l// clusters, words with //l// followed by a fricative vary between /ə// and /ə//, as in solve, involve, dolphin. Nonfinal geminate //l// words are categorically //ə//, as in rollick, dollar, Holland, pollen, jolly, and are useable in //ə// drills. A summary of the priorities among words for use in //ə// exercises is provided in (9).

(9) A. Nonvariable environments
   //ə// + p, b, t, d, k, m,
   \n   n, ñ, ç, j, l + V

*B. Variable environments
   //ə// + f, s, ð, ð, g
   //ə// + r, l + fricative

If, on a range check, a student is found to say [əw] for words like song, lost, coffee, cause, draw—environments and a word class excluded because of their variability, this is an occasion for a range drill. With his or her own pronunciation, the teacher encourages the student to move away from [əw]. In the direction of either of the two standard English variants, [ə] or [ə]. Whichever of these two variants the student can pronounce most comfortably should be accepted, even if song is said with [a] and coffee with [o].

Variable Consonant Contrast Units. In some dialects of English, speakers find minimal pairs in such words as which-witch, whether-weather, whey-way. The minimal pairs identify the presence of two different phonemes, /hw/ and /w/, in these dialects. Elsewhere, the above pairs are homophonous, pronounced identically with an allophone of /w/; in these dialects, there is only a single phoneme. The difference in phonemic inventory from one area to another highlights another variable contrast unit, in this case //hw//. In pronunciation instruction, only //hw// should be taught. The drill material should contain no items from the //hw// word class, easily identified by the <wh> spelling. The //hw// contrast unit, then, is excluded from classroom consideration, not because the unit is present in

---

*Even in environments like postvocalic //k//, in which centralization to /ə/ has taken place, some few items are still variably pronounced, e.g., chocolate. Such items are either the residue of an already completed change in an environment or part of the transition in a currently ongoing change. The environmental guidelines given in (9), then, are somewhat simplified.
only a few dialects and not because it is generally disappearing, but because it is variable.

These examples of variable vowel and consonant contrast units have shown the applicability of the variability principle beyond variable environments. A question may arise out of this procedure, however, which calls for clarification. The teacher may wonder: Since so many common words are excluded from drill material, how can drills, especially dialogues and readings, be constructed without words like what, when, why, which? It is important to understand that the principle elaborated here does not “blacklist” words with variable environments or variable contrast units. The principle says simply that these items should not be the focus when only one of the variant pronunciations is being drilled. These items should not be part of minimal pair lists, nor used as examples, nor corrected in any drill except a range drill. Beyond these purposes, variable words, like the rest of the English lexicon, are at the disposal of the materials writer.

**Leveling with the Student**

The approach to variability developed here will work best when the student understands the nature of English pronunciation and how classroom instruction relates to it. So important is this understanding, that a class hour should be set aside at the beginning of the semester for its development. In that hour, the following points should be made with ample illustration.

First, English has been standardized to a large extent in its grammar. But in its sounds, there is no one single way to pronounce English correctly. That is, educated speakers of English may pronounce the language in many different yet acceptable ways. Second, the student will learn pronunciation from the teacher, but the teacher will deal only with aspects of pronunciation which are uniform throughout the English-speaking community. The student will be asked to learn nothing which is unique to a particular dialect. Third, this means that in areas of pronunciation where there are multiple standard English renderings, the student may use either what he or she has learned before or what is easier to pronounce, as long as it falls within the limits of standard English. Such pronunciation need not match the teacher’s.

The healthy classroom atmosphere created by this understanding is remarkable. It is the opposite of that created by texts and teaching which approach English pronunciation as a homogeneous system where there is only one correct way to pronounce sounds. By eliminating this point of view, the teacher eliminates a classroom tension associated with it. The teacher is no longer put in the artificial position of having to judge among equally acceptable pronunciations. The student knows that there is some latitude in certain areas of the learning task. And both the student and the teacher are allowed to appreciate the everyday variability which they find from speaker to speaker and within themselves. Furthermore, we have discovered that our students are fascinated with variability. Brief comments on acceptable
variation made throughout the semester, although never part of the drill-work, are well received. In sum, by leveling with the student, the teacher puts the pronunciation task in its proper perspective for both the student and the teacher.

Conclusion

Variability is in the nature of an ever-changing language. The language teacher cannot responsibly dodge variability but must arrive at a realistic strategy for coping with it. Such a strategy is outlined here. Its realism is derived from an understanding of sound change in language and of the language-level (as opposed to dialect-level) goal of the student.

Sound change has affected the phonemic inventory, the phonemic word classes, and the phonetic composition of phonemes in every dialect. The teaching strategy developed here acknowledges such sound changes and uses this information to promote the student's language-level goal. This is accomplished by avoiding the dialectal dogmatism which arises out of the phonemic approach to teaching. In place of the phoneme is the language-level concept of contrast unit. In the contrast approach to pronunciation, the teacher eliminates from instructional materials all instances of variability in phonemic inventory and phonemic word classes, that is, all phonological variability. But the teacher does nothing to eliminate or modify his or her allophonic repertoire, or phonetic variability, although tolerance in accepting known variants is encouraged.

In order to reassess pronunciation materials in the way described here, the textbook writer and the teacher need information about environmentally-controlled language change. Such information, unfortunately, has not yet been assembled in one place. The Linguistic Atlas materials are helpful, as are dictionaries, because variant pronunciations are often cues to areas of patterned variability. Other sources of information are Allen (1973), Bailey (1973), Dickerson (1975 a, b). In all, there is enough information available about English vowel and consonant variability to justify a significant revision of pedagogical materials. The linguistic realism and sense of direction which such a revision brings to the classroom clearly makes the revision worthwhile.
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The Pronunciation of the English <NG>:
A Case Study in Phoneme-Grapheme Relationships

Edward G. Fichtner

English spelling is frequently described as “irregular,” in the sense that several phonemes may sometimes be represented by one grapheme, or that the same phoneme may, on occasion, be represented by several different combinations of letters. In a recent study, however, it was demonstrated that the degree of phoneme-grapheme correspondence in English is actually in excess of 80%—more predictable than is ordinarily believed. The greatest inconsistencies occur between vowel graphemes and phonemes; among the consonants, the digraph <ng> is a problematic case, as it may stand for four different phonemes or phoneme combinations: /ŋ, nɡ, ng, ɲ/. This article shows that the phonemes represented by the digraph can, with few exceptions, be predicted when the structure of the word in which it appears is taken into account. The phonemic value of the digraph in a word depends on certain features in the underlying morpheme structure of that word, as well as various subsidiary processes, e.g., assimilation. The example of the digraph <ng> suggests that English spelling, while not “phonemic,” should not be dismissed as hopelessly irregular without a careful investigation of all aspects of the complex relationship between orthography, phonology, and morpheme structure. Suggestions for the use of the findings in classroom situations conclude the article.

It is a commonplace among teachers of language that speech is prior to writing, and that the written language is merely a visual surrogate for the spoken language. This view has deeply influenced the methodology of language teaching, especially in regard to the ordering of those activities through which the student comes into contact with the language being studied: first, he learns the sound or spoken word; only then is he introduced to the visual written representation of that sound in the form of the letters and signs of the traditional orthography.

Recently this view has been subjected to a re-examination, the result of which has been an adjustment, not so much of the principle that language is fundamentally speech, as in the inferences which are being drawn from it. As far as the written language is concerned, there has been a renewed appreciation of the role and value of literacy, and on the more pragmatic level an increased recognition of the validity of the fundamental principle that one first learns to read and then reads to learn (Saville-Troike 1973). This

Mr. Fichtner is Associate Professor, Department of German and Scandinavian, Queens College. His major interests are German philology, applied linguistics, and contrastive structures of English and German.
has lead in turn to a reversal of the way in which relationship between the phonemes and graphemes of a language was formulated. Whereas previously it was customary to identify a phoneme and then to determine what graphemes could be used to represent that phoneme, the utility of the opposite procedure was recognized anew: it can also be helpful to establish what the significant letters or combinations of letters are, and then to catalogue the phonemes which they represent (Kreidler 1972: 4 ff.). To be sure, the English language did not at first seem to be an appropriate field for an undertaking of this kind, because of the well-known “irregularity” of its orthography. Indeed, spelling instruction in American elementary schools has for years been predicated on the assumption that the writing and sound systems of English are inconsistent, and hence that the orthography is an unreliable guide to pronunciation (Hanna, Hanna, Hodges and Rudorf 1966: 1 ff.).

On the other hand, there have been those who have claimed that English orthography, while complex, is by no means as “irregular” as has been thought (e.g., Cronnell 1972). Even the concept of “irregularity” has been challenged, and the notion of predictability urged as a substitute (Venezky 1970a: 269 ff.). This line of research has culminated in an extensive and systematic review of the patterns of phoneme-grapheme correspondences in English (Venezky 1970 b). But even this treatment was not without its inadequacies. For while its author recognized the importance of the morpheme structure of the language in connection with spelling, for the most part information from this stratum was applied ad hoc to difficult cases. In other words, the orthography of the language was a more or less predictable series of correspondences between sound and letter, with an occasional morpheme boundary thrown in when it appeared useful in clarifying a confusing relationship.

There has been a change in attitude, however, which has resulted from a better understanding of the way in which the sound system of language functions. Recent research in the phonology of English—in effect, since Chomsky and Hall (1968) —has for the most part operated on the assumption that an English word has an underlying abstract form which is realized in a variety of situations which in turn determine the actual phonetic shape of that word. Among the factors which may influence the actual pronunciation of the word are the presence or absence of affixes, e.g., telegraph, telegraphic, telegrapher, or the function-class to which the word belongs, e.g., ‘conduct (noun), but con’duct (verb). This view has significant implications for the writing system of the language. If the apparent irregularities of the sound system can be explained as reflexes of underlying representations which are realized through the operation of transformational rules, then it is by no means impossible that the same or similar approach might account for the inconsistencies in the writing system. If appropriate rules could be formulated which would make plain the patterns underlying the superficial irregularities, then these rules could be of great benefit in connection with
the teaching of English, both to elementary school children and to foreign students of English (Chomsky 1970: esp. 29 ff.).

In this article, the attempt will be made to formulate such a set of rules for predicting the pronunciation of the English digraph <ng>. There are several reasons why this combination of letters was chosen. In a recent study it was determined that in most cases the degree of phoneme-grapheme correspondence is in excess of 80%, which means that English spelling is not as unpredictable as has been commonly assumed. For the most part, the greatest inconsistencies occur between vowel graphemes and phonemes; among the consonants, however, the phoneme /ʊ/ is represented by the grapheme <ng> roughly 59% of the time, whereas it is represented by the grapheme <n> in about 41% of all cases (Hanna, Hanna, Hodges, and Rudorf 1966: 44, 916–918). The latter category is hardly problematic: it is unlikely that even an inexpert reader would interpret the <n> of think, drink, sink, etc., as representing a phoneme other than /ŋ/. But the digraph <ng> is another matter, since it can represent any one of four phonemes or combinations of phonemes: /ʊ/, /ʊg/, /ŋ/, or /ŋj/. Since native speakers of English ordinarily find it possible to select the proper pronunciation pattern in a given case, we may assume that there are cues in the structure of the language itself by which a reader may tell which of these pronunciations is correct. The purpose of the present article is to find these cues and incorporate them into rules which may be applied by those learning to read the English language.

Let us begin by considering some examples from the point of view of the foreign student of English, who, in the course of his reading, encounters groups of words in which the digraph <ng> appears in virtually the same environment. Its pronunciation is indicated in each case below between slashes.

- hanger /ʌ/, anger /ʊg/, danger /ŋj/
- sing /ʌ/, singer /ʊŋ/, long /ʌŋ/, longer /ʊŋ/
- finger /ʊŋ/, ginger /ŋj/
- young /ʌŋ/, younger /ʊŋ/, youngish /ʊŋ/
- unguent /ʊŋ/, unguarded /ŋ/
- inguinal /ʊŋ/, ingurgitate /ŋ/
- congregate /ʊŋ/, congratulate /ŋ/
- congress /ʊŋ/, congressional /ŋ/
- fungus /ʊŋ/, fungi /ŋj/

From these examples, it can be seen that the pronunciation of the digraph <ng> as /ʌŋ/, /ʊŋ/, /ŋ/, or /ŋj/ does not seem to depend on any immediately evident factor.

Certain features which can be correlated with some of these pronunciations have already been noted by other investigators; for example, the pronunciation /ʊŋ/ always marks the final boundary of a free form like sing, hang, ding, sterling, or of a bound morpheme joined to such a free form, i.e.,
the verb inflection -ing (Wijk 1966. 95ff.). Moreover, all words derived by affixing to these words retain the morpheme-final /ŋ/ in the compound, e.g., sing /sɪŋ/, singer /sɪŋər/, singing /sɪŋɪŋ/, etc. Words ending in -ngue pronounced /ŋ/ also come under this rubric, e.g., tongue, harangue, merlingue, as well as haranging /hɔrəŋɪŋ/, etc. (Chomsky & Halle 1968:85ff.).

There is a large group of words which contains the digraph <ng> in medial position. Certain patterns can be described quite simply: <ng> before a back vowel letter <a, o, u>, or before a consonant letter, is pronounced /ŋg/, as in angle, mongrel, prolongation, ingot, fungus. Note that this statement applies when the digraph stands before a back vowel letter, and not a back vowel sound. Hence, palatal glides in words like angular /əŋɡələr/ and singular /sɪŋɡələr/ do not constitute exceptions to this statement.1

When the digraph appears before one of the front vowel letters <e, i, y>, on the other hand, the stop /g/ is palatalized to /j/ and the velar nasal /ŋ/ is assimilated to the new affricate, with the result that the digraph is in this environment pronounced /nj/, as in angel, danger, engine, stingy. This applies even when the <e> is the so-called silent <e>, as in flange, revenge, hinge, sponge, plunge, and the like. Moreover, when any of the several affixes is joined to a word in this group, the final consonants do not change in pronunciation: avenge /əvənj/, avenging /əvəŋɪŋ/; sponge /spəŋj/, sponges /spəŋʒəz/; plunge /plʌŋj/, plunged /plʌŋd/.2

There are two groups of words with final <nger> which do not follow this pattern. The first consists of a number of nouns ending in the letters named, but having the pronunciation /ŋɔr/. The existence of two groups of words spelled alike in respect of the last four letters, but having different pronunciation, is an obvious inconsistency, all the more so since the “exceptions” are words frequently encountered. The more important lexical items in each class are presented in the following lists. For purposes of comparison, a list of some of those words ending in morpheme-final <ng> with the suffix -er is included:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>/ŋɔr/</th>
<th>/ŋ + ər/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ginger</td>
<td>singere (&lt;singe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>harbinger</td>
<td>linger (&lt;malinger)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manger</td>
<td>ranger (&lt;stranger)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>danger</td>
<td>conger (&lt;monger)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plunger</td>
<td>hunger</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 The word hangar is an exception. Borrowed from French, it had the pronunciation /hæŋɡər/ in British English well into the nineteenth century, where it meant "a covered space, shed, or shelter"; with the appearance of the airplane, it was taken over for use as a term for "a shed for accommodating aircraft", in which function it acquired the pronunciation /hæŋər/; cf. OUD, sv. hangar. The latter pronunciation is probably a spelling pronunciation influenced by the word hanger from hang.

2 For all practical purposes, messenger < message and passenger < passage can be included here, despite the fact that, historically speaking, the -n- is intrusive.
Those forms ending in the suffix -er can easily be classified on the basis of their final consonants, i.e., *singer* /sɪŋər/ from *sing* /sɪŋ/, compared with *singer* /sɪŋər/ from *singe* /sɪŋ/. As to the remaining categories, we have a clue in the two words in each group which can take adjective suffixes as to the processes at work: on the one hand, *ginger* > *gingery* and *danger* > *dangerous*, but on the other, *anger* > *angry* and *hunger* > *hungry*. If these words be taken as typical for the group—and we so regard them, even though not all the words in these groups can form adjectives in this way—then we might argue as follows: we observed that the phoneme /ŋ/ was palatalized to /nj/ before a front vowel; this suggests that words like *anger* and *hunger*, in their underlying forms, do not end in final -er, but in -gr; this would also explain why the adjectival forms are *angry* and *hungry*, and not *angery* /əŋjər/ and *hungery* /hʌŋjər/. On this interpretation, the words *ginger* and *danger* reflect the morphemes {GINGER} and {DANGER}, but *anger* and *hunger* the morphemes {ANGER} and {HUNGER}. The ending -er on the latter pair is explained by a phonotactic rule prohibiting the final consonant cluster /ŋɡ/ in English. These relationships may be summarized in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Morpheme</th>
<th>Root</th>
<th>Root + Affix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>{GINGER}</td>
<td>/sɪŋər/</td>
<td><em>singer</em> /sɪŋər/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{DANGER}</td>
<td>/deɪnɪŋər/</td>
<td><em>danger</em> /deɪnɪŋər/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{ANGER}</td>
<td>/əŋgr/</td>
<td><em>angry</em> /əŋgr/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{HUNGER}</td>
<td>/hʌŋgr/</td>
<td><em>hungry</em> /hʌŋgr/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This means that those words in which the final cluster of letters <nger> is pronounced /ŋɡər/ may be regarded as special cases of the category of medial <ng> before consonants.

There is a second exception to the group of words with medial <ng> before front vowel: the comparative and superlative of those adjectives ending in <ng>. There are four of these: *long, strong, young,* and *wrong,* the last of these is as a rule not compared (Long 1961:256). The pronunciation of the remaining adjectives and their compared forms is:

- long /lɒŋ/, longer /lɒŋɡər/, longest /lɒŋɡəst/
- strong /strɔŋ/, stronger /strɔŋɡər/, strongest /strɔŋɡəst/
- young /jʌŋ/, younger /jʌŋɡər/, youngest /jʌŋɡəst/

These formations are clearly not analogous to the pattern of *sing* and *singer* because of the medial /ŋ/ in the compared forms of the three adjectives; on the other hand, the solution offered in the case of *anger* and *hunger* is inapplicable because the base forms of the adjectives do not end in -nger. Hence, this is a category sui generis—a group of exceptions, fortunately only three in number, to be learned by heart.

In concluding this part of the presentation, we may summarize our findings in the following chart:
In addition to these, there is a category of words in English which is characterized by the presence of a morpheme boundary between the component letters of the digraph \(<ng\>). In these words, it would be more properly rendered \(<n + g>\), the sign “+” standing for an internal minor juncture between the two component morphemes. In words of this group, the digraph \(<ng\>) has either the pronunciation /ng/ or /ŋg/, under conditions which will be defined presently. We may take as typical the word pairs congress and congressional, and ingrate and ingratitude. Our concern here is with the first two syllables in each—the prefix, and the root syllable. In one word in each pair, the prefix is accented; in the other, it is not. In English, a syllable may be either accented or unaccented, and vowels may be either full or reduced; an accented syllable must have a full vowel, but an unaccented syllable may contain either a full or reduced vowel (cf. Fichtner 1972). While an unaccented syllable preceding an accented one tends not to affect the morpheme boundary, an unaccented syllable following an accented one tends to become enclitic to that preceding syllable; the reduction of the unaccented vowel tends to bind the syllable in which it stands even more closely to the neighboring syllable (cf. Grammont 1963: 98–100). One of the signs of this kind of fusion of syllables is the assimilation of sounds at morpheme boundaries.

These tendencies may be seen in one or the other of these four words. In the case of ingrate vs. ingratitude, the accent is in the former case on the first syllable; in the latter, on the second. In ingrate, both vowels are full, while in ingratitude, the vowel of the prefix has been reduced. This is in partial contrast with the pair congress and congressional. In the former word, the first syllable is accented and hence has a full vowel, while the second is unaccented and its vowel is reduced; in the latter word, the vowel of the first syllable is reduced and that syllable has no accent.

These conditions may be summarized and compared in the following table; the symbols \(A\) and \(F\) mark the accentual condition and the fullness of vowels, respectively:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graphemes</th>
<th>Phonemes</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(&lt;ng&gt;)</td>
<td>/ŋ/</td>
<td>sing, hang, tong, rung,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>shilling, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tongue, harangue, meringue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(&lt;ngue&gt;)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hungary, ingot, anguish,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>language, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/ŋg/</td>
<td>angle, mongrel, dangle,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tingle, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>anger, hunger, monger,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>finger, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(&lt;nger&gt;)</td>
<td>/nj/</td>
<td>danger, manger, ginger,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{NGER}</td>
<td></td>
<td>etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>hinge, range, lunge,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>laryngeal, longitude, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(\text{\texttt{A}}\) and \(\text{\texttt{F}}\) mark the accentual condition and the fullness of vowels, respectively.
The patterns of accentuation and vowel reduction are the same in the case of ingratitude and congressional; the prefixes in- and con- are unaccented and have reduced vowels, the roots -grat- and -gress- are accented with full vowels; more important is the fact that the /n/ in those prefixes has not been assimilated to the /g/ of their roots. As to ingratitude and congress, on the other hand, we note a significant difference: whereas both prefixes are accented and have full vowels, and whereas both roots are unaccented, the root in congress has a reduced vowel, while the root vowel in ingratitude is not reduced. Moreover, the <n> in ingrate is pronounced as the dental nasal /n/, while the <n> in congress has been assimilated to the preceding velar stop, and is pronounced /ŋ/. Because the pronunciation of medial <ng> across a morpheme boundary is normally /n + g/, the retention of the pronunciation /n + g/ in ingratitude is, so to speak, a mark of phonological and morphological independence. In congress, on the other hand, the assimilation of the nasal to the stop constitutes a weakening of the morpheme boundary, a change which is correlated with the diminished independence of the syllable -gress as indicated by the reduction of the vowel in that syllable. Hence, the words congress and ingratitude exemplify two different degrees of fusion, distinctions signaled by the different patterns of vowel reduction and the differing degrees of assimilation across the morpheme boundary. These phenomena may be observed in a number of forms, which are alike in having the accent on the first syllable, but different in that the second vowel is in some cases full, in others reduced. In the former instance, the nasal is not assimilated to the /g/, in the latter, it is, as in these examples:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ingrate} & \quad /'\text{in} + \text{greyt}/ \\
\text{congress} & \quad /'\text{kan} + \text{gres}/
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ingratitude} & \quad /'\text{in} + \text{gretitiwd}/ \\
\text{congressional} & \quad /'\text{kan} + \text{gres}\text{nal}/
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c}
\text{Vowel in} & \text{Vowel in} \\
\text{1st Syllable} & \text{2nd Syllable} \\
\hline
\text{ingrate} & +A & +F & \text{+A} & +F \\
\text{congress} & -A & -F & \text{+A} & +F \\
\text{congressional} & -A & -F & \text{+A} & +F
\end{array}
\]

At this point, it may be of value to summarize our findings in concise rules as a way of expressing the patterns of correspondence between the distinct phenomena of accentuation and vowel reduction. These rules will be based on the observation that the accent is generally on the first syllable, and that the second vowel is either full or reduced, depending on whether the nasal is assimilated to the /g/ or not. For example:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ingroup} & \quad /'\text{in} + \text{gruwp}/ \\
\text{ongoing} & \quad /'\text{in} + \text{gowin}/ \\
\text{ingress} & \quad /'\text{in} + \text{gres}/
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{congregate} & \quad /'\text{kaŋ} + \text{greyt}/ \\
\text{congruence} & \quad /'\text{kaŋ} + \text{gruŋ\text{a}}/ \\
\text{but cf. congruence} & \quad /'\text{kaŋ} + \text{gruŋ\text{a}}/\text{a}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{V2 = full} & \quad /'\text{\ldots n + g \ldots}/ \\
\text{V2 = reduced} & \quad /'\text{\ldots ŋ + g \ldots}/
\end{align*}
\]

*This correlation may also go far to explain the two pronunciations of the name Congreve, i.e., /'kangr\text{iv}/ and /'kangr\text{iv}/; the former suggests the first syllable of the name, Con-, has been interpreted as the prefix con-. Further examples of the correlation between root vowel reduction and assimilation of the nasal can be found among words where the root begins with the voiceless velar stop /k/; cf. conquist /'kankwest/, but conquer /'kank\text{k}ə/; or the pronunciations concord /'kank\text{ord}/, but Concord (Massachusetts) /'kank\text{k}ərd/; or word pairs like conclave /'kank\text{lev}ə/ as compared with Conklin /'kank\text{kl}\text{n}/.
graph < ng > and the phonemes which it represents. In so doing, we must take into account not only the sounds for which it may stand, but also its position in the morpheme in which it stands, as well as its phonemic and graphemic environment. Our rules are two in number:

Rule 1.0. In morphemes not containing the internal morpheme boundary “#,” i.e. those having the morpheme structure {# . . . #}, the digraph < ng > is pronounced as /ʊɡ/; except:

Rule 1.1. When {... NG #}, then as /ŋ/;

Rule 1.2. when < ng > is followed by < e, i, y >, then as /nj/;

except:

Rule 1.2.1 when < nfer > = {... NGR #}, then as /ʊɡ/;

Rule 1.3. when < ng > contains the internal minor morpheme boundary “i”, i.e., {... n + g ...}, then as /ng/; except:

Rule 1.3.1. when the vowel following < ng > is reduced, then as /ʊɡ/.

Rule 2.0. In words containing an internal major morpheme boundary “#”, i.e., those compounds and inflected forms having the morpheme structure {# . . . # {... #}, etc.}, the pronunciation of < ng > is as defined by Rule 1.0; except:

Rule 2.1. in the combinations < nger #, ngest # >, where < er, est > represent the morphemes (COMPARATIVE, SUPERLATIVE), respectively, then as /ʊɡ/.

The thrust of Rule 1.0 is to define the pronunciation of the digraph basically and fundamentally as /ʊɡ/, subject to certain exceptions. When < ng > stands in root-final position (Rule 1.1), it is pronounced as /ŋ/, as in sing, thing, bring, etc., as well as in the bound morpheme (ING #). Before a front vowel (Rule 1.2), the digraph has the pronunciation /nj/, as in fringe, gingival, stingy, etc. In cases like anger and hunger (Rule 1.2.1), where the < nger > represents the underlying morphemic pattern (NGR #), the digraph is pronounced /ʊɡ/. Where the digraph is split across an internal minor morpheme boundary (Rule 1.3), it is pronounced /ng/, as in congressional, ingrate, and ingratitude; however, where the digraph contains this morpheme boundary and, in addition, is followed by a reduced vowel (Rule 1.3.1), it is pronounced /ʊɡ/, as in congress. Rule 2.0 says, in effect, that compounding does not affect the pronunciation of < ng > as assigned by the provisions of Rule 1.0, except where it appears in word-medial position followed by the morphemes for the comparative and superlative degrees of the adjective comparison (Rule 2.1), where it has the pronunciation /ʊɡ/, as in Younger, longest, etc.

It may be no more than an accident, but there appears to be a certain symmetry to these patterns of pronunciation when they are arranged in three groups: the basic pronunciation pattern; exceptions to that pattern;
and exceptions to the exceptions to the basic pronunciation pattern. These relationships are presented in the following chart:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Pronunciation</th>
<th>Exceptions to Basic Pronunciation</th>
<th>Exceptions to Exceptions to Basic Pronunciation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/ŋg/ (Rules 1.0 and 2.0)</td>
<td>/œ/ (Rule 1.1) → /ŋg/ (Rule 2.1)</td>
<td>/ŋj/ (Rule 1.2) → /ŋg/ (Rule 1.2.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/ŋg/ (Rule 1.3) → /ŋg/ (Rule 1.3.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The basic pronunciation is /ŋg/, to which there are three exceptions: /œ, nj, ng/; the exceptions to these exceptions are in every case /ŋg/, constituting a return, as it were, to the primary pronunciation pattern. Symmetrical patterns of this kind may not prove, but they strongly imply the existence of consistent phonological and morphological rules underlying the superficial confusion of the varying patterns of pronunciation of the digraph < ng >.

In conclusion, it may be helpful to spell out certain further implications which this analysis has for the teaching of this and similar points of English structure. First and foremost, it is apparent that the pronunciation of the digraph < ng > is not only not inconsistent, it is almost completely predictable, if the relevant orthographical, phonological, and morphological features which correlate with the pronunciations it has are taken into account in specifying the environments in which these pronunciations occur. The reader will have noted that all of the exceptions to the assignment of the pronunciation /ŋg/ have been described by reference to the position of the digraph in the morpheme (Rule 1.1), by the composition of the morpheme (Rules 1.2.1 and 1.3), by the proximity of the digraph to other letters (Rule 1.2), or by its relation to other morphemes (Rules 1.2.1 and 2.1). The main practical effect of this observation is the renewed meaning it gives to the study of word structure in the classroom. The experienced teacher who has grasped this point will find it possible to translate these rules into linguistically and pedagogically valid statements like:

1. "you pronounce it singer /sɪŋər/ because it comes from sing, but cringing /kriŋɪŋ/ because it comes from cringe" (Rules 1.1, 1.2, and 2.0);

2. "you say fungus /fʌŋgas/ because the letters ng stand before a back vowel, but fungi /fʌŋjɪ/ because they stand before a front vowel" (Rules 1.0 and 1.2);

3. "The ng in congratulate is pronounced /ŋg/ because the vowel following it is a full vowel, which is not the case in congregate" (Rules 1.3 and 1.3.1).

Remarks of this kind transform the formal statements of the linguist into the language of the classroom. This can be encouraging to the student who is led thereby to see that the relationship between spoken English and its written representation is by no means unpredictable as the conventional wisdom would often have it.
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Measuring Values in Multilingual Settings*

Jon Jonz

Spanish and English versions of a values assessment instrument were administered to a group of second language students of Junior and Senior High School age. The instruments were back-translated forms of the Rokeach Value Survey, and were used in an attempt to provide current, site-specific information for use by an educational program in a multi-cultural/multilingual environment.

The results of the assessment suggest a high degree of similarity between expressed values hierarchies of the students involved. It is suggested that the information obtained from the survey provides a stable basis for the pursuit of a goal common, if not universal, in such settings: the peaceful and equitable coexistence of groups heterogeneous in linguistic and cultural background.

A significant proportion of the suspicion and lack of trust which often characterizes the relationship between culturally diverse groups in contact is hypothesized to result from uncertainty generated by both a lack of information and the stereotypic inaccuracy of that information which might be available. It is suggested that the instruments used in the study are capable of quickly and easily providing accurate information which might in turn readily be transformed into appropriate action.

An important, but often overlooked, aspect of special programs designed to implement language policies in communities which are characterized by linguistic and cultural plurality, is that striking similarities-as well as striking contrasts-frequently exist across groups. A priori educational decisions are often made based on the mistaken notion that the cause of peaceful and equitable intercultural coexistence will always be advanced by focusing attention on cultural differences and by passing lightly over or even purposefully ignoring those similarities that might exist.

Numerous models for multilingual education exist. Mackey’s (1970) preliminary typology (which deals only with patterns of language distribution) enumerates no less than ninety. That number can easily be multiplied when factors are incorporated from an analysis of sociocultural variables. Concentration on variables which only exhibit differences greatly reduces the theoretically possible total number of models and thereby increases the probability of the application of an inappropriate model. It is toward the end of putting cultural differences and cultural similarities into clearer perspective and of decreasing the probability of the inappropriate application of educational models that the research reported in this article is directed.

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

Mr. Jonz, Bilingual Testing Specialist with Lancaster-Lebanon Intermediate Unit Thirteen, Lancaster, Pennsylvania, is a doctoral candidate at the University of New Mexico. His publications include an article which appeared in the February, 1975, issue of Anthropological Linguistics.
An Index to Culture

Culture is the totality of the way of life evolved by a societal group (Zintz 1963). This totality includes such elements as religion, government, economics, recreation, family organization and education. It is visibly reflected in the behaviors and beliefs of participants in the culture.

A comparison of the “culture” of any two groups, then, would require a cataloging of the behaviors and beliefs peculiar to each group. A point-by-point comparison across groups should then result in statements which point out interesting and enlightening facts about the two groups in question. This describes in a gross way the work of the cultural anthropologist. Very few programs of bilingual education in the United States can claim a staff anthropologist, however; so for descriptions of the groups involved at each project site, project administrators often rely on whatever characterizations of the groups are available. For example:

The Cuban children tend to be outgoing, warm, expressive, talented, versatile, and resourceful. They value highly family ties and their family units, which extend in many cases to include grandparents, cousins, aunts, and uncles. Cuban children are eager to learn, and they respect authority and accept graciously any corrections and suggestions for their improvement (Klovekorn, Madera and Nardone 1975:256).

This description makes general statements about the behaviors and beliefs of the Cuban child, a cultural archetype who may or may not exist in the immediate environment of the authors of the passage. As the article from which the passage is extracted is disseminated nationwide, however, the value derived from the exposition of the archetype becomes analogous to an inverse algebraic function involving time and space. The Cuban child in Mrs. Elder's seventh grade class in Pokawanee, Pennsylvania, for example, is embodied in the form of a thirteen-year-old Hector Garcia who was born in Orlando, Florida, of a second generation Cuban father who speaks little English and an Eurasian mother who speaks little Spanish. Hector's family migrated from Florida to Pennsylvania following whatever agricultural work was available. His father obtained employment of a more permanent nature in Pokawanee and decided to stay—at least through the winter. Mrs. Elder reads the article from which I quoted and rightfully wonders how the characterization of the Cuban child applies to her new seventh grader.

In a small town in southeastern Pennsylvania, the public school system faced a situation similar in kind to the one faced by our fictitious Mrs. Elder. A relatively large number of families had moved to the area from Colombia, South America. The members of the local school board agreed that the children of these new families deserved an equal opportunity to take advantage of the quality education provided by their school system. A program of multilingual education was conceived, funded and implemented. One important objective of the program addresses itself to the question of cross-cultural understanding and the promotion of peaceful intergroup coexistence, a noble and humanitarian goal in our culturally plural society. In attempting to implement this objective, however, does the multilingual program rely on the abundant supply of characterizations of cultural
groups similar to the one cited above? Does the program engage a cultural anthropologist to do a comparative study in depth? Neither.

The project staff reasons that cultural differences and similarities are likely to exist, and since culture is reflected in both behaviors and beliefs, perhaps a "cultural index" might be established by measuring one or the other or both. It is upon the results of an investigation into the "beliefs" construct that the remainder of this article reports.

**The Study**

To find a suitable way to measure this construct, attention was initially turned to the sociolinguistic research referred to as "language attitude" study (see Cooper and Fishman, 1973, for a current overview of that field). Attitude can be defined as "an organization of several beliefs around a specific object of situation" (Rokeach 1973:18). It was felt that by measuring the way that subjects felt toward language as an attitude object and toward language as a group referent, an index to the beliefs construct could be obtained. This notion was not rejected, and a project of language attitude measurement is currently underway.

However, since attitudes are defined as organizations of beliefs around an object or situation it was felt that a more immediately useful, less ambiguous and more stable index to culture could be established by attempting to measure the more enduring individual beliefs that are referred to as "values" (Allport 1961; Handy 1970; Maslow 1959; Rokeach 1973). Whereas attitudes represent organizations of beliefs, values are singular beliefs of a very specific nature. Rokeach (1973) defines values as lasting beliefs that one's way of doing or being are personally and socially preferable to an opposite way of doing or being.

The instruments employed to measure values were back-translated versions of the Rokeach Value Survey (Rokeach 1967; see Appendix). The back-translation resulted in only one modification to the original Value Survey: SPIRITUAL TRANQUILITY substitutes for INNER HARMONY. (See Appendix.) This survey, in its parallel forms, was administered to two small groups (total N = 31): the Junior and Senior High School age.

---

1. "Back-translation" is a process by which an instrument created in one language is converted into two parallel but "decentralized" (Brislin, Lonner and Thorndike 1973: 40) instruments in two different languages.

2. Two independent studies would support the use of the Value Survey with students of this age group: (1) McLellan (1970) reports that three-week test-retest reliabilities range from .62 for seventh grade students to .74 for eleventh grade students. (2) My own work subsequent to the study presently reported has shown that for a sample of 280 English/Spanish multilingual of this age group, coefficients of concordance (Kendall's W) average .89 (significant at p = .05) for English-dominant students, and .75 for Spanish-dominant students. These coefficients were computed on the results of the administration of the Value Survey in each of the students' languages with a period of one week intervening. Were the two forms (i.e., Spanish and English) of the instrument semantically tyrannical, and similarly, were the concepts involved outside the control of the subjects, it would be difficult to explain this tendency toward similar response across languages. The sources of the differences that would seem to exist are the subject of a current investigation.
Table 1
Summary of Analyses of Variance Between Values Ranked by Native Speakers of Spanish and Values Ranked by Native Speakers of English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Spanish Speakers Mean</th>
<th>s.d.</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>English Speakers Mean</th>
<th>s.d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A COMFORTABLE LIFE</td>
<td>11.58</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>14.63</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN EXCITING LIFE</td>
<td>13.58</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>12.53</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A SENSE OF ACCOMPLISHMENT</td>
<td>10.42</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>8.84</td>
<td>4.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A WORLD AT PEACE</td>
<td>7.08</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>10.73</td>
<td>4.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A WORLD OF BEAUTY</td>
<td>12.92</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>10.84</td>
<td>4.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQUALITY</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>8.89</td>
<td>4.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAMILY SECURITY</td>
<td>6.92</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>6.97</td>
<td>10.42</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREEDOM</td>
<td>7.83</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>4.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAPPINESS</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>7.68</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATURE LOVE</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>7.79</td>
<td>4.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATIONAL SECURITY</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>14.74</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLEASURE</td>
<td>14.33</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>14.84</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALVATION</td>
<td>10.67</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>17.10*</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>4.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF RESPECT</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>7.36</td>
<td>4.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL RECOGNITION</td>
<td>11.58</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>10.68</td>
<td>5.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPIRITUAL TRANQUILITY</td>
<td>6.92</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRUE FRIENDSHIP</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WISDOM</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>24.79*</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = P < .01, critical F = 7.60 for 1 & 29 d.f.

The justification for using a parametric statistic (F) for apparently ordinal data involves an argument which is clearly beyond the scope of this article. The reader is referred to Baker, Hardyck and Petrinovich, 1966.

Colombian immigrants at the local Middle/High School, and a group of their English-speaking peers who were enrolled in Spanish as a Foreign Language. This instrument involves the subjects in a rank-ordering task. Eighteen terminal values are presented to each subject, and the subject is asked to place a “1” beside the value that is the most important to him, “2” beside the second and so forth through “18.” The day before the Value Survey was administered, a native language proficiency measurement employing parallel back-translated cloze procedures was administered to both groups. This precaution was taken simply to assure the project staff that the subjects were capable of handling the ranking task outside of possible interference from low language proficiency. This procedure confirmed that members of both groups had the requisite language to handle the task.

The results of the administration of the Value Surveys are summarized in Table 1. These results, of purely local applicability, appear to reveal that the two groups differ significantly only in the ranking that each gives to the values SALVATION and WISDOM. Insofar as the eighteen terminal values represented by the Value Survey provide an index to enduring beliefs held by the two groups of subjects, and insofar as this index can be thought of as an “index to culture,” these results serve to bring a major contrast

---

The terminal values are defined as singular beliefs concerning desirable end-states of existence (ways of being) and are contrasted to instrumental values which are beliefs concerning desirable modes of conduct (ways of doing).
between the groups sharply into focus, a contrast, I hasten to add, which is highlighted against a background of a series of similarities. The English-speaking subjects weigh heavily the teachings of their fundamentalist religion (SALVATION) and the mature understanding of life (WISDOM) which that religion allows them to have. This is valuable information for each group to have. It seems to provide a basis-in-fact from which each group might deal with the other. It seems clear, more importantly, that the similarities between the groups far outstrip the differences.

It would also seem clear that had this multilingual project proceeded, as many might, to focus attention on “cultural differences” based on any one of a number of widely available characterizations of “Latin” groups and “Anglo” groups, its focus would not have been as sharp as it could have been. Instead, the project, by using the Value Survey, had at hand a currently valid, site-specific characterization of the two groups in contact. As a result of the information obtained from the Value Survey, the project immediately began to incorporate specific orientations to local religious practices into the situation-based second language curriculum (Bauder 1975) for the Colombian students. Additionally, it seeks to make clear to both groups (via activities, for example, in a school-sponsored “club” to which members of both language groups belong) that with respect to the way that they feel about some fundamental values (TRUE FRIENDSHIP, SOCIAL RECOGNITION, and SELF RESPECT are obvious examples from Table 1 which are particularly meaningful to adolescent groups) they will find that their peers from the other language group generally feel the same way.

Having access to the results of the Value Survey administered to the specific groups in contact certainly provides the project with the beginnings of a foundation for pursuing its objective of peaceful and equitable intercultural coexistence. A good deal of the suspicion and lack of trust that often characterizes daily intercultural contact can be attributed to fear generated by uncertainty. By accurately assessing at least one major component of cultural variation, and by sharing the results of that assessment with the groups in question, uncertainty can be diminished. Classroom teachers and school administrators appear to profit immensely from the knowledge that the different cultural groups in the school share some very basic orientations.

It is clearly of urgent importance that those who seek to select and implement models of multicultural/multilingual education study each local situation as thoroughly as time and other resources permit. The Value Survey would appear to be one measure capable of quickly and easily providing quite valuable information. Whether that information accents similarity, as this study found it to, or diversity, as is surely a possibility, is not as important as the fact that the data are current and site-specific and are readily transformed into appropriate action.
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APPENDIX

THE VALUE SURVEY* 

Instructions: This is a scientific study of value systems. There are no right or wrong answers in this study. The best answer is your own personal opinion.

Below is a list of 18 values in alphabetical order. We are interested in finding out the relative importance of these values to you.

Study the list carefully. Then place a "1" next to the value which is most important to you, place a "2" next to the value which is second most important, etc. The value which is least important should be marked "18."

When you have completed ranking all the values, go back and check over your list. Feel free to make any changes. Please take all the time you need to think about this, so that the end result truly represents your values.

_A COMFORTABLE LIFE_ (a prosperous life)
_AN EXCITING LIFE_ (a stimulating, active life)
_A SENSE OF ACCOMPLISHMENT_ (lasting contribution)
_A WORLD AT PEACE_ (free of war and conflict)
_A WORLD OF BEAUTY_ (beauty of nature and the arts)
_EQUALITY_ (brotherhood, equal opportunity for all)
_FAMILY SECURITY_ (taking care of loved ones)
_FREEDOM_ (independence, free choice)
_HAPPINESS_ (contentedness)
_MATURE LOVE_ (sexual and spiritual intimacy)
_NATIONAL SECURITY_ (protection from attack)
_PLEASURE_ (an enjoyable, leisurely life)
_SALVATION_ (saved, eternal life)
_SELF RESPECT_ (self esteem)

*The Value Survey is subject to a copyright owned by Milton Rokeach, Professor of Sociology and Psychology, Washington State University. All correspondence concerning the reproduction of these instruments should be addressed to Halgren Tests, 873 Persimmon Avenue, Sunnyvale, Calif. 98407.
MEASURING VALUES

SOCIAL RECOGNITION (respect, admiration)
SPIRITUAL TRANQUILITY (freedom from inner conflicts)
TRUE FRIENDSHIP (close companionship)
WISDOM (a mature understanding of life)

Spanish version

Instructions: Este es un estudio científico de valores. No hay contestaciones correctas o incorrectas. La mejor contestación es aquella que expresa su opinión personal.

Aquí encontrará una lista de 18 valores en orden alfabético. Estamos interesados en encontrar importancia relativa que estos valores tienen para usted. Escriba un número “1” al lado del valor que es más importante para usted y un número “2” para el que le sigue y así sucesivamente. Aquel valor que es menos importante para usted debe de ser el número “18.”

Cuando haya terminado de numerar los valores en orden de importancia, vuelva sobre ellos y revisélos. Siéntase en libertad de cambiar el orden. Por favor tome todo el tiempo que sienta es necesario para que el producto final sea representativo de sus valores.

AMISTAD VERDADERA (compañía íntima)
AMOR MADURO (intimidad sexual y espiritual)
FELICIDAD (ser contento)
IGUALDAD (hermandad, igual oportunidad para todos)
LIBERTAD (independencia, escoger libremente)
PLACER (una vida placentera con tiempo libre)
RECONOCIMIENTO SOCIAL (respeto, admiración)
RESPETO PROPIO (estimación propia)
SABIDURÍA (una entendimiento maduro de la vida)
SALVACION (salvado, vida eterna)
SEGURIDAD FAMILIAR (el cuidado de los amados)
SEGURIDAD NACIONAL (protección de ser atacado)
TRANQUILIDAD ESPIRITUAL (libertad de conflictos internos)
UNA VIDA COMODA (una vida próspera)
UNA VIDA EXCITANTE (una vida estimulante y activa)
UN MUNDO DE BELLEZA (belleza de la naturaleza y el arte)
UN MUNDO EN PAZ (libre de guerra y conflictos)
UN SENTIDO DE HABER LOGRADO ALGO (contribución perdurable)

(NOTE: These lists of eighteen values appear again on a second page in each of the instruments used in the study. The ranking task inevitably involves erasures as a subject is seriously considering the relative importance of each value. The list on the first page functions as a worksheet; the second list on the following page serves to allow the subject to record his ‘final’ decisions.)
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The Proud Mexicans
by Robert Decker and Esther Tiscareno Marquez

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 heroism 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.
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The Relevance of Anthropology to Language Teaching

Beverly McLeod

The relevance of anthropological theory, methodology, and literature to language teaching is discussed. It is argued that culture should be taught explicitly in the language classroom, and that the anthropological theory of cultural relativity is useful in creating a judgment-free atmosphere. Both teacher and students should become amateur anthropologists, exploring and testing their own and each other’s cultures. The language classroom should be the neutral territory between two cultures, where cultural patterns and attitudes can be freely discussed. This approach would alleviate many of the psychological problems inherent in language teaching and learning. The use of an anthropological approach to language teaching enables students to gain communicative as well as linguistic competence and provides interesting and relevant content with which to practice linguistic structures. The teaching of culture can be integrated with all aspects of language teaching. Some suggestions for techniques are given. The possibility of using this approach to language teaching with speakers of a minority or non-standard language is also discussed. Both teacher and students can learn a great deal if they become partners in mutual inquiry of their own and each other’s cultures, using anthropological literature and their own knowledge as resources.

A great deal is asked of the EFL/ESL teacher these days. Not only must he teach the language, but he is also responsible for teaching something about American culture, and for developing in his students a communicative as well as a linguistic competence. As Hannerz (1973:238) states, “It is not enough for a person to be able to produce grammatical sentences; one must also know when they are contextually appropriate.” In addition, the teacher is required to know something about the linguistic and cultural background of his students. Baxter (1974:80) notes that the teacher should also have a knowledge of his students’ paralinguistic system. This is a formidable task; where is the teacher to look for help? When one thinks of “culture,” one thinks of that branch of social science which has been devoted to the study of culture—anthropology. What does anthropology have to offer to the EFL/ESL teacher?

There are some basic tenets of anthropology which may be useful to the language teacher. Most of these ideas have parallels in linguistic theory. First of all, there is the concept of culture as the shared value system of the members of a society. As a system, it has discernible patterns which can be understood by an outsider to the particular culture. Secondly, there is the idea of “cultural relativity,” a theoretical equality among the cultures.

Ms. McLeod is an M.A. student in Anthropology at the University of Hawaii. She has published in the TESL Reporter and is co-author of an article forthcoming in the Journal of Applied Social Psychology.
of the world; each should be viewed as a complete system having an integrity of its own and as appropriate for its own members. The third point is that the traditional methodology of anthropology, that of comparing two cultures, has proved to be a valuable way of discovering the characteristics of each.

How can these ideas be of use to the EFL/ESL teacher? We know that a person learns his own culture in much the same way as he learns his native language, through exposure from childhood. Thus culture is a learned behavior. Just as a person can learn another language, he can also learn another culture. This is part of what is meant by communicative competence, learning the culturally approved ways to use language. But just as the post-adolescent may need special help in learning a new language, mere exposure to the culture may not be sufficient for him to understand it. The argument here is that culture should be taught explicitly, rather than implicitly. Some justifications for this view, and some practical suggestions for implementing it, are outlined below. These ideas have particular reference to the teaching of English to foreign students in the U. S., but may also be applicable to other English-teaching situations.

Assuming that we agree on the desirability of teaching culture along with language, it should be taught explicitly for several reasons. First of all, the learner doesn't have time to learn it implicitly. A foreign student who is in the U.S. for a few years, or the student who is learning English in his own country, does not have sufficient exposure to the new culture to be able to go through the "hypothesis formation and testing" procedure. Moreover, the most fundamental aspects of one's culture are learned as a child in a family context, an experience which cannot be duplicated for the older student. Even immigrants who spend half a lifetime in a new culture often cannot be said to have "mastered" it; only their children are able to do so.

Secondly, by teaching a language, or by being a native speaker of that language, one is inevitably already teaching culture implicitly. But students may be confused or may not "get the message" unless it is made explicit. Tucker and Gatbonton (1971: 137) noted that Filipino students studying American literature either failed to understand the values implicitly expressed or interpreted them by filtering them through Filipino culture unless they were made explicit by the teacher or by specially prepared materials. Anthropological literature may be useful in helping the American teacher in an American educational system to understand his own situation. Spindler (1969: 1-9) notes the unconscious transmission of American values by the classroom teacher, and he advocates bringing the awareness of these values to the conscious level. Anthropologists have done studies of American education (Jules Henry's Culture Against Man, for example), and such studies may be helpful to the EFL/ESL teacher in making him aware of the values implicit in the system and in his role as a teacher. Anthropologists have also done studies of education in other countries, and such studies may aid the teacher in understanding the background and expectations of his students.

It is important for the teacher to understand the values which he is transmitting and also the values of the students' cultures, Anthropological
literature can be very useful to the teacher in giving him information about specific cultures and in providing the basis of training programs for teachers with students of a particular cultural background. This is a reasonable task if the teacher teaches students from a single homogeneous background year after year. But the teacher who is responsible for teaching a heterogeneous group cannot be expected to have knowledge of each culture. Paulston (1974), in her excellent article on this topic, offers a partial solution to this problem; "The difficulty with so many rules of communicative competence is that we don't consciously know many of our own, much less those of another culture. This is where the teacher becomes an anthropologist, by listening to the students, observing behavior and most of all by being aware and alert to possible conflicts." (p. 356) Paulston also gives some practical suggestions for classroom techniques for teaching communicative competence, including dialogs and role playing.

I wholeheartedly agree with Paulston's approach, but I would go one step further. Not only should the teacher become an anthropologist, but he should also encourage his students to become anthropologists as well. There is no reason to assume that the teacher is any more skillful in learning the culture of his students through implicit means alone than the students are in learning the teacher's culture. This kind of approach may solve many problems and hold greater potential for learning; it also removes the responsibility on the teacher of being omniscient and make the students more active participants in their own learning. It is Baxter's (1974:80) point of view that, unless teachers know thoroughly their students' dialect/language and paralinguistic system, "... many will be forced to expose in the classroom their ignorance of many of the subtleties of their students' communication patterns." But this is not a problem if teacher and students are viewed as partners in cultural research, rather than viewing the teacher as the source of all knowledge, and the student as merely the recipient.

In other words, the language student should be trained to be an amateur anthropological investigator, with the new culture as his field of research, as well as an informant about his own culture for the teacher. The classroom should be a haven from society, where one is allowed to ask questions about "sensitive" topics and try out new hypotheses about the culture. This kind of atmosphere is necessary because, as Paulston (1974:353) notes, people are reluctant to correct the behavior of adults in society. Thus a non-native may continue to make faux-pas in society without knowing it. The only place he can gain such information about the unacceptability of his own behavior is in the language classroom, and the person he should feel free to ask for information and advice is the language teacher. Also, the student may be puzzled by something he observes in the society but may refrain from asking about it for fear of offending. He should be encouraged to ask such questions in the language classroom. The teacher should also feel free to ask questions of the student about his own culture and behavior in order to increase his knowledge. In other words, the language classroom should be the place where students and teacher are engaged in a mutual exploration...
of their own and each other's cultures. The teacher should see himself as a link between his own culture and the students, and the students should see themselves as links between their own culture and the teacher.

Several problems which frequently occur in the language class can be alleviated by an emphasis on an anthropological approach. One problem is that some students are likely to feel that their own identity and culture are being threatened; that the language and culture they are learning is presented as being superior to their own and that learning this new language and culture may mean a loss of their own. A second problem often encountered in classes of heterogeneous composition is the fierce and often disruptive competition among national groups. Both of these problems can be ameliorated if the teacher makes it clear from the beginning that he is operating on the philosophical basis of anthropology of cultural relativity, that cultures and languages differ from each other, but no one culture or language can be said to be superior to another.

Both Rothmell (1971: 51–53) and Wissot (1969: 130) deal with this question and give suggestions as to how to conduct a heterogeneous classroom. Rothmell notes that the problem of cultural abrasion can be turned into an advantage and can be an incentive to communication. He advocates encouraging students to discuss cultural differences in class and observes that, "real, emotionally-motivated communication practice is obviously more valid than artificial communication in promoting automatic responses in English." (p. 52) Wissot uses several methods to channel hostility and competition into useful ends. He gives one bulletin board section to each national group to display pictures of their country, and he has the students teach each other the music and dances of their countries. He also has students write and teach short dialogs in their native language to students of other nationalities. This gives the students an appreciation of the difficulty of teaching and learning a foreign language and also gives them an opportunity to teach something of their own culture and language to others. This atmosphere of cultural exchange and multidirectional learning solves many of the psychological problems inherent in language learning.

Whether in a heterogeneous or homogeneous language class, teaching from an anthropological perspective has many advantages. Teacher and students can learn about their own and each other's cultures. It also gives them something to talk about. One of the problems of teaching language is finding relevant content. The topic of cultural differences provides an almost inexhaustible, inherently interesting, and realistically meaningful subject. In addition, although good materials are undoubtedly helpful, a teacher need not be deterred by their lack, since his own knowledge and that of his students about one's own culture can be used as reliable sources. There are several psychological and pedagogical advantages to this. When a student is talking about his own culture, he is talking about something in which he has some expertise. Thus, when he is sure of the content of what he is saying, he doesn't have to "worry" about it and can concentrate on using the correct
form. An Indonesian student who is attempting to discuss building a snow-man has to worry about both the content and the form. Also, the position of “resident expert” inevitably gives one self-confidence.

There are many ways to approach this subject. For example, Jaramillo (1973: 51), in stressing the importance of understanding cultural differences, notes areas in which North American and Latin American cultures may differ. These include holidays, gestures, use of time, learning styles, sex roles, teacher behavior, emotional expression, use of space, body contact, etc. Not only is it important for both teacher and students to understand these differences, but the language classroom should be the place where they can learn about them and discuss them explicitly.

Blatchford (1973:145) gives practical suggestions for the use of non-news items in newspapers for teaching culture. Brooks (1969: 20–28) advocates teaching culture along with language and provides a useful scheme of focal points of critical importance in a culture, such as subsistence and temporality, each of which could serve as an almost endless discussion topic. Baumwoll and Saitz (1965:53) give some suggestions for discussion or essay topics which stress cultural comparison. They include describing the effects of a recent borrowing or invention in one's culture, finding words in English with no equivalents in one's own language and vice versa, describing English education in one's own country, comparing a café or restaurant in the two cultures, comparing pasttimes and amusements in the two cultures and pointing out American amusements that one particularly enjoys or finds offensive, features of life in one's own country that one misses in the U. S., comparing typical activities such as shopping or sports, comparing politics, religion, class structure, comparing male-female relationships, comparing the concepts of family, privacy, and marriage, describing the distinctive characteristics of one's own people, describing tradition and change in one's own country, etc. Seelye's (1974) volume provides not only a philosophical basis for teaching culture along with language but also numerous practical suggestions for implementation, and an exhaustive catalog of available materials. He also gives valuable guidance in the evaluation of the teaching of culture and examples in designing behavioral objectives.

Returning to a linguistic level, a comparative approach may also be very useful. Asking students, “Can you say it this way in your language?” may give teachers a clue to understanding students’ errors and confusions and provide explanations which will help them. Teachers may also gain valuable information about the students’ languages from the student-taught dialogs mentioned above. For teachers who already know the language of their students, Burt and Kiparsky (1972: 19–20) recommend using it to highlight mistakes; for example, if a student uses the word order of his native language with English words, the teacher can give the student a feeling for the incorrectness of this form by showing a sentence with English word order but words from the student’s native language. A very perceptive article by Kaplan (1966) examines the different rhetorical styles used in
different languages. In order to teach English composition effectively, the teacher must be aware of these differences and make them overtly apparent to the students.

The teaching of culture need not be relegated to a half hour free conversation period once a week, but rather should be integrated into every aspect of teaching. Paulston's suggested dialogs can be used for learning structure as well as culture. She also recommends role playing as an effective technique for learning and practicing social formulas, which differ greatly from country to country. When students are learning new vocabulary, they should be learning the social as well as referential meanings. Researchers such as Szalay, Noon, and Bryson (1971) are engaged in preparing “communication lexicons” which will provide information about the actual usage and social meanings of words in different cultures. As noted above, an understanding of cultural differences aids in developing writing skills. When writing compositions, students need to know that, while a circular progression of ideas is appropriate for developing a topic in Chinese exposition, a linear progression is the preferred form in English (Kaplan 1966). And of course, reading is an area which offers many possibilities for emphasizing culture although, as noted above, care must be taken that misinterpretations do not result. Marquardt (1967:9) advocates the use of selected literature to teach American culture, and gives specific suggestions of appropriate works. He especially recommends stories and plays which show Americans interacting with non-Americans or in foreign cultures, those which emphasize particular American values or illustrate American family life, and those written by foreigners about America. A further avenue for cultural exchange would be to have students translate or recount stories from their own countries and explain the cultural content.

Just as the archaeologist pays attention to every tiny fragment of pottery he finds, so the social anthropologist hopes to discover general patterns by observing minute aspects of behavior. This approach can also yield valuable results in the language classroom. For example, suppose a lesson were devoted to the ethnography of a meal. The students could write essays, or dialogs, or have a discussion, or role play, but whatever the form, the following information should be brought out about mealtime in various cultures:

1. What time of day is the main meal eaten?
2. What kind of food is eaten?
3. What kind of receptacles, utensils, are used?
4. How is the food cooked, by whom, where?
5. How is the food served, by whom?
6. Where is the meal eaten?
7. Who eats with whom? Who eats separately? Who eats before or after whom?
8. Does everyone eat the same food, the same amount of food?
9. How long does the meal last?
10. What happens during the meal? Is there talk or silence?
11. Who talks to whom? Who is silent?
12. What are the rules of etiquette, table manners?
Having students describe such simple daily routines as this, or draw a plan of their house, school, or village at home, reveals distinctive cultural differences which may be linked to cultural values.

In summary, the language teacher should take the responsibility of explicitly teaching culture as well as language; partly because one cannot properly separate language from culture, and teaching language only will leave the students social cripples, and partly because there is no one else to assume this responsibility. In many cases, the language teacher is the only “neutral” person the student can turn to for information and advice. In order to create a “judgment-free” atmosphere of inquiry in the language class, an anthropologist perspective may be a valuable guide. Just as studying another language brings to awareness aspects of one’s own language, comparing a new culture with one’s own brings to a conscious level the knowledge one has about one’s own culture. A heightened self-awareness, as well as a knowledge of the other culture, is important for both teacher and student. When the students leave the language classroom to go out into the society, they must be equipped to decode the social messages they receive, to realize when there has been miscommunication, and to be able to articulate their own values and behavior patterns. They should be able to educate Americans about their cultures as well as learning about American culture.

So far, the discussion has focused on post-adolescent learners who are foreigners in the U.S. Can the anthropological perspective be of value to those who teach children and/or U.S. citizens whose native language is not English or not standard English? First of all, with regard to children, there is no more the need to assume that the teacher must be omniscient than when teaching adults. Goodman (1962: 238), in a study of children’s values, notes her “… assumption that children can serve as anthropological-style informants, being qualified like their elders by membership in a society and command of a limited part of that society’s culture. It is reasonable to assume that children not only can but should be solicited to act as informants, since their very naivete offers advantages. They can tell us first-hand and without retrospection what their society and culture look like through their eyes, or what childhood is like with respect to its perceptions of society and culture.”

The problem of culture dominance and defensiveness is even more pronounced in a second language/minority language classroom than in a foreign language/foreign student classroom. Therefore, the need for a cultural relativity point of view is even more imperative. Abbey (1973:249) recognizes the importance of teaching elementary school social studies as social anthropology, from a perspective of cultural relativity, especially for minority or bilingual children in the school system. Huntsman (1972: 255) notes that the usual equation of good English with a good job by teachers is an ineffective motivation and may be damaging to the self-esteem of students whose native language is not standard English. Such students tend to see
themselves as failures in this situation, and lower their aspirations. Huntsman advocates instead making cultural differences explicit by discussing language attitudes in class.

For their own survival in American society, it is necessary for students from minority ethnic and language groups to know and understand the values of the dominant cultural group. On the other hand, those who are committed to a pluralistic society do not want to see ethnic cultures and languages disappear. By using an anthropological perspective, the English teacher can begin to work on both these problems. Minority students can learn about the dominant culture and at the same time teach their non-ethnic teacher and peers about their own language and culture, without feeling threatened by assimilation. But this can be accomplished only in an atmosphere of honesty and explicitness, where the basic assumptions of cultural relativity are understood and accepted by all. The teacher must prepare the students for the reality of prejudice that they will inevitably face. It is unfair to assure students of the dignity of their own language and culture and their “right” to their own heritage without also making them realize that this “right” is thus far more theoretical than actual. Nostrand (1966:1-25) advocates “innoculating” students with small doses of culture shock in order to avoid or lessen possible future conflict or unhappiness.

The anthropological perspective and the technique of role playing can be especially effective for students whose cultural learning styles are radically different from those of the dominant culture and who are suddenly thrust into the dominant school system. For example, many American Indian students are now being educated for the first several grades of elementary school in reservation schools which attempt to use traditional culture and ways of learning. Then they must suddenly switch to an Anglo school, and they often have difficulty adapting. This kind of situation for the Warm Springs Indians of Oregon is described in an article by Phillips (1972:370–94). There are two solutions to this dilemma. One is to educate the Indian children in the “Anglo style” from the beginning. This was the practice of the past and it is generally agreed to be either a failure or culturally insensitive. Another solution is to let the students practice Anglo culture while still on the reservation, in other words, inoculate them.

The plan I would propose would be this. First of all, the children would be assured of the value and integrity of their own culture but would also be made to recognize the fact that they would have to deal with the dominant culture. Thus, they should learn about the dominant culture, its values, and behavior patterns. In addition, they should have an opportunity to “practice” the dominant culture. Thus, the teacher on the reservation could designate one day a week to role play and practice “attending an Anglo school.” Thus the students will learn what to expect and what will be expected of them when they actually do go to the Anglo school. They will be confident because they will have a knowledge of the values and rules of behavior of Anglo society. At the same time, one would hope that, in the situation de-
scribed by Phillips, in which Indian students comprise one-fifth of the student body, some effort would be made on the part of the Anglo school to understand Indian culture. It would not be unreasonable to expect the Anglo students and teachers to learn about and even “practice” Indian culture. In this way, both groups can deal with realities rather than with stereotypes, and the minority group need not feel that by “acting Anglo,” they will “become Anglo” any more than an actor becomes the character he plays on stage. This is not to say that this approach will solve all of the difficulties inherent in this situation. But it will at least give more options to the Indian students. If they wish to conform to the patterns of the Anglo school, they will be equipped with the linguistic and social skills necessary to be successful. If they choose not to conform, both they and the Anglo-teachers will understand what is really happening, instead of automatically assuming a lack of intelligence or motivation. Moreover, it is hoped that each group would develop a respect and understanding of the culture of the other group.

The ideas expressed above are an initial attempt to show how the literature, philosophy, and methodology of the field of anthropology may have relevance to language teaching. There is an opportunity for both students and teachers to learn a great deal more than language if the teacher is willing to join with the students in an atmosphere of mutual inquiry about one’s own and other cultures.
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Models of English for The Third World

White Man's Linguistic Burden or

Language Pragmatics?

Braj B. Kachru

The development of non-native varieties of English in Third World countries (e.g. West Africa, the Philippines, South Asia) is of linguistic, cultural, pedagogical and sociolinguistic interest. The attitude of TESL specialists, among others, toward such varieties of English on the two sides of the Atlantic is evaluated in Prator (1968). One such attitude, endorsed by Prator, and represented by him as typically American, may be termed linguistic purism and linguistic intolerance—a pragmatically unrealistic attitude. If one follows Prator’s language, this attitude may be categorized as one of “seven attitudinal sins.” These “sins” seem to be the result of a formally and functionally unjustifiable position which some scholars in TESL, following Prator, have adopted. Such views have naturally resulted in various types of “heresies,” which are theoretically suspect and without empirical evidence. In linguistically and culturally pluralistic Third World countries, the motivations for the study of English—its social educational and other roles—have to be viewed in terms of the typical native sociolinguistic parameters. An interrelationship has to be established between the formal and functional aspects of language to understand the pragmatics of the Third World Englishes and their linguistic innovations and “deviations.” Data from Indian English is discussed to provide arguments against the attitudinal “sins” and “heresies,” and to present the pragmatics of Indian English—one of the Third World Englishes.

In the last century a substantial body of linguistic literature has been written presenting language attitudes of those speakers of English who use English as their first language, for example, the speakers of American English, British English, and Australian English. (For discussion see, e.g., Read 1933, 1935, 1936 and 1938; Mencken 1936.) These attitudes and reactions form a spectrum which vary from hilarious attitudinal epithets to a

---

1 An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Ninth Annual Convention of the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Los Angeles, California on March 7, 1975. I am grateful to Rudolph C. Troike and Ladislav Zgusta for their comments. The responsibility for the views expressed in this paper remains, of course, entirely mine.
plea for linguistic tolerance (Quirk 1972: 14–31). In recent years the language war between cousins speaking the same language and living on different continents seems to have subsided. In America it has, however, taken the shape of a family feud in which the members of the same speech community, say, for example, the speakers of American English, have started evaluating attitudes toward the various dialect speakers of their variety of the language. On this side of the Atlantic the last decade has produced a great deal of literature presenting conflictive points of view on the colored varieties of English, i.e. Black and White. (See, e.g., Burling 1973; Dillard 1972; Labov 1972; and Shuy 1967.)

In this paper I propose to discuss another linguistic feud, primarily one of language attitudes, between the native speakers of various varieties of English (and some non-native speakers, too) and the speakers of the non-native varieties of English, such as Filipino English, Caribbean English, Indian English, etc. In the available literature on this topic only one side of the picture seems to have been presented, that of the native speakers of English. I shall first discuss these attitudes and then focus on certain pragmatic questions related to a particular non-native variety of English used in a Third World country. Since in these countries a large spectrum of colors is involved, it is not possible to categorize these varieties as Black English, White English, or Brown English. No one color category can include all these varieties.

It would be appropriate first to clear away a few attitudinal cobwebs which we find in some recent literature, about non-native varieties of English. I do not want to give the impression that I am out to destroy an imaginary linguistic straw man; therefore, as an illustration of such linguistic attitudes, I shall use this paper as a belated response to a paper of Clifford H. Prator, a distinguished and active scholar in the area of the Teaching of English as a Foreign Language. His paper “The British Heresy in TESL” (Fishman, et al., 1968: 459–76) provides my starting point for several reasons. First, it demonstrates a typical language attitude which continues to be nurtured by several educated native speakers and educators of English. Second, it reflects the attitude of one important segment of our profession toward those varieties of English which are not used as first languages; this interdisciplinary profession has several acronyms depending on which aspect of it is under focus, but the ones generally used are TESL and TEFL. In the TESL operation, as is evident from Prator’s paper, an unrealistic and unpragmatic attitude toward the non-native varieties of English seems to have developed. The reasons for this are several, but one main reason is that, as yet, the role of English in the sociolinguistic context of each English-using Third World country is not properly understood, or is conveniently ignored. The consequences of this attitude are that the Third World countries are slowly realizing that, given the present attitude of TESL specialists, it is difficult to expect from such specialists any theoretical insights and professional leadership in this field which would be contextually, attitudinally and prag-
matically useful to the Third World countries. Third, since Prator’s attitude is shared by other influential people in the profession, it is important that a user of a Third World (transplanted) variety of English, like myself, attempt to present the other side of the picture. My side of the picture is naturally based on my Indian experience and Indian data; but it seems to me that one can make several generalizations on the basis of this experience which may apply to most of the Third World (English-using) countries.

The paper under discussion was presented by Prator in 1966 and published in 1968. This paper provides a good example of linguistic purism and linguistic intolerance, in which Prator has naturally associated himself, as he says, with the French attitude to language, and dissociated himself with what he terms “the British group.” He discusses a doctrine which is “unjustifiable intellectually and not conducive to the best possible results in practice” (459). The heresy which has provoked Prator’s puritanic wrath is summed up by him in the following words:

... the heretical tenet I feel I must take exception to is the idea that it is best, in a country where English is not spoken natively but is widely used as the medium of instruction, to set up the local variety of English as the ultimate model to be imitated by those learning the language. (459)

I shall, therefore, first discuss briefly some of the points raised by Prator in his paper and then turn to the question of the pragmatics of the English language in a Third World country, namely India. By the term “pragmatic” I mean the roles and uses of English in the overall societal network of India, in which Indian English is used as a language of interaction, for maintaining Indian patterns of administration, education, and legal system, and also for creating a pan-Indian (Indian English) literature which forms part of the world writing in English. I shall also present some results of a recent restricted survey of the uses of the English language in India and the Indian attitude toward its various models.

1.0. Seven attitudinal sins

Since Prator’s paper, both in its title and its tone, introduces us to the world of heresies in TESL, it might not be inappropriate to divide his attitude into seven parts and term these “the seven attitudinal sins.” His paper is a sociolinguistically important document, as it exhibits the language attitude of an educated speaker, and his perception of how his language should be used by those who use it as a foreign or second language. It demonstrates much more than just that; it also establishes an identity with the speech community of another language based on the identical language attitudes (in his case, with the French). Prator then develops a set of fallacies to mark as separate those members of the English speech community who (he would like to believe) do not have language attitudes identical to his, namely the British.

It is easy to demonstrate that the linguistic tolerance attributed to my former colonial masters is undeserved. But I will not go into that digression
It is true that David Abercrombie, M. A. K. Halliday and Peter Strevens, among others, have adopted the position condemned as “heretical” by Prator. But the position of these scholars has developed partly as a reaction to those British scholars or organizations who hold views identical to those of Prator. However, I will go along with Prator’s assumption about the British linguists working in the field of TESL and take the position that I am in good company with several British linguists in the stand which I adopt here. An analysis of Prator’s paper shows that he has committed the following “seven attitudinal sins”—that is, if we follow his own use of the terms.

1.1 The sin of ethnocentrism: Prator has adopted (rather perversely) an intellectually and empirically unjustified view concerning the homogeneity and speech uniformity of American society. Consider, for example, his statement that “Social classes are difficult to distinguish in the United States, and social dialects show relatively little variation” (471). This view is, of course, contrary to the empirical linguistic research undertaken in America for over two decades (see, e.g., Allen and Underwood 1971; Currie 1952; Labov 1966; Markwardt 1958; Williamson and Burke 1971). Consider, for example, the following observation in Wolfram and Fasold (1974: 27):

It is obvious that throughout the history of the English language in America, the layman has recognized that social differences were often reflected in language differences. Scholars of the English language in America have also been quite aware of these differences. Terms such as vulgar, uncultivated, common or illiterate speech all refer to what we now call nonstandard English. For the most part, English scholars viewed these language varieties as deviations from acceptable usage, reflecting the same linguistic prejudice as the layman.

In earlier literature, too, the social parameter of language variation has been well documented and discussed (see, e.g., Babbitt 1896 and McDavid 1948). It is obvious, therefore, that this unrealistic view has been adopted by Prator in spite of the empirical evidence contrary to it; in turn it is this view which makes him adopt an unrealistic attitude of homogeneity and linguistic conformity in non-native varieties of English.

1.2. The sin of wrong perception about the language attitudes on the two sides of the Atlantic: Prator has attempted to structure the language attitudes of the speakers of English on the two sides of the Atlantic in a neat

---

2 One might say that Prator has been unfair in condemning the whole British nation for a linguistic tolerance which traditionally they have not extended even to the first varieties of English, say Australian English, American English, and Scottish English. A Scotsman speaking Scottish English was until recently made to blush for his “dialect” in the portals of the British Broadcasting Corporation and the Foreign Service Office. The RP speaking fraternity was dominant, and RP was considered the only model for the teaching and learning of English. It seems to me that even now the attitude present in the work of David Abercrombie, M. A. K. Halliday and Peter Strevens does not represent the attitude of the majority of British educators and TESL specialists, but, then, that is another story.
dichotomy. The British attitude is presented as one of “... deep-seated mistrust of the African who presumes to speak English too well” (471). This hypothesis has been built on the evidence of “at least one well known British linguist.” The corollary of this “one British linguist's” observation is

A man who consciously regards language as a symbol of social status is naturally suspicious of one who appropriates the symbol but clearly does not belong to the social group that it typifies. If an Englishman is himself a proud speaker of RP, he may find each encounter with a person who obviously does not speak his language well a pleasantly reassuring reminder of the exclusiveness of his own social group. (471)

On the other hand, the attitude of the French and Americans is presented thus:

The mistrust of French and Americans seems rather to be directed toward the outsider who does not speak French or English well. (471)

The reason for this attitude of the American English speaker, says Prator, is:

... the American's greater experience with large numbers of immigrants, whose presence in his country he has felt as an economic threat and a social problem, undoubtedly helps to explain his greater antipathy toward foreign accents. (471)

The sociological asides supposed to provide bases for the two types of language attitudes, unfortunately, are not only counter-intuitive, but without any empirical basis.

1.3. The sin of not recognizing the non-native varieties of English as culture-bound codes of communication: It is evident from Prator’s paper that he ignores the inevitable process of acculturation which the English language has undergone in Third World countries such as the Indian sub-continent, the West Indies, or Africa (see, e.g., Kachru 1969 and 1975; Ramchand 1970). In these countries the English language is not taught as a vehicle to introduce British or American culture. In these countries, English is used to teach and maintain the indigenous patterns of life and culture, to provide a link in culturally and linguistically pluralistic societies, and to maintain a continuity and uniformity in educational, administrative and legal systems. Again, let us consider the case of India as an example. In their almost two hundred years of not-so-peaceful stay on the Indian sub-continent, the Britishers left several legacies in India. One legacy which the Indians slowly accepted, and then in their typical Indian way acculturated, is the English language. The outcome of this long process of Indianization of the English language is what is now termed “Indian English.” In the linguistic history of India this phenomenon is consistent with the past linguistic assimilations of this country—for example, the Indianization of Persian, the Dravidization of Sanskrit, and the Indo-Aryanization of the Dravidian languages. (See, e.g., Gumperz 1971; Kachru 1975d.) In this acculturation of languages, India is not unique, since this phenomenon is typical of a situation of language contact and language convergence.
1.4. The sin of ignoring the systemicness of the non-native varieties of English: The claim that there is a system to the non-native varieties of English, say, e.g., Indian English or West African English is not taken seriously by Prator. Though he agrees that the “mother-tongue varieties of English also lack compete consistency, and idiolects vary with circumstances” (469), he is obviously concerned that among the non-native English speakers... very few speakers limit their aberrances to the widely shared features: each individual typically adds to his own speech a large and idiosyncratic collection of features reflecting his particular native language, educational background, and personal temperament. (464)

His concern develops into a serious worry when he proclaims no “scientific meaning” for a definition such as “Indian English is the English spoken by educated Indians” (465).

However, it turns out that in linguistic research or preparation of pedagogical materials it is not uncommon to use identical “impressionistic,” or what Prator calls “scientifically meaningless” concepts. Consider, for example, the use of the term “educated English” by Randolph Quirk for his Survey of English Usage, an outcome of which is the latest A Grammar of Contemporary English. When the project was initiated, Quirk presented the goal of the survey as follows: (Quirk 1960)

The Survey is concerned with ‘educated’ English: that is, no account is taken of dialect or sub-standard usage. But it is necessarily acknowledged that these terms are relative and that the varieties of English so labelled are by no means entirely contained within hard and fast boundaries. It is an important feature of a language’s ‘style-reservoir’ that there should be a periphery of relatively dubious usage which the timid avoid, the defiant embrace, and the provocative exploit; we may compare our mild fun with ‘he didn’t ought to have ate it’ or ‘who done it’... A working definition like ‘Educated English is English that is recognized as such by educated native English speakers’ is not as valueless as its circularity would suggest.

In presenting the structure of the non-native varieties of English a more or less identical procedural concept was used. (See, for example, Bansal 1969; Masica 1972.) The concept of “cline of bilingualism” (see Kachru 1965) is crucial in this context. Consider, again, in this context the observation of Quirk (1972: 49)

In the Indian and African countries, we find an even spectrum of kinds of English, which extends from those most like Pidgin to those most like standard English, with imperceptible gradations the whole way along.

1.5. The sin of ignoring linguistic interference and language dynamics: There are several reasons why the non-native varieties of English deviate at the phonological, grammatical and lexical levels. First, as is well known, the presence of a substratum. Second, the impact of cultural parameters. Third, resistance to the impact of linguistic change which influences the native varieties of English. Fourth, attaching primary importance to written
sources, especially those of the 18th and 19th centuries. This manifests itself in what has been labeled “bookishness” in Indian English (Kachru 1969: 653).

The impact of contextual parameters has been equally important in marking the distinctness of the native varieties of English, and in their innovations at various levels. This is well documented in Baker (1945) for Australian English, and Mencken (1963) and Markwardt (1958: 21-58) for American English. In the same way, a large number of innovations in Indian English or West African English are contextually determined. (See, e.g., for Indian English, Kachru 1969 and 1975b, and for West Indies English, Ramchand 1970.)

The English language has functioned in India for two hundred years; it would obviously be “intellectually unjustifiable” to expect it to function there in a socio-cultural vacuum. Probably it demonstrates the strength of the English language that the pragmatic parameters of India have molded it to Indian needs and aspirations. In other words, it has slowly gone through a process of Indianization. This is a process which is normal for a human language which is used for day to day interaction. Prator seems to attach too much importance to the “model” of the spoken word.

1.6. The sin of overlooking the “cline of Englishness” in language intelligibility: In whatever little research has been done on language intelligibility we find that this concept has yet to be related to the concepts of appropriateness and effectiveness in a speech situation (Catford 1950:7–15). In understanding the pragmatic use of language it is essential that the concept intelligibility be explained in these terms and that it be related to the “context of situation” (Kachru 1966). The little we know about intelligibility convinces us to accept the “cline of intelligibility” more or less parallel to and related to the “cline of bilingualism” (Kachru 1965:393–96). In fact, the cline of bilingualism makes sense only if intelligibility is used as the primary criterion. Note, however, that the cline of intelligibility is not a concept related only to the phonetic level of language, as Prator suggests, but extends to all the levels. It applies to the first-language varieties of a language, to the second-language varieties and also to intelligibility between dialects of the same language. Consider, for example, Quirk’s observation (Quirk 1972: 36):

It is in fact impossible to read the Lallans poetry of contemporary Scotland without believing them independent, or the novels of Alan Sillitoe without

---

3This point has been well presented by Markwardt (1958:6) with reference to American English:

“Language is the product of the society which employs it, and as it is employed it is engaged in a continual process of re-creation. If this is the case, we may reasonably expect a language to reflect the culture, the folkways, the characteristic psychology of the people who use it.”

There is no reason to believe that the same logic should not apply to a nonnative variety of English which has been used as a second language in a linguistically and culturally pluralistic context for over two hundred years in India or in parts of Africa.
sharing his belief that the working class substandard speech of contemporary Nottingham is capable of the fullest sensibilities and range of expression. And you may recall that although Mellors was perfectly fluent in Standard British English, he felt that only his Derbyshire dialect was adequate to loving Lady Chatterley.

Thus, the problem, as Prator perceives it, is not necessarily one of intelligibility between the speakers of the native varieties of English and the non-native varieties of English. Rather, the question is one of recognizing that there is a cline in intelligibility among the members of the speech community who speak different varieties. In the case of non-native speakers, the higher a person is on the cline of bilingualism, the higher intelligibility he attains with a person of identical background and education (see below, 2.0). There are two other points which need enumeration here. First, in language learning, it is not only appropriate but crucial to relate the model of language to the attitudes and reactions of the actual learners. One wonders how sensible it is to present a speaker of RP as a model of spoken English to a class full of Black students in America, or a Midwestern speaker in a junior college in a village in India. Second, overemphasis on the role of the phonetic level for language intelligibility is also questionable. There are two angles to this question. One is a pedagogical one, the other is a pragmatic one. Pedagogically one might ask: Do all the Indian learners of English really need to concentrate on the spoken forms? The uses of English in India are so varied and so medium-restricted that a large percentage of learners, perhaps, need only a reading knowledge of English. In overemphasizing the spoken form of a language for intelligibility, we still seem to be under the hangover of the structuralist tenets of language pedagogy.

It seems to me that the whole concept of intelligibility is open to question if we do not include the appropriate parameters of the context of situation as relevant to intelligibility at various levels. J. R. Firth, a proud Englishman and a supporter of English as a world language has put this point well in the following words (Firth 1930:177 (quoted from 1966 reprint)):

In the primary speech situation 'meaning' is as much a property of the situational context of people, things, and events as of the 'noise' made by the speaker. The noise is important, but not nearly so important as purists and others believe.

1.7. The sin of exhibiting language colonialism: An enthusiastic defender of the non-native varieties of English will not be too wrong if he detects traces of linguistic and cultural colonialism in Prator’s arguments. If this attitude does not manifest itself in the imposition of a particular language, it shows in an unrealistic prescription with reference to a model.

Prator mentions the current research in language learning in which various types of motivations for achievement in language learning are discussed, for example Lambert’s research at McGill University. Out of the two motivations in language learning, namely integrative and instrumental, Prator seems to recommend an “integrative” orientation to language teach-
ing as opposed to an “instrumental” orientation. In an approach based on the integrative orientation a learner wants “... to identify with the members of the other linguistic-cultural group and be willing to take on very subtle aspects of their behavior such as their language or even their style of speech (Prator’s italics, 474). On the other hand, in the instrumental orientation, a language is used primarily as a tool and “... corresponds to the typically British attitude toward the teaching of English” (474).

In presenting these two motivations in language learning Prator seems to set up a preferential order with an embedded language attitude which ignores the realities concerning the uses of English and elevates the integrative approach to the level of cultural colonization. The “insistence on aiming toward a mother-tongue type of pronunciation is an essential part” in the teaching of French, German or Russian in India, but the case of English in India is entirely different from those of these languages.

In suggesting—even indirectly—the “integrative approach” to the teaching of English in India Prator is committing several fallacies, viz. (a) neglecting the roles of English primarily as an Indianized link language for function in Indian culture and society; (b) failing to see the role of English as identical to that of Sanskrit in earlier Indian history, or that of Indian Persian in the North of India during the Muslim period. It is true that the areas of function of Sanskrit and English are not identical. However, the parallel between the use of these languages in the Indian socio-cultural network remains; and (c) failing to make a distinction between second language learning and foreign language learning at various levels of bilingualism in a culture where over 17 million people are English-knowing bilingual. (That is, approximately 3% of India’s population.)

In India, as in other Third World countries, the English language is used to “integrate” culturally and linguistically pluralistic societies. “Integration” with the British or American culture is not the primary aim. It might not be out of place to mention here that this “outer language colonialism” seems to manifest itself in “internal colonialism” within the U.S.A. too, especially with reference to the attitude toward Black English and such other varieties of English.

2.0. From “sins” to “heresies”: the case of Indian English

Prator’s language attitude is clearly shown in the preceding statements which I have labeled “attitudinal sins.” In addition, the list of “heresies” reflecting his attitude toward one specific non-native variety of English, namely Indian English, is equally impressive.

I shall discuss some of these “heresies” below, since Prator has made claims which are subjective and without any empirical basis. It is not uncommon to find Prator’s claims on Indian English quoted by others without verification. These claims, and many other such claims, have gained a snowball effect and generated several myths about Indian English.

4I have taken this term from Rudolph C. Troike (personal communication).
The first claim Prator makes is that "...the doctrine of local models of English is championed more often and more vehemently in India than anywhere else" (473).

A recent survey of the attitudes toward various models of English among the faculty and graduate students in English in Indian universities does not support this claim of Prator. The survey was based on written questionnaires and administered to three groups of people: (a) 700 Indian students enrolled in Bachelor's and Master's programs in selected Indian universities and colleges, (b) 196 members of the teaching faculty involved in the teaching of English in selected colleges and universities, and (c) 29 heads of English departments. (For details see Kachru 1975c.) The participants in the survey were asked to rank in order of preference American English, British English, Indian English or any other variety, as models for teaching English. The ranking of various models in terms of preference is presented in Table 1 and Table 2 below.

### TABLE 1
Graduate Students' Attitude Toward Various Models of English and Ranking of Models According to Preference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Preference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American English</td>
<td>5.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British English</td>
<td>67.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian English</td>
<td>22.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't care</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Good&quot; English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is interesting that Indians still consider the British model to be the preferred model (66.66% first preference). It is only after British English that they rank Indian English. Perhaps Prator is not aware of the fact that the struggle for recognition of the term and concept "Indian English" has as eventful a history as that for the terms "American English" and "Australian English." The opposition to the concept Indian English came from both

---

1. The pilot survey was originally undertaken by me as a consultant to the Ford Foundation during 1974. (See Kachru 1975c.) I am thankful to the following for helping me in abstracting the relevant information from the questionnaires: Syed Mohd Syeed, Ahmad Hasan Siddiqui, and S. N. Sridhar.
British educators and highly educated Indians. It is only recently that the term has gained currency in India (Kachru 1969).

The second claim Prator makes is that “...for the rest of the English-speaking world the most unintelligible educated variety is Indian English” (473). It is obvious that in making this statement Prator has been carried away by emotions and by his language attitude. It is not even clear what Prator has in mind when he uses the term “Indian English.” Indian English has a “cline of intelligibility” the same way as does any other variety of a language. A distinction therefore, has to be made between the educated or the standard variety as opposed to its non-standard varieties. The educated or standard variety of Indian English will also allow variation, as does educated British English or American English. In this context let me present the sober words of a blue-blooded Englishman and a distinguished linguist, J. R. Firth. (Firth 1930, reprint 1966: 196)

Educated English shows a wide range of permissible variation. Speakers of this kind of English do not necessarily submerge all signs of social or geographical origin. Their accent is often unmistakably local and characteristic of a class. Educated English is spoken by all classes of people all over the English speaking world. This is the only kind of English that has the remotest chance of universality even in Great Britain itself.

And he also warns against cultivating “...a shameful negative English which effectually masks social and local origin and is a suppression of all that is vital in speech.”

At present we have very little empirical evidence on the question of the intelligibility of non-native varieties of English. The results of a study completed in 1969 (Bansal 1969) are summarized in Table 3 below. The table presents the results of tests for measuring intelligibility between, (i) Indian English speakers and native speakers of English (both American English and RP speakers); (ii) between Indian English speakers and other non-native speakers of English (Germans and Nigerians); (iii) among the speakers of Indian English. Note that the highest figures and the average figures are of interest, and these do not support the subjective judgment of Prator.

**TABLE 3**

The Intelligibility of Indian English (Test Results)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants in test</th>
<th>Highest %</th>
<th>Lowest %</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Indian English &amp; RP speakers (group)</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Indian English &amp; RP speakers (cline of intelligibility)</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Indian English &amp; American English speakers</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Indian English &amp; German speakers</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Indian English speakers &amp; Nigerians</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Indian English speakers with other Indian English speakers</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. RP speakers with other RP speakers</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In his third claim Prator is only partly correct; at least, that is what the above-mentioned survey shows. His claim is that “An Afghan will probably be greatly pleased if you tell him he speaks English like an Englishman or an American; an Indian may be quite discontented by the same remark” (460). Any educator working in the field of English studies in India could intuitively tell Prator that he is not completely correct in making such a statement. The response of the participants in the above survey does not present a clear opinion on this point. In Table 4 I have presented the self-identification of the spoken variety of English by graduate students majoring in English.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity-marker</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American English</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British English</td>
<td>29.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian English</td>
<td>55.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Mixture” of all three</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t know</td>
<td>8.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Good” English</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.0. **Indian English in the Indian sociolinguistic context**

After discussing Prator’s attitudinal linguistic “sins” and “heresies,” let me now turn to the question of Indian English in the Indian sociolinguistic context. In order to contextualize Indian English with reference to its participants in what may be termed “the Indian English speech community,” two questions must be asked: First, why is Indian English (or, if one prefers, just English) used in India? Second, how is Indian English used by the Indian English speech community? The first question then relates to the functions of Indian English in typically Indian contexts, and the second to the formal aspects of Indian English. It seems to me that it is only after one relates the functions and form of Indian English that one can provide a pragmatic profile of this variety of English in Indian culture and society. It is only then that one can meaningfully explain the deviations of Indian English from the native varieties of English at various linguistic levels.

In the development of the distinct non-native varieties of English three types of grids have primarily determined their deviations from the native varieties of English, namely the cultural grid, the linguistic grid, and the pragmatic grid.

The interaction of cultural and linguistic grids in a language contact situation, and their influence on languages at various linguistic levels, has formed part of linguistic studies from the neo-grammian period to the recent studies of Black English and the non-native varieties of English (for a detailed bibliography see Kachru 1969). I shall, therefore, not discuss these here. By the term “pragmatic grid” I mean the use of language in contextually determined situations, the emphasis being on the appropriateness of an
utterance in a well defined contextual unit. (See for discussion Kachru 1975a: 77–78.) The appropriateness of an utterance may be judged by contextual substitution and textual substitution (Kachru 1965:391–92). The contextual unit is, of course, to be related to the wider “context of situation” peculiar to the speech community which is actually using the language under discussion.

3.1. A pragmatic profile of Indian English: A pragmatic profile of Indian English will not be complete without answering the following questions: Who are the members of the Indian English speech community? Who do the members of the Indian English speech community interact with outside their own speech community?

The membership of the Indian English speech community consists primarily of those bi- or multilingual Indians who use English as a second language mainly in Indian sociocultural, educational and administrative contexts. In all these contexts the interaction is basically among Indians who make use of English as a “link” language or as an “official” language. Only a minimal fraction of the English-using Indian literate population has any interaction with native speakers of English. In fact, it is interesting that out of the graduate faculty of English in the universities and colleges surveyed by me, 65.64% had only occasional interaction with native speakers and 11.79% had no interaction. Only 5.12% claim to have daily interaction with native speakers of English. Note that in this case we are talking of a highly specialized segment of the Indian educated population, professionally involved in the teaching of English at the higher level (see Table 5).

| Interaction of Graduate Faculty of English with Native Speakers of English |
|---------------------------------|---|
| Frequency                | %  |
| Very frequently          | 15.38 |
| Daily                    | 5.12  |
| Occasionally             | 65.64 |
| Never                    | 11.79 |

Such interaction will be considerably less if we take a typical cross section of the users of English in India from all walks of life.

3.1.1. The varieties of Indian English: In the multilingual and culturally pluralistic context of India, the English language has naturally developed its regional, social and occupational varieties just as any living language is expected to do. The standard (or educated) variety of Indian English cuts across these regional varieties, in the same way as does standard American English in America, or Standard Scottish English in Scotland. It is interesting to note that the members of the Indian English speech community surveyed by me intuitively recognized from one to ten varieties of Indian English. (See Table 6.)
TABLE 6
Varieties of Indian English Intuitively Recognized by Members of the Indian English Speech Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of varieties</th>
<th>% of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>16.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>17.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>16.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>12.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>7.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven</td>
<td>5.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nine</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1.2. The uses of English in India: Indian English has developed typically Indian registers of legal system, business, newspapers, and also a large body of Indian English creative writing (fiction, poetry, etc.). A detailed treatment of these aspects of Indian English is available in Iyengar (1962), Kachru (1970), Mukherjee (1971), Naik et al. (1968) and Narasimhaiah (1967).

Tables 7 and 8 give some idea about the use of English in the reading of general literature and also in personal interaction.

TABLE 7
Use of English in the Reading of General Literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Material</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers &amp; magazines</td>
<td>70.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General reading</td>
<td>63.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 8
Use of English in Personal Interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction with</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>All the time</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>50.34</td>
<td>28.97</td>
<td>9.11</td>
<td>8.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>49.65</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>40.81</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>27.75</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>67.48</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.0. Third World Englishes: two premises

It seems to me that it is essential that the attitudes toward the major Third World varieties of English should not be those of Prator. There is a need to see the function of these varieties with reference to the country in which English is used, its roles in the sociocultural network and the dependency of the local variety on the native variety with special reference to interaction with native speakers. If looked at in this way, the cases of India
and West Africa are different from those of Japan and Iran. Let me provide here a specific example with reference to Indian English. We must accept two premises concerning Indian English, as we should about any other Third World variety of English. First, that the users of Indian English form a distinct speech community who use a variety of English which is by and large formally distinct because it performs functions which are different from the other varieties of English. Second, that Indian English functions in the Indian socio-cultural context in order to perform those roles which are relevant and appropriate to the social, educational and administrative network of India.

It is evident that the position Prator adopts is based on a fundamentally different assumption, namely that the aim of the Indian English speech community is necessarily to interact with (and become part of) those speakers of English who use it as their first language. This assumption is only partly true. A fraction of Indian English speakers certainly have such goals in mind if they desire positions in the foreign service or international business, or if they desire interaction with the international scholarly community. The small group of such status seekers in India, as elsewhere, have to be proficient in a model which is very high on the “cline of intelligibility.” It does not necessarily have to be RP or standard American English. Let the model be educated Indian English. A little effort on the part of the native speakers to understand Indians is as important as a little effort on the part of Indians to make themselves understood by those who use English as their first language. The result will be a desirable variety of English with the distinctiveness of Kissingerian English, intelligible, acceptable and at the same time enjoyable. Let us not make almost seventeen million Indian English speakers sound like WASPS lost in the tropical terrain of India, nor should they sound, as Quirk notes, like the RP speakers sound to the Americans, “clipped, cold and rather effeminate.” (Quirk 1972: 22)

The second premise is that the appropriateness of these varieties should be judged with reference to the socio-cultural context of the particular non-native speech community which is using the variety. It seems to me that in language use one has to consider three things, namely role appropriateness, intelligibility between the participants in the role, and cultural appropriateness. In the case of Indian English, the Indian context of situation provides the parameters of appropriateness. In turn, it is these parameters which determine the deviations of Indian English. These deviations are naturally variety-restricted, register-restricted and genre-restricted. (For details see Kachru 1965, 1969 and 1973b.) A large number of deviations result from the process of acculturation which has rightly made the non-native varieties of English culture-bound and created a distance between the various varieties. This is an inevitable process which is both linguistically and culturally justifiable. After all, language is a tool of communication, and Indian English is used as a tool of linguistic interaction by Indians to communicate mainly with other Indians.
In the context of English as a second language, it is, therefore, desirable to recognize an hierarchy in its use. On that hierarchy, as mentioned earlier, the needs for the study of English, e.g. in Japan and Iran on the one hand, and India and West Africa on the other hand, will rank differently. It is crucial that the sociolinguistic realities of each country and area be taken into consideration in any discussion of the teaching of English in the Third World.

5.0 Conclusion

It is obvious that in the Third World countries the choice of functions, uses and models of English has to be determined on a pragmatic basis, keeping in view the local conditions and needs. It will, therefore, be appropriate that the native speakers of English abandon the attitude of linguistic chauvinism and replace it with an attitude of linguistic tolerance. The strength of the English language is in presenting the Americanness in its American variety, and the Englishness in its British variety. Let us, therefore, appreciate and encourage the Third World varieties of English too. The individuality of the Third World varieties, such as the Indianess of its Indian variety, is contributing to the linguistic mosaic which the speakers of the English language have created in the English speaking world. The attitude toward these varieties ought to be one of appreciation and understanding, and not the attitude of Prator whose call is to “. . . cry out for . . . denunciation.” (463).

It is, however, reassuring to note that Prator’s linguistic purism is not shared by all scholars, even on this side of the Atlantic. Lloyd’s refreshing discussion of this problem applies as much to the non-native varieties of English as to native varieties. His comments on the attitude of the “snobs and slobs” of the English language is worth recapitulating (Lloyd 1951: 129):

If there is one thing which is of the essence of language, it is its drive to adapt. In an expanding culture like ours, which is invading whole new realms of thought and experience, the inherited language is not wholly suited to what we have to say. We need more exact and expressive modes of utterance than we have; we are working toward finer tolerances. The fabric of our language is flexible, and it can meet our needs. Indeed we cannot stop it from doing so. Therefore it would be well and wholesome for us to see, in the locutions of the educated which brings us up sharply as we read, not evidences of a rising tide of illiteracy (which they are not), but marks of a gradual shift in modes of expression, a self-reliant regionalism, and a persistent groping toward finer distinctions and a more precise utterance.

In recent literature, both by linguists and scholars involved in TESL and TEFL, one notices an increasing tendency toward the attitude present in Firth and Lloyd. (See, for example, Gleason (1960); Halliday et al (1964); Richards (1972).) This tendency is encouraging, but as yet this attitude has not been accepted by the practicing TESL specialists in general either in Britain or in the U.S.A.
In the preceding sections I hope that I have not given the impression that this paper is intended primarily as a defense of Indian English and as a rejoinder to an attitude shown toward this non-native variety of English. That was only a partial aim. My main aim is to question the bases of the linguistic attitude which one encounters in the English speaking world toward the transplanted varieties of English which have developed in Africa, South Asia and other parts of the world. This paper is a plea for a new perspective, a realistic vision and, of course, an understanding toward the Third World varieties of English. In some sense such a change in attitudes is already noticeable—though still in restricted circles—toward “Black English” and “Chicano English” in the U. S. A., and toward Scottish and other varieties of British English in Britain. The next step in this slowly increasing linguistic tolerance may hopefully be an understanding of the pragmatics of the “new Englishes.” It is important to understand the functions of these varieties of English in the perspective of their uses and users. A change in the current language attitude is, therefore, desirable for various cultural, linguistic, educational, and, what is more important, pragmatic reasons, some of which I have discussed in this paper.
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### TWO METHODS IN SEARCH OF A THEORY

Richard C. Bedford’s English Experienced: Teaching Foreign Students by Staging Communications and Richard A. Via’s English in Three Acts seem on the surface to be two very similar books. Both advocate an approach to teaching English through the use of plays, and both books contain a number of one-act playlets, (10 and 7 respectively). By historical accident both Bedford and Via developed their approaches in Japan at more or less the same time (as far as I know in complete oblivion of each other’s existence) and the many references to Japanese learners and culture serve to underline the similarity. It is, however, a surface similarity and the two methods differ irreconcilably, although I cannot but speculate that the same theoretical notions may well account for the success of both approaches.

I am proceeding on the assumption that both Bedford and Via found their methods successful in the classroom (they say so), and it remains an empirical question whether one method is better than the other. In the absence of empirical data, the following remarks can only be interpreted as my own reflections on the two approaches, based on my, inevitably biased, opinions about language learning. It is part of my bias that I think the quality of scholarly work in language acquisition would increase considerably if we were always careful to identify and separate empirical questions and data from personal opinions. Facts demand respect while personal opinions can be discounted.

It is curious that English Experienced has been so totally ignored; I cannot recall ever having heard or seen a reference to its existence. English Experienced must be one of the earliest proponents of what we now, in Hymes’ terms, have come to call communicative competence. Bedford recognizes that how and when something is said carries as much meaning as what is said, that

> language learning for communication is more than the development of control over a few elements of oral expression; communication is the consequence of integration of behavior patterns, one of which is oral. (p. 8)

Anthropologists and sociologists have long known that communication is more than linguistic forms, and if Bedford had tied his rather sweeping statements to any of the work by people like Hymes and Grimshaw, English Experienced might have been received differently. Instead Bedford presents his notions as claims to Truth while taking passing swipes at linguists in general. The result is a very polemic tone, and the argument is further
marred by generalizations like “all linguists agree” (p. 17) and “it has long been recognized” (p. 15) without a single footnote or reference throughout the entire book. Consequently the reader is likely to dismiss all of Bedford which is unfortunate because he is dead right, I think, in saying that the objective of language learning should be communicative competence. Not that Bedford uses that term but he means the same thing with “integration of communicative behavior patterns.” (p. 7) One is even more likely to dismiss Bedford when he goes on to claim “that this integration can best be learned by total mimicry through roleplaying by staging communication.” (p. 8) In Bedford’s approach, the students learn English by total mimicry and memorization of the teacher’s behavior as he “acts” out the various roles in a one act play. The students do perform the play eventually but the artistic quality of that performance is not important, according to Bedford. “Originality in role creation is as undesirable as creative originality would be in a pattern practice class.” (p. 20) My own view is of course that unless you do allow creative originality in a pattern practice class there is no excuse for doing it at all, and Via feels the same about role creation, but I will come to that.

The students don’t have a written copy; they memorize the script aurally. Bedford talks about overlearning and correcting through mimicry rather than through explanations. (p. 31) It sounds very much like the audio-lingual approach, and indeed “the mim-mem idea has served, greatly expanded and more fully exploited, as vital underpinning for the implementation of my approach.” (p. 28) It is very difficult not to see this approach simply as one of aggrandized and glorified dialogue memorization.

How very different is English in Three Acts. For Via, the play’s the thing, and every single consideration follows from the determination to put on as good, as theatrically good, a play as possible. Via is a professional man of the theatre and he stumbled into language teaching by mistake, as it were. He discovered accidentally that working on a play taught his actors a lot of English, and he began working out his “drama, method.” The drama method is only for intermediate and advanced students, and, like Bedford’s method, necessitates a natively fluent teacher.

Via is of the Stanislavski method acting school, and thus all acting must come from within the students themselves. To that purpose, Via takes them through a series of exercises—standard in the theatre—some of which I would find so embarrassing (like being a butterfly) that whatever tension comes from the use of only the target language must pale by comparison. Language learning can be, Stevick is perfectly right, a very stress-filled situation, and the drama method serves, I imagine, to relieve such stress. In addition, it gives the students something to talk about and a powerful motivation for doing so.

After voice and relaxing exercises, the students go on to Talk and Listen. A student reads his line, looks up and speaks it to his fellow actor who carefully listens before he turns to his script to reply. It sounds like a variation
on Michael West's *Read and Look Up*, and it is. West, indeed, did develop his technique from a method which actors use to memorize their scripts. Only, according to Via, one mustn't memorize lines; one recreates them (I think). The distinction is lost on me, but then I am not a professional man of the theatre.

The next step is improvisations, and Via gives excellent techniques for dealing with them. I say they are excellent because I know they work since they are very similar when not identical to the techniques we use for role-plays with our students in the English Language Institute. In fact, what Via calls improvisations, I have called roleplay. It turns out, according to Via, that roleplaying is a very bad word in the theatre and has to do with the character becoming the actor or the actor the character, I forget which. I am afraid we are likely to ignore that roleplay is a taboo thing and go on and use the word roleplay to mean improvisation, but it is exactly Via's professional attitude, his passion for doing things the right way, which makes the drama method hang together, which gives it purpose and dignity, and, for the student, direction in his language learning. If we know anything, it is that unless language is used to communicate something one cares about, it is not going to be very well learned.

There are a number of further procedures in preparing for the play but they all involve the students' creative use of language to communicate feelings. In addition, there is all the talk necessary to get the set and costumes in shape. There is a very helpful chapter on production which I wish I had had when I once directed a high school play. The book ends with some very useful references to suitable plays, information about royalty payments, addresses, etc.

In short, *English in Three Acts* is a delightful book, a joyful book which makes the reader feel pleased to be alive and an English teacher (if he isn’t, he will want to be), and which imparts a lot of experimental courage and the confidence in Via to go with it. We are going to try the drama method in the Institute next term.

It should by now be quite clear that I like *English in Three Acts* and dislike *English Experienced*. Still when all is said and done, there is no evidence that one method works better than the other. Whether Via likes it or not, his students are going to know their scripts by heart, whether they memorize them or not, just as Bedford's students will. And whether Bedford likes it or not, his students are going to give their own interpretation of their roles and they are going to care about the quality of their performance, just as Via's students will. And both methods will be tempered through the personality of the teacher.

Bedford cites concepts from audio-lingual theory to account for his method, but that doesn't mean that those are the right concepts to explain and predict the results of the method. What both methods do is to structure the language learning situation so that the students have the opportunity and will to use the language as a means to an end rather than an end in
itself. Via's book gives me a lot of helpful techniques and procedures for the structuring of that situation which is one reason I much prefer English in Three Acts. But my guess is that it doesn't make a lot of difference whether the students mimic the lines or not, and that the points where the two methods are at odds may not be important. They share communicative goals and settings, and a conceptual framework for both methods can be found in the theoretical notions of communicative competence.

Christina B. Paulston
University of Pittsburgh


What words do foreign students of English need to know if they are going to study in universities in the United States? Answers to this question are likely to be as numerous as the number of teachers in EFL programs in this country. Many institutes, intensive courses, and orientation programs have developed their own inventory of vocabulary words, based on the experience of teachers and students, the suggestions of subject-matter professors, the advice of linguists, and a variety of word lists and frequency counts prepared for purposes other than the needs of college-level foreign students of English. Praninskas has at last come up with a specific list of words, gleaned from the kinds of textbook reading which freshman students in American universities are likely to face. Because the publication is very slim and published in England, it may unfortunately be overlooked in this country. Yet it is a valuable reference and resource for all EFL programs whose purpose is to prepare foreign students to study in English.

The American University Word List, prepared while Praninskas was Director of the University Orientation Program at the American University of Beirut, is based on a corpus of ten textbooks used in freshman classes. These basic texts, all recent publications, were in the fields of mathematics, chemistry, biology, physics, psychology, sociology, history, and English rhetoric and literature. (Praninskas lists the publishing information in an appendix.)

All of the words on every tenth page were punched onto computer cards, then assembled into a single alphabetical list of words, frequencies, and sources. This list included 30,844 types and 272,473 tokens. At this point, the editor of any word count must make certain practical decisions concerning a variety of lexical and semantic distinctions. One of the values of this particular list is that such decisions were based on the specific purpose to

1 Attention should perhaps be drawn to one other study of this kind, used but not described in detail by Helen Barnard in Advanced English Vocabulary (Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, 1971). The vocabulary for this text was selected from the General Service List and "counts of non-technical vocabulary in university science and social science textbooks prescribed in Osmania University, Hyderabad, and Victoria University, Wellington." (p. iii)
which the word count was to be put. For example, proper nouns, foreign words, and abbreviations were eliminated. Technical terms from individual disciplines were also eliminated on the grounds that they can best be taught by the subject-matter teacher in the context of the discipline. Praninskas wisely retained, however, words which have a general sense and are used widely in a number of different fields: plot, factor, doctrine, magnet, embryo, velocity, for example. Finally,

Since the students for whom this list was being prepared had studied English for several years at school, it could be assumed their vocabularies would include the bulk of the 2000 most frequently used English words. Michael West’s A General Service List of English Words, being the most reputable and widely-circulated list of this size, was chosen as authoritative. Words appearing on that list and their derivatives were expunged. Also not included in the final tally were names of the days, months, and numbers—omitted from the West list by design—and a few of the less common function words, such as nevertheless, being thought more properly the province of grammar. (P. 8)

With these guidelines, Praninskas has assembled a total of 507 base words and 840 derivatives. These words are presented in three different lists: an alphabetical order of base words, a list of base words by frequency rank, and lists of the base words and their derivatives according to the number of texts in which they occurred. This recognition of the range of a word is important. As Praninskas says, “Surely a word which occurs twenty times in several books in different subjects is more useful to a learner than one which is recorded twenty times from the same book.” (p. 8)

The following figures demonstrate the way in which each of these lists is presented in the text.

In figure 3 note that “only derivatives which actually appear in the corpus are included: a blank space in a column does not mean that a particular form does not exist or that it is uncommon; it merely means that it did not appear on the particular pages of the texts chosen for this study.” Note also that “nouns usually used as countable are preceded by a or an;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alphabetical List of Base Words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>abandon 8*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>absorb 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abstract 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accelerate 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accomplish 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accurate 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>achieve 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acid 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attitude 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attribute 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>author 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avail 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>awe 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>axis 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bacteria 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barbarian 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>benefit 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concentrate 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conclude 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>condense 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conduct 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cone 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>confer 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>configuration 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>confirm 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conflict 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* The number beside each word indicates the number of texts from which each word was taken.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1
### Base Words Listed by Frequency Rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Word</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>atom</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>formula</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>attitude</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>define</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>molecule</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>mode</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>element</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>establish</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>mode</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>phenomenon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>individual</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>constant</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>phenomenon</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>correspond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>energy</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>author</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>correspond</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>maintain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>specify</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>analyze</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>maintain</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>parliament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>cell</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>occupy</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>parliament</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>perceive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>principle</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>region</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>perceive</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>theory</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>perceive</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>source</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>military</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>cell</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>perceive</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>military</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>evolve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>individual</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>constant</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>evolve</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>investigate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>energy</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>author</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>investigate</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>maintain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2**

### Words Found in Ten Texts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nouns</th>
<th>Verbs</th>
<th>Adjectives</th>
<th>Adverbs</th>
<th>Frequency*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>an analysis</td>
<td>to analyze</td>
<td>analytic</td>
<td>analytically</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an analyst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an approach</td>
<td>to approach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an assumption</td>
<td>to assume</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a complex</td>
<td>complex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—complexity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a conclusion</td>
<td>to conclude</td>
<td>conclusive</td>
<td>inconclusive</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a consistency</td>
<td>to consist</td>
<td>consistent</td>
<td>consistently</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an inconsistency</td>
<td>to consist</td>
<td>inconsistent</td>
<td>consistently</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—constancy</td>
<td>constant</td>
<td>constantly</td>
<td></td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—construction</td>
<td>to construct</td>
<td>constructive</td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a definition</td>
<td>to define</td>
<td>definite</td>
<td>definitely</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—definiteness</td>
<td>to redefine</td>
<td>undefined</td>
<td>indefinitely</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a derivation</td>
<td>to derive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a derivative</td>
<td>to derive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a device</td>
<td>to devise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a distinction</td>
<td>to define</td>
<td>distinct</td>
<td>distinctly</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—distinctiveness</td>
<td>to define</td>
<td>distinct</td>
<td>distinctly</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an element</td>
<td>elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an establishment</td>
<td>to establish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—evidence</td>
<td>evident</td>
<td>self-evident</td>
<td>evidently</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3**
those usually used as uncountable are preceded by a dash (—). Unmarked nouns may be countable or uncountable, depending on the context.” (p. 8)

One possible classroom use of this material is suggested by the way in which Praninskas has presented words according to their range and with the various derivatives that occurred in her corpus (see figure 3). For teachers who prefer a systematic presentation of derivational suffixes, as one way to help students develop their sensitivity to common patterns of word formation in English, this list of derivatives would be a convenient source of common, useful words.

To judge the value of Praninskas’ contribution, we need to consider several questions that bear on the usefulness of word counts in general. Just how realistic is the principle of grading the selection and sequence of vocabulary for foreign-language learning? And just how reliable are the various lists that have been published, and how does the Praninskas list compare?

It is fair to say that the principle of graded vocabulary has a long and respected history. One of the best known lists, Thorndike and Lorge’s Teacher’s Word Book of 30,000 Words, was published in 1944 but includes counts going back to 1921. The general list is a summary of four different counts of a total of 4½ million words. However, the count was based partly on the Bible and classical literary material and consequently reflects this bias.

The Computational Analysis of Present-Day American English is a more recent count (1961, although not published until 1969). This is a computer-assembled frequency list, based on a corpus of slightly more than a million words, divided into 500 samples of 2,000 words each, selected from 15 different genres (press editorials, biography, scientific writing, mystery fiction, etc.). Unlike the Thorndike-Lorge list, this count (frequently referred to as the Brown Corpus because it was done at Brown University) takes into consideration the range of a word; that is, not only how often a word occurs but also in how many different kinds of writing.

---


4 In a cursory check of the Thorndike-Lorge list, I find the following words all listed within about the same frequency: ere, handkerchief, hast, mouse.


The most recent computer-based word count is the American Heritage Intermediate Corpus, published in the Word Frequency Book. For the preparation of the American Heritage School Dictionary, intended for students in the fourth through eighth grades, more than five million running words were recorded from 1000 different publications, including textbooks, periodicals, novels and student workbooks, on the assumption that "the vocabulary they contain is (a) likely to be encountered by students, (b) of some pedagogical significance, and (c) therefore of substantial reference value to the student." In its present form, the alphabetical and rank lists of words are difficult for teachers to use, although a frequency-per-million statistic is provided for each word so that direct comparison can be made with the Thorndike-Lorge list and the Brown Corpus.

The difficulty with these three word counts of English is that they are semantically insensitive. A word has been defined "as strings of characters bound left and right by space. This definition is insensitive to differences in meaning and function; it treats all words spelled the same way as the same word." The Thorndike-Lorge list and the Brown Corpus cannot distinguish the month of May from the auxiliary may. The American Heritage Corpus has coded capital letters, but even in this count it is impossible to separate the different meanings of spring, for example, or bear. Lastly, although these lists have a possible pedagogical application to the teaching and learning of English, none of them has been prepared with the non-native speaker in mind.

In the early 1930's such scholars as Faucett, Sapir, Thorndike, Palmer, Maki, and West recognized the need to select vocabulary for foreign students of English on some commonly agreed, purposeful criteria. The tentative nature of their early studies was reflected in the title, An Interim Report on Vocabulary Selection, in 1936. Although the objective criterion of frequency was basic to their list of words, several other criteria were also used: the universality and usefulness of a word for the purpose of defining vocabulary, consideration of subject range, and the structural importance of a word. The Interim Report was interrupted by the war, but almost 20 years after its initial publication, the list was revised and edited by Michael West and published as A General List of English Words.

Praninskas was probably right to assume that foreign students of English, preparing to enter an English-language university program, should be familiar with the words on the General Service List. They form a core vocabulary of 2000 head-words, plus about 500 of their derivatives, and many

---

8 Word Frequency Book, p. vi.
EFL materials, especially outside the United States, are based on this reference work.

According to her statistics in the appendix, Praninskas eliminated from her list 82% of the total number of words counted because they already occur in the General Service List. In a kind of mini-replication of this finding, I counted the General Service List words in five passages, totaling 470 words. I found a slightly higher percentage, 86%. Here is one test passage, from B. F. Skinner’s “The Technology of Teaching,” in which any word beyond the General Service List has been replaced by a nonsense word but with a morphological structure similar to the original word:

The basic perflugency between an act and its conliquators has been studied over a fairly wide duval of sagems. For example, pigeons have been rechastled for milsing at transeffucient skaps, monkeys for operating glotter pentels which were first dekighted for that more advanced apalax, man. Rechastlers which have been studied include water, riptual tetroty, the opportunity to act splastically, and—with human subjects—approval of one’s fellow men and the universal generalized rechastler, money.

Of the fifteen different italicized words, seven occur in the Praninskas list. If a student is familiar with both the General Service List and the American University Word List, the passage would appear as follows:

The basic perflugency between an act and its consequences has been studied over a fairly wide range of sagems. For example, pigeons have been reinforced for milsing at transeffucient skaps, monkeys for operating glotter pentels which were first designed for that more advanced apalax, man. Reinforcers which have been studied include water, sexual contact, the opportunity to act aggressively, and—with human subjects—approval of one’s fellow men and the universal generalized reinforcer, money.

Of the 470 words in my five test passages, only 29 or 6.2%, are not in either list. This is admittedly a small sample (although Praninskas’ figure of 82% is based on a count of about 272,000 words). However, a conservative estimate suggests that a foreign student who knows all the words in the General Service List would recognize anywhere from 80-85% of the words he comes across in his reading. The American University Word List would raise this close to 90%.

One must recognize, of course, that statistics of this kind can be misleading. In an excellent review of the value of word lists, 13 Jack Richards points out that the claims sometimes made by word list compilers for the inclusion power of word lists, meaning the amount of any arbitrarily chosen text likely to be included in the vocabulary, give a distorted idea of the information content of normal discourse. Although 2,000 words may represent 80% of what we say or read, the remaining 20% of the vocabulary

---

represents all the other words in the language. . . . Frequency and range are not a reliable measure of all the important words in the language, since many crucial words do not happen to be distributed in a way which gives them significance according to these criteria, The second-language learner will need the most frequent and wide ranging words in the language, but he will need other words too. The question of what other words he will need will depend on the context of particular topics of discourse.¹⁴

The value of the Praninskas list is that it is based on the kind of reading—that is, the “particular topics of discourse”—which students will face while studying in college. The 507 base words and 840 derivatives in the list constitute a good starting point for the selection of vocabulary to be taught in orientation or study skills courses that prepare foreign students to study in English. There will of course be many other, low frequency words that cannot be predicted. The roughly 10% of the words that students will meet beyond the General Service List and the American University Word List are likely to be words more specific to a particular discipline—what Richards calls “crucial words” that carry the main burden of information content. The eight words in the Skinner passage that are not on either list (in order of their occurrence in the passage) are contingency, species, pecking, transilluminated, disks, toggle, switches, and primate. Words such as these are best learned in the context of the discipline rather than in English classes.

Richard Yorkey
Concordia University
Montreal, P.Q. Canada


Foundations for Teaching English as a Second Language (FTESL) is one of the timeliest books I have read in a long while and also one of the best. In fact, let me explain just how timely it is for me. The day after tomorrow the English Language Institute is sponsoring a workshop for 50 public school teachers who have Vietnamese children in their classes, most of whom are on the elementary level. FTESL contains all the basic information these teachers need with the exception of language specific material. The teachers don’t know it yet but this book will make life a lot easier for them, and maybe more importantly, for the children as well.

The book is written for classroom teachers and teachers-in-training who teach in the elementary and secondary schools in the United States. It is designed not only for ESL teachers but for any teacher who has children in his classroom who are learning English as a second language. The book could also equally well apply to, say, teaching Spanish as a second language.

to Quechua children in Peru, but it would not apply to teaching Spanish in an American high school. In other words, the book deals with the problems that accompany second language learning, and the difficulties the children of minority groups encounter when they meet up with the institutionalized culture of the dominant group in the form of the public schools. Ultimately the book is written for the children from an ideological bias which I share: “Accepting the goal of success in school often requires alienation from home, family, friends, and cultural heritage, and this is a terrible price to ask children to pay.” (p. 65) The objective of this book is to help teachers help children achieve success in language learning without accompanying alienation. The compassion and understanding for both the teachers and the children which permeate the book reminds me of Mary Finocchiaro.

I have long thought that the best work on language teaching at the classroom level is done by those who have actually been classroom teachers themselves. Saville-Troike certainly exemplifies that point; a unique strength of the book lies precisely in her extensive experience as an elementary teacher. It is very rare to find a professor with solid training in anthropology and linguistics who has also been an elementary classroom teacher of minority group children. Join that with an ability to clearly explain in very simple language complex ideas and concepts without distorting the issues, and it should be clear that FTESL is in fact unique in its kind.

The subtitle gives a clue to the organization and content of the book. The theory part consists of the sort of background knowledge a teacher of students from another culture needs to have before he ever steps into a classroom. Chapter 1 “From Melting Pot to Salad Bowl” sets the tone of the book with an affirmation of what has come to be called cultural pluralism, a willing acceptance of other cultures and languages within the one society. Chapters 2, 3, and 4 explore the implications of cultural pluralism in the schools from the viewpoint of “Psychological Foundations,” “Linguistic Foundations,” and “Cultural Foundations.” I wish those first 67 pages could be required reading for every school teacher in the United States. Most of the discussion is relevant not only to teaching children who are learning English as a second language but also to teaching any child who doesn't come from upper middle class Anglo culture, presumably the majority of children in the public schools. Come to think of it, it would improve the teaching of middle class Anglo children as well. My own child informed me recently that ain't was not a word; his teacher had told him so. I am not given to the use of ain't so in my son's case he was simply given factually erroneous information. But I wondered what kind of attitudes and values toward the home the school conveyed to those students who come from a working class background. The aim of the first part of FTESL is exactly to help alleviate unintentional and thoughtless but nevertheless efficiently harmful snags in the cross-cultural communication process. The intended referential meaning of language use is often a very minor part of the actual message, and the first part explores that theme.
The second part of the book deals with classroom strategies. The best will in the world is not sufficient to teach the children English, and after a brief introduction to “Current Trends in TESL” in chapter 5, chapters 6 “Survival Skills for Students and Teachers” and 7 “Strategies for Instruction” discuss both general methods and specific techniques of teaching ESL, the most valuable of which pertain to the instruction of younger children. I was pleased to see my own heretical (from audio-lingual viewpoint) point endorsed: “Vocabulary is most important for understanding—knowing names for things, actions, and concepts.” (p. 87) I know perfectly well that the workshop teachers will find these two chapters a veritable goldmine.

The last two chapters are very brief (15 pages) but on the other hand they are the most controversial. Chapter 8 discusses “The Role of ESL in Bilingual Education” from the perfectly reasonable view that ESL is an indispensable part of a bilingual education program and in fact “all teaching done in English when it is a second language is ESL.” (p. 133) But there have been a number of discussions on this topic which somehow exclude ESL from bilingual education, and although these discussions are primarily noteworthy by the exclusion of reason, we are likely to see more of them. So it is very nice to have a sensible statement on the topic. The only point I question is that “each teacher in a bilingual program should be qualified to teach in both the students’ native language and in ESL.” (p. 132) Saville-Troike does go on to discuss the possibility of team-teaching in which one teacher uses one language and the other the second, but one gets the impression that Saville-Troike considers such an alternative second best. My own view is somewhat different. I agree with Saville-Troike if and only if perfectly balanced bilingual teachers are available. I see too many bilingual programs around the country where the teachers have poor command of English and the children’s learning of English suffers accordingly. I would certainly prefer the team-teaching approach in such situations.

We are still faced with another problem. If we take the “bicultural” component in bilingual education programs seriously, it is clear to everyone that Anglo teachers are inadequate at teaching/maintaining Navajo or Chicano culture; the children need a teacher of their own culture. But the reverse is also true. If the children are to become bicultural, they also will need to be exposed to teachers of mainstream Anglo culture, and any argument to the contrary is based on political issues rather than pedagogical. Not that Saville-Troike raises these issues, but I wanted to point out some considerations involved in such a seemingly innocent recommendation.

Finally, chapter 9 “Preparation for Teaching” discusses teacher qualifications and training. I don’t really know what a teacher would do with that chapter except for the one thing he can’t do, disqualify himself from teaching students from another cultural background because he doesn’t have the proper training or qualifications. I myself barely qualify, and when I think of the workshop teachers, I can’t help but think that they will be discouraged. Not that I have any quarrel with the Center for Applied Linguistic's
Guidelines for the Preparation and Certification of Teachers of Bilingual-Bicultural Education which form the basis of Saville-Troike's discussion, but rather I find the discussion slightly out of place in this book. The book is for teachers and teachers have no control over their training. In a second edition, Saville-Troike would do better to recast the discussion, move it up to chapter 1, and use it as a rationale for the organization and content of the book because in fact the book does address itself to most of the points raised in this last chapter; only I am not certain that is immediately apparent to every reader.

Now for some nitpicking. I disagree with Saville-Troike's interpretation that the national professional organization Teachers of English as a Second Language (TESOL) had assimilationist roots (p. 73). Many of those instrumental in the formation of the organization were themselves bilingual/bicultural, and almost all of the academicians that I can think of were involved with English as a Foreign Language where the issue of assimilation does not arise. Given Saville-Troike's other views, “assimilationist roots” may just be an unfortunate wording but it is not one I am willing to ignore—it is quite incorrect and misleading.

It is not my understanding that the major characteristic of the audio-lingual method was trial-and-error learning (p. 77) but more to the point, it isn't John Carroll's either. (The Study of Language. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1953.) And finally, I would never use scrambled sentences in a writing exercise (p. 118), and this is absolutely all I can find to disagree with. Also, an index would have been helpful.

FTESL is a neat book. It is fatuous to say that it is the best of its kind since it is the only one of its kind. Rather, in the vernacular, it is a damn good book and one that should become required reading in every ESL/Bilingual education program in the country. I am just plain grateful to Saville-Troike that she has written a book that so speaks to the needs of the teachers I work with.

Christina Bratt Paulston
University of Pittsburgh


Ross and Doty have incorporated several changes and modifications within their second edition of Writing English. First of all, the text has been divided into two major parts plus appendix and index. The first part is entitled “Writing in grammatical patterns” and primarily deals with points of grammatical difficulty often encountered by foreign students studying English composition. Some of the problems dealt with in this first section include syntax, tense, voice and verbals. The method of presentation is through explanation, discussion, and/or rules accompanied by model passages and exercises. The exercises contain practice in writing paragraphs,
rewriting sentences, finding examples of grammatical principles within the model passages, etc.

Part two is called “Writing in Rhetorical Patterns” and deals with an assortment of difficulties within this area, many of which are not exclusively EFL problems. That is to say that many of the problems and principles included in this section are shared by native speakers as well. Contained within this part of the book are many excellent and well thought out discussions, models and exercises. For example, a great deal of attention is paid to comparative rhetoric, no doubt inspired by the work of Kaplan and others. The last chapter is devoted to the library research paper and is extremely valuable for students who have had little or no experience in this area. Perhaps the most valuable aspect of this part of the book is that it acts as a fine attention pointer for the student who is not aware of the differences in style, organization and form that exist between his/her native language and English. All teachers of EFL who have taught writing to more advanced students are aware of this problem. Here at last is a writing text which deals with it.

The appendix is divided into two parts which contain charts or selected grammatical points and conventions in the mechanics of writing. The first part has frames for the irregular plurals of nouns, classes of non-count nouns, irregular verbs, different types of auxiliaries, prepositions and subordinators and conjunctions. The second part of the appendix explains punctuation, capitalization and forms for acknowledging borrowed material and ideas. This section serves basically as a reference handbook for the student.

Overall, this is a highly relevant book suitable for the needs of the very advanced student of EFL who needs both a rapid review of important grammatical principles and exposure and practice in the field of rhetoric. Although the authors state in the preface that the book is intended for intermediate or advanced students of EFL, the level of the material presented is so complex that it seems to be suitable only for those students who are at what is generally considered a rather advanced stage. The only possible drawback in using this book as a text in a writing course would be the brevity in some of the sections of exercises. This would necessitate the creation of supplementary exercises by the teacher for those areas where the students experience the greatest difficulty. Beyond this, this is a fine text, particularly for students who wish extensive explanations of principles with examples and models.

Paul Roberts
Oregon State University
Comment on Mary Newton Bruder's review of Samelson's Let's Converse (Vol. 9, No. 2, 191-195).

The following letter is reprinted at the request of Dr. William Samelson and with the permission of its writer, Mrs. Jan Booth. The letter is complete except for the deletion of a final paragraph which dealt with other matters.

Dr. William Samelson
Chairman, Department of Foreign Languages
San Antonio College
San Antonio, Texas 78284

Dear Dr. Samelson:

Since I have been a member of TESOL for the past few years, I recently read Ms. Bruder's review of Let's Converse in the June Quarterly. Although Mrs. Bruder has some valid points, I also feel that she is unfair in several of her judgments.

For example, she states that "there are no directions as to the presentation of the various sections." Since she makes reference to the introductory material with reman numerals, I wonder to whom she believes these discussions are addressed. Perhaps she has fallen into the pit that Leon Jakobovits has warned language teachers about so often—that is, expecting the theorists and textbook writers to do everything for us. I use the phrase section as an add-on exercise in which an individual orally adds a phrase, dependent clause, adverb, adjective, or another independent clause to make a compound sentence. This checks the student's grasp of structure and also his comprehension. The sentence section serves as a free substitution drill in which a student changes one word to a word of his choice and makes any other changes needed because of the substitution.

Ms. Bruder also seems disturbed that you chose to not strictly adhere to only one linguistic theory. Frankly, I believe this is an asset. Although many may refuse to admit it, most language teachers actually employ teaching methods that do not always agree with the grammatical theory which
they profess to follow. For example, I use pattern practice as a familiariza-
tion drill only because I am not a strong proponent of the structural theory
of language acquisition. Nevertheless, I would most likely never adopt a
beginning text without some pattern drills. I also like to conduct classes in
the target language only; but if all else fails to convey meaning, I translate
to the student’s native language before I allow meaningless mimicking. I
find generative-transformational theory to be very enlightening, but I often
use methods that violate this theory. The criteria for methods should be
this: Good methods are pleasant methods that teach; they are not just the
methods that seem to prop up a particular theory.

Ms. Bruder quotes a dialog from Chapter 9 to demonstrate unnatural
language. She has a point in this particular dialog; however, she uses this as
a representative dialog, and I do not believe it is. It can easily be modified
to “On top of that, he hasn’t been feeling well lately.” In this way, Isabel’s
last sentence will seem to fit in the dialog, and a very common phrase will
also be taught. As far as Cindy’s reply is concerned, a rejoinder of “Oh, I’m
so sorry. . . . What’s his problem. . . . Give him my best regards. . . .”
that Ms. Bruder would probably write for the dialog would seem overly
formal and polite for two friends shopping together. Perhaps Cindy should
have said, “That’s too bad” or “I hope you find something nice for him,”
but to quibble over this particular reply seems to be straining gnats.

The criticism of the pronunciation drills falls into the same category as
mentioned before—if a method doesn’t support a particular theory, it must
be bad. Actually, the teach-one-thing-at-a-time theory is rather amusing.
Dialogs, the favorite technique of structuralists, always introduce a multi-
plicity of items, but theorists never blink. In presenting some linguistic
facts, it may be more expedient to focus attention on only one item at a
time. But we cannot take this principle to its illogical end and still teach
language.

Ms. Bruder is also concerned about the “I’m not pleased to meet you.”
All languages contain social hypocrisies, and to include a stark truth that
one would not use except in special circumstances adds an opportunity for
humor. Certainly the teacher must assume much of the responsibility for
defining contexts of language. No textbook can possibly do that completely,
if for no other reason because customs and social amenities vary from area
to area.

I do find the grammar and syntax a bit confusing. In fact, I also use
some other grammar handbooks as a supplement. Thus, I would like to see
some of the terminology changed and clarified.

I believe the most notable item in your book is the liberal use of idioms.
Ms. Bruder criticizes the lack of explanation and their use out of context.
If the teacher is not a native English speaker and has limited experience in
the language, perhaps she has a valid criticism. However, my intermediate
and advanced groups relish the idioms and vocabulary expansion sentences.
Although several have studied English for as long as twelve years, they did
not know the meaning of “That’s my cup of tea,” “I mean business,” “I’m broke,” “I’m so hungry I could eat a horse’ and most of the other idioms until they began to study your book. In addition, I use the daily newspaper and films to reinforce textbook idioms and to introduce others such as “cutting red tape” and “the light at the end of the tunnel.” Clichés are very important items that new English speakers need to learn.

Yours truly,
/s/ MRS. JAN BOOTH
San Antonio, Texas
July 20, 1975

Response to Booth Comment on the Review of Samelson’s Let’s Converse.

I regret that I must have been dreadfully unclear in my review of Samelson’s Let’s Converse since Ms. Booth has so completely misunderstood my comments. I’m very happy Ms. Booth is able to adapt the text for her class, but I was discussing the text from the viewpoint of a materials writer and not from that of a teacher dealing with bad texts.

Since the comments do not deal strictly with the review but seem to be directed to the author as editorial comments for revision of the text, I will not discuss them item by item; but there is one point I would like to mention. As a text author and as a teacher I agree with Ms. Booth that one must be eclectic in regard to linguistic and pedagogical theory. What I objected to in Let’s Converse was the complete lack of theoretical orientation of any kind.

MARY NEWTON BRUDER
University of Pittsburgh
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
Ralph Long — 1906-1976

Dwight Bolinger

Outside the classroom, Ralph Long’s professional life was a series of battles on two fronts: that of the English language, with all its recalcitrance to analysis, and that of linguistic fashion, of the reluctance of linguistics to do a simple job of work that was not at the same time a shining demonstration of some theoretical point. He would have appreciated a recent remark of George Lakoff on the importance of “just doing good linguistics” regardless of higher doctrine, for it signals a change in climate that was probably in his mind when he wrote rather sadly, in 1973, “I have a strong feeling that right now would be a better time to start in this field.”

His work in English was always with his beloved Dorothy at his side, teaching related courses to seniors and graduates as well as writing. The extent of their collaboration is hard to tell, as it was not always explicit. Their last major work, The system of English grammar (Scott, Foresman: 1971), was co-authored; but constant references to their discussions of grammar points appear in his letters, and much that was hers must have figured in the earlier Grammar of American English (Austin, Texas: University Co-op), which went through several editions during the years at the University of Texas, and in The sentence and its parts (Chicago: 1961, and subsequently).

Ralph Long the writer is impossible to separate from Ralph Long the teacher. He had the advantage of teaching English as a foreign language throughout his career—he met his first group of foreign students, from Mexico, in 1933, and his years in Puerto Rico (1947-48 and permanently after 1960, with lengthy visits in the years between investigating the teaching of English on the Island) gave him a perspective that no mere theoretician could match. The explanations in his grammars were meant to be used by students struggling to express themselves, not to impress a colleague or bolster a theory. He could not be choosy about his sources. He taught Jespersen’s Essentials in the 1940s while elaborating his own approach. He drew from some of the structuralists in the 1950s, and, with greater ease of mind, from the transformationalists of the 1960s, adopting the notions of “kernel” and “transform” in 1959. But his disappointment with the unfulfilled promises of generative grammar led him to abandon transformations in 1967: “I’m about to give up all deriving,” he wrote. He was an avowed traditionalist; which is simply to say that as a teacher he had to be a pragmatist. Theoreticians can choose their data. The person who fields questions from a class cannot. “We never can accept the idea,” he wrote in 1968, “that describing the grammar of the words we use as we use them, directly, is respectable.” It was that, the simple and comprehensible statement, that was his aim in everything he wrote.
This pragmatism and innocence of theory had a hard time in an age when linguistics was coming into its own and suffering from small delusions of grandeur. The resistance that the transformationalists encountered in their early years from the brand of establishment linguistics then in vogue, and overcame by setting up an establishment of their own, was the fate of a traditionalist no matter which establishment he contended with. The way to recognition and financial support was blocked in the decade of the 50's by the Trager-Smith-Hill-Fries styles of description. Not all structuralists of the period were unsympathetic (Long admired Pike, and mentioned Smith's generosity), but scientific linguistics thought it had a mission, and the plums were not for nonconformists. It was natural for Long to be drawn to any doctrine that questioned this orthodoxy, and he welcomed transformational grammar when it first appeared. He was encouraged by his early correspondence with Chomsky, which seemed to augur “a return to traditional methods and aims.” Yet as the years went by and Chomsky's followers became more and more abstract, the teacher in him rebelled. As late as 1962 he still felt that “Chomsky definitely does not want to be responsible for a third linguistic blitz,” but five years later he referred to himself as an ex-fellow-traveler of transformational grammar. His disillusionment with theory—stratificationalist as much as transformationalist and structuralist—was complete. “Everything is theory,” he complained, “and not very defensible theory either. And putting old analysis—often bad old analysis—into formulas.” It hurt the dedicated professor of English to see the language being treated mainly as a grab-bag for examples. On first teaching the Jacobs-Rosenbaum English transformational grammar he declared, “It's a remarkable piece of work,” but then added, “I feel like a man that's taken a degree in theology and lost his religion.” (To which this writer's response, based on a similar experience with Hadlich's grammar of Spanish, was “PS is done by fools like me, but only God can do TG.”)

But at least there was the satisfaction of seeing the Old Guard routed. At Miami in 1962 the structuralists were “completely submerged.” Robert Lees dominated the show, and Long sat up two nights discussing grammar with him. Always the doubter, though, he declared himself “as skeptical of basic doctrine in language as in religion.” The honeymoon was brief, but he enjoyed it while it lasted.

He might have enjoyed it more had the schools not been affected by the usual pedagogical lag. Structuralism—“wrong in psychology and wrong in analysis”—kept its power over the classroom, and this in Puerto Rico made it doubly hard for a gringo professor to improve the teaching of English. In the grades, the obstacle was the entrenched Fries-style mechanical teaching; in the University, “a few bright girls, almost no bright boys” enrolled in English—hardly an unfamiliar phenomenon, but deadly in a place where ESL probably gets more attention than anywhere else in the world.

Yet the frustrations served to temper the discernment. The harder it was to make a point clear, the more necessary it became to forge explana-
tions that would fit the facts exactly, would not presume on theoretical knowledge, and would be understood on first reading. That is the quality of Long’s writing. He describes English on its own terms, and he speaks to students and teachers. An Australian reviewer put it best, writing, in 1972, of The system of English grammar: “There’s no doubt in my mind that this is a great book. It’s sitting on my shelf, within reach, beside Jespersen. Where it looks at home and useful.” Long was a steadying influence in an uneven time. His importance will grow as the controversies subside.

Dwight Bolinger
Palo Alto, California
1977 TESOL CONVENTION
April 26 — May 1
Americana of Bal Harbour, Miami Beach Florida

TO: TESOL MEMBERS AND FRIENDS
RE: FIRST CALL FOR PARTICIPATION IN TESOL 1977

Most of us who are concerned with the Teaching of English as a Second or Foreign Language and of Standard English as a Second Dialect are involved in more than one of the many specialties which TESOL encompasses. Each of us is committed to service on behalf of one or more of the special interest areas listed on the left; each of us assumes day-to-day job responsibilities related to one or more of the professional activities listed on the right.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTEREST AREAS</th>
<th>PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Applied Linguistics</td>
<td>1. Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Standard English as a Second Dialect</td>
<td>2. Conducting Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ESL in Bilingual Education</td>
<td>3. Administering and Supervising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ESL in Adult Education</td>
<td>4. Designing Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ESL for U.S. Residents in General</td>
<td>5. Developing Materials and Methods for Teaching/Testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. EFL in Foreign Countries</td>
<td>6. Training Researchers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. EFL for Foreign Students in the U.S.</td>
<td>7. Training Teachers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This year in asking for your participation in the 1977 TESOL Convention we invite you to submit proposals which fit into any one or any combination of the above areas/activities or others which you may wish to add.

We believe that we have much to say to each other within our circles and across our circles of endeavor. TESOL 1977 will be pointed toward a balance of communication:

... within our interest areas / professional activities
... across our interest areas / professional activities
... from disciplines outside TESOL without whom we would not exist (Linguistics, Psychology, Sociology, Education, Anthropology, and others).

Your proposals for pre-convention contributions and/or convention contributions — within, across, from outside—are herewith invited.

Joan Morley,
Convention Chairwoman
Carlos Yorio,
Pre-Convention Chairman
CALL FOR CONVENTION PAPERS AND DEMONSTRATIONS

Due Date: OCTOBER 15, 1976

Mailing Address: Joan Morley
English Language Institute
The University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109

We are asking for proposals for TESOL 1977 in five different categories. For clarification, brief definitions of each have been prepared. Two appear here and three in the call for pre-convention presentations which follows.

TESOL PAPERS

A TESOL paper provides a vehicle for telling about something you are doing or have done in relation to theory or practice in the interest areas/professional activities listed above; often this information is accompanied by the use of audio-visual aids and handouts.

The abstract should be a summarized version of the conceptual content of the paper (central idea, issue, or purpose—details of description, procedures, evidence, or argument—a summary, conclusions, applications or implications). Papers selected for TESOL 1977 presentations should not have the conceptual content changed substantially after acceptance.

TESOL DEMONSTRATIONS

A TESOL demonstration provides a vehicle for “showing how” you do something. Techniques used in teaching, testing, or gathering research data often lend themselves well to this kind of presentation.

The abstract should include a brief statement of your rationale and a description of what you will demonstrate and how (i.e., video demonstration + narration, “live” students, audience participating as “students” or “subjects”).

PROCEDURES:

1. Before OCTOBER 15, 1976, send the following items to the above address:
   a. Six (6) copies of your 200–250 word typewritten abstract, 3 copies with your name ON and 3 copies with your name OFF. Prepare the abstract as you would wish it to be printed in the program. Indicate whether it is a proposal for a paper or a demonstration.
   b. If you wish, attach 6 copies of a two-page double-spaced typewritten summary of your paper for use by the panels of readers. Again, prepare 3 copies with your name ON and 3 copies with your name OFF.

2. Include 2 copies of a separate sheet which contains:
   a. A 50–75 word bio-data statement. Prepare this as you would wish it to be printed in the program. Follow the format used for the bio-
data statements which accompany articles appearing in the TESOL Quarterly.

b. A list of all equipment you require (from a simple blackboard or lectern to more complex equipment).

c. Time desired: (30 minutes or 60 minutes).

d. A list of primary audiences intended (as many as you feel are appropriate). Prepare this by referring to the lists of interest areas and professional activities on the previous page.

e. The number of handout pages you plan to distribute.

f. The following information with items 1-3 as you wish them to appear in the program:

(1) preferred name
(2) preferred professional title (only one)
(3) preferred affiliation
(4) preferred mailing address
(5) preferred telephone number (for TESOL contact).

---

PLEASE DOUBLE CHECK BEFORE YOU SEND.
INCOMPLETE PROPOSALS ARE DIFFICULT TO EVALUATE AND DIFFICULT TO PROCESS.

---

CALL FOR PRE-CONVENTION WORKSHOPS,
MINI-COURSES, AND COLLOQUIA

Due Date: OCTOBER 15, 1976

Mailing Address: Carlos A. Yorio,
Department of Linguistics,
University of Toronto,
47 Queen's Park Crescent East,
Toronto, Ontario, M5S 1A1
Canada.

TESOL WORKSHOPS

In a workshop, a leader or group of leaders work with a group of interested people, helping them to solve a problem, or to develop a specific teaching or research technique.

The abstract should include the goal that the leader(s) intend to accomplish, a summary of the theoretical framework or approach to the specific problem or technique, and the tasks to be performed during the workshop.

TESOL MINI-COURSES

In a mini-course, one or more lecturers deliver a series of talks on a specific topic.

The abstract should include a description of the overall content of the mini-course and a list of the sub-topics to be included.
TESOL COLLOQUIA

In a colloquium, a relatively small group of people with a common interest discuss their current research and/or concerns under the leadership of a chairperson. It is the responsibility of the chairperson to secure the participation in the colloquium of a number of representative people in the field.

Proposals should include a description of the area of interest, and the names, affiliation and specific contribution of each invited participant.

PROCEDURES:

1. Before October 15, 1976, send the following items to the above address:
   a. Six (6) copies of your 200–250 word typewritten abstract or proposal, 3 copies with your name ON and 3 copies with your name OFF. Prepare the abstract or proposal as you would wish it to be printed in the program. Indicate clearly whether it is a proposal for a workshop, a colloquium or, a mini-course.

2. Include 2 copies of a separate sheet which contains:
   a. A 50–75 word bio-data statement. Prepare this as you would wish it to be printed in the program. Follow the format used for the bio-data statements which accompany articles appearing in the TESOL Quarterly.
   b. A list of all equipment you require (from a simple blackboard or lectern to more complex equipment); in addition, indicate the type of seating arrangement which would be most appropriate for the proposed workshop, mini-course or colloquium.
   c. Time desired:
      Workshops: 3 hours (1/2 a day)
                  6 hours (1 day)
   Colloquia: 6 hours (1 day)
              12 hours (2 days)
   Mini-courses: 6 hours (1 day)
                  12 hours (2 days)

Notes:

I) Morning sessions will run from 9:00 to 12:00; afternoon sessions will run from 1:30 to 4:30.

II) The limitations imposed on the duration of workshops and the addition of the mini-course format of presentation will give TESOL members broader possibilities of participation in the activities of the pre-convention.

d. A list of primary audiences for whom your workshop, mini-course or colloquium is intended (as many as you feel are appropriate). Prepare this by referring to the lists of interest areas and professional activities given above.

e. The maximum number of participants which you will accept.

f. The following information with items 1–3 as you wish them to appear in the program:
   (1) preferred name
   (2) preferred professional title (only one)
   (3) preferred affiliation
   (4) preferred mailing address
   (5) preferred telephone number (for TESOL contact).
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Announcements

Meetings of interest to TESOL members


Linguistic Society of America Summer Meeting. July 30–August 1. SUNY/Oswego.


The University of Texas at San Antonio has a program leading to the M.A. degree in English as a Second Language which commenced in 1975. For further information write to Curtis W. Hayes, Director of English as a Second Language, College of Multidisciplinary Studies, The University of Texas at San Antonio, San Antonio, Texas 78285.

First announcement and call for papers: Linguistics and Philosophy. An International Journal. Articles for publication and communications relative to editorial matters should be sent to Robert Wall, Department of Linguistics, University of Texas, Austin, Texas 78712.

Computer Searches of the ERIC Data Base. The ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics, located at the Center for Applied Linguistics since 1974, is now offering a computer search service in the fields of language teaching and linguistics. Upon request and prepayment we will search the ERIC data base by computer to identify journal articles and documents—which include papers, research reports, bibliographies, curriculum and teaching guides and instructional materials—relevant to a particular topic.

The two monthly ERIC journals that linguists and language teachers may already be familiar with, Resources in Education (RIE) and Current Index to Journals in Education (CIJE), announce the documents and journal articles, respectively, that are added to the data base each month. A computer search of the data base provides access, all at one time, to everything that has been put into the data base since its inception in 1966—a total of over 110,000 items to date. A list of a few ERIC subject index terms and the number of times they have been used will give an indication of the
considerable amount of information which ERIC can bring to language-related research and curriculum design:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ERIC Index Term</th>
<th>No. times used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language Instruction</td>
<td>6976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English (Second Language)</td>
<td>2770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Education</td>
<td>1533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psycholinguistics</td>
<td>1242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic Theory</td>
<td>1223</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In a computer search, we combine appropriate terms in such a way that the result is a specialized annotated bibliography listing only those citations relevant to the requester's topic. For example, a computer search for material on psycholinguistics in ESL will yield all but only those citations indexed with both the terms English (Second Language) and Psycholinguistics.

A search yielding up to 100 citations costs $26.00, with each citation over 100 costing an extra $.10. The computer print-out of the retrieved citations is usually sent to the requester within 10 days after the request for a search has been received. If you are interested in this service please write to: Computer Search Service, ERIC/CLL, Center for Applied Linguistics, 1611 N. Kent St., Arlington, Virginia 22209. We will send you a computer search request form which should be completed and returned to us with pre-payment of $26.00.
Publications Received


Idiom. The New York State Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages and Bilingual Educators Association. Volume 6, Number 2, Winter 1976.


*RELC* (Seameo Regional English Language Center Newsletter). VIII, 2, Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organization, June, 1975.


PUBLICATIONS AVAILABLE FROM THE TESOL CENTRAL OFFICE

Reference Guidelines . . .


Other TESOL Publications . . .


Program of the Ninth Annual TESOL Convention, March 4-9, 1975, Los Angeles. Contains 96 abstracts of papers presented at the Convention. 183 pp. Paper. $1.50 to TESOL members, $2.00 to nonmembers.

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, 139 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.

From Other Publishers . . .


Back Issues of the TESOL QUARTERLY
(1967) Vol. 1 #2,4 ........................................... $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 #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 #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 ........................................... $56.00
ORDER FORM

TESOL

Date

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

Please ship to:

ZIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL $

___ Check, cash, or money order for $___ enclosed (POSTPAID).
ORDERS FOR LESS THAN $10.00 MUST BE PREPAID.
___ Please bill me (a postage charge will be added to orders not prepaid).
___ I am a TESOL member.

Please make checks payable to TESOL. When sending funds from outside the U.S., please remit in the form of a U.S. Postal Money Order, a check drawn on a U.S. bank or a foreign bank draft on a U.S. bank. Do not send checks drawn on foreign banks.

Prices subject to change.
Requests concerning advertising should be directed to:

AARON BERMAN
TESOL Exhibits and Advertising
Apartado Postal 1124
Mexico 1, D.F., Mexico
Telephone (after July 1, 1976):
(905) 538-85-69
(Air Mail Preferred)
"A. P. Cowie and R. Mackin are both experts in the teaching of English as a second language, and the impetus to compile two exhaustive volumes on idioms came from the need to get foreigners to the heart of the language.... This is an important compilation."

—Anthony Burgess in The Times Literary Supplement

OXFORD DICTIONARY OF CURRENT IDIOMATIC ENGLISH

Volume 1: Verbs with Prepositions & Particles

A.P. Cowie & R. Mackin

This new dictionary, to be completed in two volumes, records and describes some 20,000 idiomatic expressions. For both the native and non-native speaker of English, this valuable reference explains such expressions as "buzz off!", "make advances", "get into", and "when one's ship comes in." It is the most comprehensive survey of this very important area of English and gives much more attention to idiomatic expressions than general dictionaries.

Each entry is supported with illustrative sentences, many of them drawn from modern fiction, drama, and biography with additional material from newspapers, radio and television. The authors provide a grammatical reference for each entry to a set of tables showing the sentence patterns in which the expression normally appears. Indications of style (for example, informal, slang, commerce) are included along with lists of words commonly associated with the item being defined. Other important features include: a cross-reference system of expressions that have the same or related meanings; notes on special features of grammar or usage; and separate entries for expressions which have the same written form but different meanings.

1975  478 pp.  $13.50

English Language Teaching Department

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

200 Madison Avenue

New York, New York 10016
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______________________