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On the Adult’s Ability to Acquire Phonology

Gerald G. Neufeld

During the preparation phase of research designed to test the strong version of the critical period hypothesis, the author noted a marked discrepancy between the perceptive and the productive performance of several English-French bilinguals who had evaluated the text instruments. Although these bilingual spoke French with an English accent, most were able to match the performance of native-speaking francophones on the initial version of the Foreign Accent Recognition Test especially prepared for the 1979 study. The inspiration for the research described here was drawn from the apparent asymmetry observed in the input and output of these fluent bilinguals.

The Foreign Accent Recognition Test was administered to English-speaking students who were advanced learners of French and who had acquired their second language as adults. Although all Ss spoke French with traces of foreign accent, the investigator wished to know to what extent they could match the perceptive performance of native-speaking francophones. To assess the relevance of competence in L2 as a variable, another group of English-speaking adults who were less advanced in French was tested.

The results of these follow-up studies are interpreted as tentative support for a dual model of linguistic competence. They also constitute, for the author, grounds for re-examining biological constraints in adult language learning as a psychomotor rather than psycholinguistic problem.

When perusing the literature on child language, one notes with interest that learning ability is rarely discussed as a significant variable. Whether advocates of a species specific language acquisition device or proponents of a cognitive processing theory, first language acquisitionists accept without question that children possess the capacity to acquire native-like proficiency in their language at all linguistic levels. Although it has been shown that children vary in initial rate of acquisition and in the time at which they begin to use language systematically, these differences have not attracted serious attention in studies on first language acquisition. Our view of the child as indistinguishable from his peers with respect to language learning ability may change of course as a result of work conducted in the areas of pragmatics and individual style (Snow & Hoefnagel-Hohle 1975, Hatch 1978).

In the field of second language acquisition, positions on language learning ability also reflect current thinking about the child’s capacity to acquire and use language. Prior to Chomsky’s discussion of the LAD (1957), foreign language aptitude was viewed by many researchers as one of the most important...
variables in second language learning (Henmon 1929, Kauflers 1930, Salomon 1954, Carroll 1958, Harding 1958, Pimsleur et al. 1962). Although some specialists in the field still maintain this position (Gardner 1977, Wesche in press) the majority of researchers in the field now support the critical period for language learning hypothesis, which ascribes no special relevance to language learning capacity as a significant variable. In children as old as ten or eleven years, the language acquisition device or system is viewed to be still intact, hence enabling any school-age child to attain native-like proficiency in a second language. According to the critical period hypothesis, this device or system either decays or becomes progressively less accessible with the onset of adolescence, rendering adults incapable of native-like proficiency in $L_2$.

The critical period hypothesis has not been extended to encompass the adult’s acquisition of syntax and lexicon. Researchers who have discussed the relevance of the critical period hypothesis in second language learning have been careful to restrict their claims to the adult’s ability or inability to produce accent-free speech in $L_2$ (Scovel 1969, Hill 1970, Asher & Garcia 1969, Krashen 1973). In addition to this constraint, the strong version of the hypothesis, which allows for no exceptions to the neuro-physiological rule, has been further modified so as to accommodate a small minority of adult learners who appear capable of attaining native-like proficiency at all linguistic levels of their second language. This more moderate position has not been universally accepted, however. Scovel (personal communication) argues that there exist no hard data to disconfirm the original or strong version of the hypothesis. He implies that acceptance of the weaker version occurs simply on the basis of subjective impressions of researchers about the performance of a handful of older learners who seem to have acquired a native-like command of $L_2$.

There are other questions concerning the critical period hypothesis which have attracted less attention. Do the biological changes in the brain, which are alleged to influence language learning in adults, affect the acquisition of phonological competence as well as the acquisition of performance skills? Does the hypothesis encompass all aspects of performance or simply those involved in articulatory production? In other words, is the language learning disability of adults psycholinguistic or psychomotor in nature? It does not suffice, of course, to answer these questions purely on the basis of articulatory performance. As discussed later in this paper, there is clear evidence to demonstrate the inadequacy of speech production as an important criterion for assessing linguistic competence. If we are to develop anything approximating a comprehensive theory of second language acquisition, we will have to make a clear distinction between the learner’s ability to internalize native-like phonological rules and phonological representations, and his ability to perform this competence in perception and production. By proceeding in this manner, we will be able to provide more theoretically valid comparisons of child and adult language learning ability.
1. The 1979 Study

The 1979 study was conducted to test the validity of the strong version of the critical period hypothesis. It was felt that a comprehensive study of foreign language learning ability required hard data upon which to confirm or reject the strong version. Lacking precise statements about what aspects of phonology the hypothesis involved, we included both competence and productive performance in our informants’ task, believing that if we could locate persons who had learned a second language as adults and who could consistently pass as native speakers of that language under rigorous test conditions, we would have ample grounds upon which to reject the strong form of the hypothesis.

Seven non-native informants along with three native-speaking controls were tape-recorded reading a carefully-prepared corpus in French. The non-native informants were selected for the study on the basis of their ability to pass as native speakers of French in casual conversation situations. These conversations took place in the presence of three French-speaking persons who were thoroughly familiar with the goals of the research. The French corpus included numerous sounds and sound sequences known to be especially difficult for English-speaking students. The ten tape-recorded passages were placed in five random order blocks and re-recorded onto cassettes for scrutiny by native-speaking judges. These judges included 85 French Canadians whose dominant language was French, approximately half of whom were students at the University of Ottawa. They were directed to listen carefully to each passage, and, the second time around, to assess each speaker as: 1) Francophone du Canada; 2) Francophone d’un autre pays; 3) Non-francophone. Five of the seven non-native informants were consistently evaluated by our native-speaking judges as francophone. Their scores closely approximated those obtained by our native-speaking controls.

We hoped to attain a measure of rigour in our test by including difficult sounds in our corpus and by providing stimuli which would force judges to focus chiefly upon phonological material. To this end, we controlled for lexical and syntactic competence by requiring all informants to read the same corpus aloud. Furthermore, with exclusively auditory stimuli, judges lacked the extra-linguistic cues normally available when making decisions about the ethnic background of an interlocutor. Hence, only those linguistic levels implicit in the critical period hypothesis could be used as criteria by our judges. Given the consistency of Ss’ responses to the majority of our non-native informants, we interpreted the data as sufficient evidence to reject the strong version of the hypothesis. If our informants could consistently pass as native speakers in situations where judges intensively scrutinized their prosodic and articulatory production, these same informants might be expected to fare even better in normal communication situations where native-speaking interlocutors would have to simultaneously process much more than phonological information.

---

1 Only a brief account of the scope and results of this research will be given here since I have discussed the work in detail elsewhere (Neufeld 1979 a, b).
With respect to the weak version of the hypothesis, which allows for exceptional cases like ours, we could say very little. While our findings corroborate our claim that some adults can and do acquire native-like proficiency at the phonological level in L2, the data shed no light at all on the validity of the biological constraints argument as applied to the majority of older foreign language learners.

2. Follow-up Study #1

During the preparation phase of the study just summarized, we administered the foreign accent recognition test to a small group of English-speaking and French-speaking students and faculty members in the Department of Linguistics. A cursory glance at the scores obtained by the anglophones on the trial version of the test revealed a lack of symmetry in receptive and productive performance. Although all of these English-speaking bilinguals exhibited marked traces of foreign accent when speaking L2, most experienced relatively little difficulty in distinguishing between native and non-native informants. Since the majority of these twelve English speakers were either studying or teaching linguistics, and since several of the respondents personally recognized the voices of some of our informants, we dismissed the data as not indicative of what average bilinguals do. However, because of the potential significance of asymmetry in perception and production of phonology, we decided to look more closely at the problem with a larger sample of respondents who had no formal training in linguistic analysis.

2.1. Aim of the Study. Our intent was to see to what extent native speakers of English, who had learned French as adults, could detect traces of foreign accent when listening to tape-recorded speech in their second language. If no disparity could be found between the perceptive and productive performance of our subjects at the phonological level, we would have further support for theories of speech perception in which production is seen as an integral component (Liberman 1964). Similarly, such findings would be useful in discussions on the validity of a dual competence model for input and output (Troike 1970). Finally, data which revealed no significant difference in the bilingual’s ability to perceive and produce sounds and sound sequences in L2 would support the broad claims embodied in the critical period hypothesis.

If, on the other hand, the results pointed to a marked discrepancy in the receptive and productive performance of many bilingual, as suggested by our preliminary data, we would have tentative grounds for models of linguistic competence which would differ much from the appealingly simple one to which we are accustomed (Chomsky 1975).

2.2. Informants. Three French-speaking assistants and I prepared a list of bilinguals we knew in the university community who spoke French without accent and who had learned that language as an adult. Fifteen people were contacted for interviews. Our criterion for selection was that informants speak fluent French with no trace of foreign accent in informal conversational situa-
tions. Interviews with the 15 potential informants were tape-recorded and subsequently assessed according to this criterion. Seven of the 15 qualified. Although we had originally intended to use only anglophones as non-native informants, our group of seven included a Pole who began learning French in Belgium at the age of 16, as well as a student from Holland who spoke French as a third language.

In addition to our non-native informants, we included three native speakers of French as controls for the study. Two of these were French Canadians while the third was from France. Our non-Canadian control was required since the phonology in the speech of two of our non-native informants represented a European rather than a Canadian dialect. We included these controls as a check for sensitivity and reliability of our French-speaking judges (subjects).

2.3. Materials. Since the critical period hypothesis does not encompass the adult’s acquisition of vocabulary and grammar, there was no need to include these components as variables in our study. We were interested primarily in the ability of our non-native informants to pass for native speakers of French with respect to articulatory and prosodic production. This is not to say that we discounted the importance of lexicon and syntax in Ss’ performance. To the contrary, we were convinced that reading aloud, with appropriate articulation and prosodic contours, would be very difficult if not impossible without extensive knowledge of vocabulary and language structure. To ensure that our native-speaking judges focused exclusively upon articulatory and prosodic features, however, it was necessary to control for form and content by providing identical target material for all informants.

A corpus in French of approximately 78 words was prepared by three French Canadians who were trained in applied contrastive phonetics of English and French. In addition to our requirement that the corpus represent informal conversational French as spoken in Canada, we wanted material which included articulatory and prosodic features known to be especially difficult for English-speaking students. We surmised that if our informants could accurately reproduce the corpus, despite these articulatory obstacles, there could be little doubt about their proficiency at phonetic and phonological levels. (For a phonemic transcription of the French corpus, see Neufeld 1979).

In individual sessions, each informant first silently read the corpus to become familiarized with the form and content of the dialogue. We then asked the informant to read the passage into a tape recorder in as spontaneous and conversational a manner as possible. No additional instructions, cues or corrections were given. We allowed informants to listen to their recordings. Those, both native and non-native, who wished to do so were permitted to re-record the passage as often as they liked. In most cases, only one or two retakes were required. At no time in the entire procedure did we intervene in any way other than to reset the recording equipment.

The final taped versions of the dialogue for the ten informants were then placed in five random order blocks with the constraint that no more than two
native-speaker versions appear consecutively. Each of the five cassettes contained a set of a verbal instructions in English, followed by one of the randomly ordered blocks of ten passages in sequence. Three-second pauses separated each informant's version in this initial presentation. A block with a different order then followed with intervals of eight seconds between each version. The reasons for including two blocks on each cassette will be discussed in the section on procedure. Cassettes included approximately 15 minutes of material.

A short pencil-and-paper type questionnaire was prepared containing a self-evaluation scale for overall proficiency in French as a second language, as well as items on first and second language background. A sheet with general information about the project, along with precise instructions concerning procedure, was attached to the questionnaire.

2.4. Subjects. Fifty-four English-speaking students at the University of Ottawa were selected for the study under the following criteria: 1) that they be highly proficient in the oral-aural skills of French; 2) that they have acquired their second language as adults; 3) that their speech in French exhibit clear traces of foreign accent; and 4) that they have no formal training in linguistic analysis. Except for the second criterion, we had no difficulty whatever in locating suitable subjects, given the bilingual environment at the University of Ottawa. No attempt was made to control for socio-economic status, academic discipline or age, nor did we go to great lengths with respect to measures of proficiency in French. Had proficiency figured as a dependent variable in the study, or had we wished to assess the relevance of proficiency as an independent variable, we would clearly have needed a sophisticated procedure which would have generated scores on a continuous scale. Our main concern was that Ss be well beyond intermediate levels of instruction in French. Further mitigating against the inclusion of an objective proficiency test was our past observation that students at the University of Ottawa tend to underestimate their competence and performance in self-evaluations of proficiency levels in L2. Our procedure was simply to select only those persons who unequivocally assessed themselves as high in oral-aural skills in French.

2.5. Procedure. Upon completion of the questionnaire, Ss read the sheet containing general information and instructions about what they were to do. If they had no questions at the time, the tape recorder was then turned on. The first segment of the tape consisted of very much the same kind of material they had just read. Ss were told, once again, that they were to hear ten versions of the same passage, each spoken by a different person. They were instructed to listen carefully to each version without comment in order to familiarize themselves with the accent of each speaker. The passages were then presented again in a different order, at which time Ss indicated the speaker to be Francophone du Canada, Francophone d’un autre pays or Non-francophone. The eight-second pauses between each version were more than adequate to allow Ss to indicate their response on their answer sheet. In order to avoid
inadvertent cues to Ss, project assistants were asked to turn away so that their faces could not be seen during the actual test.

Following the foreign accent recognition task, Ss were given a printed copy of the French corpus and were then asked to read this corpus aloud onto a tape recorder in as native-like and spontaneous a manner as possible. Although Ss were not coached in any way, they were allowed to re-record their oral version as often as they liked to eliminate any errors they might themselves have detected in their speech. As will be described later, these recordings were used to compare Ss’ receptive and productive performance.

2.6. Results and Discussion. In the 1979 study, five of our seven non-native informants had qualified as francophones. In that study, our sample of French-speaking judges was divided almost equally between student and non-student subgroups. A statistical analysis of the differences in foreign accent recognition scores, obtained by our francophone and anglophone judges, showed the English-speaking group to be slightly better in overall performance $F(1,136) = 3.46$, $P < .05$. When this latter group’s scores were compared with the student subgroup of the francophone samples, however, differences fell below the level of chance. Nor did our analyses yield significant differences between francophone and anglophone judges concerning assessments of individual informants. Once again, the same non-native informants who had qualified as native speakers of French in the earlier study were consistently identified as francophones by the English-speaking group. Similarly, the two non-native informants who had not qualified as francophones with French-speaking judges consistently elicited negative responses from the English-speaking group.

Although the performance of our anglophone judges compared favorably with that of the francophone group, the English speakers were less proficient in recognizing dialectal differences. It will be recalled that the task required Ss to identify informants as French Canadians, as French speakers from another country, or as non-francophones. While the English-speaking judges were comparable to their francophone counterparts in their ability to distinguish between native and non-native French, they clearly experienced difficulty in determining the ethnic origin of the informants considered to be francophones. Chi square analyses yielded significant differences at the .01 level between French-speaking and English-speaking judges’ responses with regard to dialect.

Had the performance of both groups of Ss been identical throughout, we might have concluded that all judges, irrespective of their first language background, might have employed the same kind of criteria for judging nativeness in the foreign accent recognition task. The disparity in performance between the two groups with respect to dialect identification, however, raised some interesting questions.

First, upon what bases do we make decisions about what constitutes a foreign accent in our first language? It seems reasonable to assume that such
decisions involve matching what we hear with the output of our internalized phonological rules and representations; in other words, we must access our phonological competence to distinguish between native and non-native sounding speech. Whether detected non-normative articulation be interpreted by the listener as dialectal variations of his mother tongue or whether they be interpreted as sounds representing another language, the decoding processes involved would appear to be the same in tasks with stimuli in L1. Do bilinguals, scrutinizing speech in their second language, proceed in a like manner, or do they employ altogether different strategies and criteria? Was it possible, for instance, that correct identification of non-normative articulation in L2 could be accomplished by a bilingual, independent of the level of his linguistic competence in his second language? Could the difficulty in distinguishing between Canadian and non-Canadian French, experienced by our anglophone judges, have resulted from inappropriate evaluation criteria? Rather than utilizing their phonological competence in L2 for the task, might these judges have reached their decisions about nativeness simply by identifying English-like sounds in the speech of non-native informants?

We viewed these issues as fundamental to our study of language learning ability in adults. If judgments about native versus non-native articulation are correct only in those cases where a high degree of phonological competence exists, along with the ability to efficiently access that competence in perception tasks, we could legitimately infer from our data that adult language learners are potentially capable of native or near-native competence and receptive performance in L2. Such inferences, if correct, would necessitate a revision of the critical period hypothesis so as to include only those aspects of L2 performance involved in articulation. On the other hand, if the ability of our English-speaking Ss to detect foreign accents in French could be traced to the use of English rather than French phonology as criteria, we would be in no position to claim asymmetry in receptive and productive performance. Since most of our informants for the 1979 study spoke English as a first language, our anglophone judges might well have confined their search to English-like sounds and sound sequences when scrutinizing the tape-recorded speech samples for foreign accent.

3. Follow-Up Study #2

If bilinguals utilize their phonological competence in L1 when looking for articulatory anomalies in L2, it may be assumed that phonological competence in L2 is not a significant variable. It will be recalled that our English-speaking judges had been selected on the basis of their self-proclaimed advanced status in French. If, in spite of their high proficiency level in that language, they resorted to their phonological rules and representations in English as the central point of reference, anglophones who were less advanced in their second language might be expected to rely even more upon L1 in foreign accent recognition tasks involving L2. If linguistic competence in L2 is not an important factor in such tasks, any English speaker might be expected to attain a modicum of
success in identifying foreign accent in a language other than his own, provided that the speech under scrutiny emanates from persons who speak English as a first language. Conversely, we would expect sensitivity scores of anglophones on L2 foreign accent recognition tasks to be low in cases where non-native deviation in articulation and prosody were the result of transfer from a language other than English.

In short, there were two distinct questions which required further attention, prior to any claims we might make about the adult’s ability to acquire native-like phonological competence in L2. First, we needed to know to what extent anglophones and francophones differed in their use of acoustic cues in our foreign accent recognition tasks, Second, we required further information on the importance of linguistic competence in L2 as an independent variable. Clearly, these issues are closely related to one another. We hoped to gain further insight into both areas in the second of our follow-up studies.

Except for the criteria we used to select our subjects, this study closely paralleled the one just described. The foreign accent recognition task was again administered to English-speaking students at the University of Ottawa. Based on information from self-report type questionnaires, we chose 24 Ss who professed to have only an elementary knowledge of French. As in the previous study, we confined our choice to students who had acquired their knowledge and performance skills as adults. Similarly, we restricted our selection to persons who spoke French with a marked accent. Upon completion of the foreign accent recognition task, Ss studied then read aloud onto a tape recorder the French corpus which they had just repeatedly scrutinized. In this manner, we were able to get a general indication of discrepancies between their ability to perceive and produce French sounds.

3.1. Results and Discussion. An analysis of the performance of the English-speaking groups of Follow-up Studies #1 and #2 on the foreign accent recognition task revealed significant differences at the .001 level, $F (1,66) = 9.13$. Even at a cursory glance, the scores obtained by the earlier group, comprising students who were advanced learners of French, were clearly superior to those obtained by the second group of English-speaking Ss. Of perhaps greater significance was the almost random-like nature of responses by Ss in the second group. At no time were native-speaking informants judged to be non-native by Ss in the first group. However, these French-speaking controls were judged to be non-francophone 39% of the time by judges in the second group. An analysis of this group’s scores, in fact, suggested that correct responses were primarily a matter of chance, $T (22) = 1.23$, $P > .05$.

Although our data provided little information about the linearity of the relationship between L2 competence and performance on our task, they did suggest that knowledge of phonological rules and representations in the second language was required in the detection of foreign accent. Had Ss utilized English phonology as their criteria in a search for English-like sounds, we would have anticipated little or no disparity in the performance of both anglophone groups.
In principle, a matching procedure, in which L1 competence was used in a search for English-like sounds in the speech samples recorded by our French Canadian controls, would have generated appropriate responses, i.e., Francophone du Canada, Francophone d’un autre pays. Ss, employing this strategy, would have detected no English-like sounds and hence would have concluded that the speech samples of these controls were legitimately French. As already pointed out, however, francophones were frequently dubbed as non-francophones by Ss in the second group.

While phonological competence in L2 seemed a highly significant factor in performance on our task, we still knew relatively little about differences that might exist between native and non-native judges concerning the nature and exploitation of acoustic cues. We re-contacted 14 of the 54 Ss who had participated in the first follow-up study. We re-administered the test, this time with a different random order block of the ten speech samples. An analysis of the scores obtained by this subgroup on both forms of the test yielded no statistically significant differences. The tape-recorded samples were then replayed, one by one, at which time we asked Ss to state reasons for Non-francophone responses. Their answers left little doubt in our minds as to the kind of criteria they had employed. In only one case did an S point to the English-like quality of segments in the sample as indicative of non-native speech. In the remaining 13 cases, Ss identified sounds as “not sounding right somehow.” When queried further about what they meant, many tried to articulate the sounds as they would prefer to have heard them, usually without success. Their explanations were frequently awkward and difficult to interpret, doubtless owing to their unfamiliarity with tasks requiring explicit statements about linguistic phenomena. As will be recalled, Ss had been selected with the constraint that they have no formal training in linguistic analysis. Ss repeatedly claimed that, while they might be incapable of producing a sound correctly, they could usually detect traces of foreign accent when listening.

A re-examination of these Ss’ tape-recorded versions of the French corpus corroborated their claims. Only three Ss had managed, after several re-takes, to approximate native-like articulation of some of the difficult sounds and sound sequences incorporated in the corpus. English-like phonology predominated throughout their recorded versions, along with English-like prosodic contours. Despite the overall low level in their productive performance, these Ss were highly sensitive in perception. In fact, when compared with performance of French-speaking judges on the foreign accent recognition task, the sensitivity scores of this anglophone subgroup were found to be slightly higher, F (1,98) = 3.88, P <.01.

In addition to the asymmetrical data discussed above, there was further evidence against the hypothesis that anglophone Ss had used L1 instead of L2 phonology in our task. Two of our seven non-native informants, whose speech samples we used for the three studies described here, spoke English as a foreign language. As a result, the subtle traces of foreign accent which appeared in their
spoken French represented transfer from native languages other than English. Had our anglophone judges been searching chiefly for English-like sounds in the tape-recorded speech sample, the two non-anglophone informants should have elicited reactions comparable to those produced by our French-speaking controls. Stated another way, the utilization of L1 rather than L2 phonology by Ss would have necessitated positive or Francophone responses for informants whose speech exhibited no English-like sounds. A Chi square analysis of our 54 English-speaking judges’ responses to our two non-native non-anglophone informants, as compared with the responses of our francophone judges, yielded no significant differences whatsoever. The introspective reasons given by our subgroup of judges for their decisions, the discrepancy in our English-speaking Ss’ receptive and productive performance, and the similarity in anglophone and francophone responses to non-native non-anglophone informants were all interpreted as strong support for the hypothesis that Ss, with an adequate background in their second language, employ their L2 linguistic competence in L2 foreign accent recognition tasks.

4. Concluding Remarks

The results from the follow-up studies can be summarized as suggesting: 1) that there is frequent asymmetry in the adult’s receptive and productive performance in L2 at the phonological level; 2) that students who acquire their knowledge and performance skills as adults do not appear to suffer from any psycholinguistic disability with respect to the acquisition of phonological competence; 3) that such students appear capable of performing that competence in a native-like manner in speech perception; and 4) that linguistic competence in L2 is a major factor in foreign accent recognition.

Although the studies described in this paper allow for little more than speculation at present, there are several points which emerge in the research about which we can be certain. When discussing second language acquisition, in children or in adults, we must not confound the student’s knowledge of rules and representations with the student’s ability to exploit that knowledge, in perception or production. Admittedly, such confusion is difficult to avoid because of our inability to bypass performance when evaluating competence. Nevertheless, as I argue in Neufeld (in preparation), the conspicuous lag between perception and production in child language, the receptive as opposed to productive performance of French immersion children, and the asymmetry in the performance of our English-speaking judges, underscore the need for a clear distinction between ability to understand and ability to speak L2.

The necessity for observing these distinctions is by no means confined to the development of practical tests of competence and performance in L2. We must be equally vigilant with respect to such distinctions when formulating theories, models and hypotheses. In our claims, for example, about biological constraints in adult language learning, we must be unequivocally clear about whether we are referring to acquisition phenomena, to performance phenomena,
or to both. Unless hypotheses are conceived in this fashion they remain very
general and almost impossible to test empirically. In my work related to the
critical period hypothesis, I have interpreted the biological argument as in-
cluding the acquisition and exploitation of phonological competence. My ap-
proach has been to isolate specific aspects of acquisition and performance in
controlled laboratory contexts in the hope of gaining further insight into the
nature of the adult’s language learning disability. While some of my research
has generated data from highly artificial language learning situations, most of
the studies have included tasks which appear reasonably close to real-life tasks.
With each successive investigation, I have found less and less evidence for the
decay or inaccessibility of the language acquisition device or system in older
learners. Insofar as the adult’s acquisition of linguistic competence is concerned,
I see little evidence to support neurophysiologically-induced language learning
disability. The only consistent indicator of adult inferiority that I can find is
the average learner’s inability to get rid of a foreign accent when speaking L2.
In other words, the disability, if one exists at all, may be less psycholinguistic
than psychomotor in nature. While adult students may know what their second
language should sound like, many may find it difficult to get their vocal appara-
tus to obey cerebral instructions. A critical period hypothesis which was con-
strained to purely articulately production would seem more appropriate than
its present all-encompassing form, since it could then account reasonably well
for the kind of data discussed in this paper. As pointed out by Adjémian (per-
sonal communication), however, the hypothesis, so constrained, would no longer
involve language learning per se.

Even in the area of articulatory performance, further study may show
adults to be capable of native-like or accent-free speech in L2. As demonstrated
in the 1979 study, some older learners do attain a native-like command of
phonological rules, prosodic features and articulatory skills in their second
language. Furthermore, the results of the 1974 study, in which we taught anglo-
phone subjects to reproduce lengthy sound sequences in three non-Indo-
European languages, suggest that adults have not lost their ability to perceive
and produce novel sounds (Neufeld 1978). Krashen (personal communication)
has suggested that our subjects might have been processing phonetic material
in the right or non-dominant hemisphere, given the non-linguistic nature of the
task. The task was seen as non-linguistic by him since at no time were the rules
or meaning of target utterances presented to Ss. The aim was to see if they
could mimic the sounds of languages they had never heard before. Even if
Krashen is correct—and he may well be—two facts are clear from this study.
First, that correct imitation of target sounds presupposes correct perception of
those sounds; second, that correct articulation of new sounds and sound se-
quences, in linguistic or non-linguistic contexts, requires efficient transmission of
cerebral signals to the vocal apparatus along with efficient muscular response to
those signals, whether they emanate from the right or left hemisphere. In other
words, there was strong evidence to demonstrate retained flexibility of the adult’s articulatory apparatus.

At present, we are only in the initial phases of our inquiry into the differences between child and adult language learning. Until the results from much of our research can be replicated under tightly controlled conditions, our data will serve primarily as a pointing mechanism for further study. One of the more fruitful areas of investigation may be the influence of biologically- or developmentally-induced changes in cognitive and learning style. As pointed out by Ausubel (1964), Krashen (1977), Bialystok (1979), and others, the adult approaches learning tasks, linguistic and non-linguistic, in ways strikingly different from those of the child. Rather than generating hypotheses only after repeated exposure to an event or series of events, adolescents and adults are inclined to process new information more expeditiously, in terms of what they already know.

There is no reason in my opinion to assume that second language acquisition or learning is not handled in the same manner by older students. Although deductive analyses may prove more efficient for adults than time-consuming inductive processing, such analyses may involve some sacrifices. While child-like inductive language learning allows for processing of data at all linguistic levels, including suprasegmentals, deductive analyses necessarily restrict the learner’s attention to linguistic features which are amenable to formalization and explicit description. We would not expect suprasegmentals or many aspects of segmental phonology, for that matter, to place high on the adult student’s list of priorities since these levels receive relatively little attention in most of the second language teaching methods with which I am familiar.

It is conceivable, then, that developmental factors do account for much of the disparity between child and adult language learning. What is not clear is the extent to which developmental changes in and outside the brain constitute inescapable disability. If we were to find, for instance, that the average adult’s approach to L2 articulation can be explained in terms of developmentally-induced changes in cognitive style, and in terms of socio-psychological factors, as discussed by Taylor (1974), we would have to radically alter our current position concerning the adult’s language learning capacity. Although it may be somewhat early to suggest that we replace the critical period hypothesis with the cognitive-socio-psychological hypothesis discussed above, I believe we should encourage further research in this area. Premature as this hypothesis may be, it is compelling from a scientific standpoint since it adequately accounts for much of the variation we see in adult second language learning. This hypothesis neither forces us into the untenable position of disregarding exceptional cases nor does it oblige us to restrict our perspectives to simplistic dichotomies as embodied in the critical period hypothesis. We must, after all, evaluate our theories and hypotheses on the basis of their ability to explain behaviour in both naturalistic and formal language learning situations. Our data must be drawn from the performance of students who have experienced considerable
difficulty, as well as from performance of learners who have attained a native-like command of their second language.
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**Contraction and Blending: The Use of Orthographic Clues in Teaching Pronunciation***

Clifford Hill and Leslie M. Beebe

This article is divided into two major sections: in Section I we outline certain problems that arise when ESL materials rely too exclusively on contractions (orthographic phenomena) as a means of presenting blendings (phonological phenomena); in Section II we provide basic information on contractions and blendings that can be used by teachers. We first present constraints on the contraction of BE, HAVE, the modals and not. Next, we present parallels between 1) blending patterns involving contractable words and those involving non-contractable words; 2) blending patterns involving contractable words and patterns of combining lexical roots with suffixes; and 3) blending patterns involving contractable words and single lexical items. These parallels will help teachers maintain a fundamental principle of pedagogy as they prepare ESL materials: namely, maximal exploitation of orthographic cues in teaching pronunciation. Working with this information, teachers can make efficient use of the limited number of contractions as they introduce the wide range of blendings which non-native learners need to master.

**Section I**

After surveying over forty books for teaching ESL, we find that most introduce a wide range of contractions in the initial lessons. When contractions are viewed strictly as orthographic phenomena, this early introduction does not seem particularly motivated, since their range of distribution and frequency of use in written communication is fairly limited. As textual resources, contractions are primarily used to convey the informal tone characteristic of speech, either in representing dialogue, or in discursive prose that is personal in tone. Some publishing houses have recently begun to extend this use of contractions to textbooks, particularly those designed for younger audiences. Despite the increasing use of contractions as resources for establishing an informal register, they are still uncommon in most types of expository writing, especially those which non-native learners of English in academic settings are often expected to master. Certainly, the major style manuals still discourage the use of contractions in most genres of discursive prose.

Even though contractions have a limited distribution in writing, their

* We would like to thank Robert Aronowitz, Sharon Goldstein, and Eric Larsen for substantial help in developing the conceptual framework of this article, Lynn Goldstein for helpful suggestions on the article in draft form, and Robert Schwarz for careful editing and typing of the manuscript.
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Presence in the initial stages of ESL materials can be justified. In general, those who prepare ESL materials follow two widely accepted principles in second language teaching: 1) they represent spoken rather than written forms of language in the initial stages, and 2) they use standard orthography in representing speech. As a consequence, they use whatever resources the orthography provides, mainly contractions, for signaling that word boundaries tend to be obscured in actual speech. In a sentence containing a WH-word followed by is, they generally show is as contracted: e.g., What’s his name?. In effect, the contraction is used to signal the omission of the vowel in is, which results in a monosyllabic coalescence of what and the remaining sibilant. The presence of the apostrophe signals the vowel omission (’s—>/s/); and the removal of the space between what and is signals the coalescence of these two words (what’s—> /wáts/).

Before discussing the presentation of contractions in ESL materials, we would like to establish a terminological distinction. In this article, the term contraction is used to refer only to a written sequence of two words in which a word boundary has been obscured, whereas the term blending is used to refer only to a spoken sequence of two words in which a word boundary has been obscured. We do not use the term contraction as it is commonly used in ESL materials to refer to spoken sequences as well as written ones.

Our major reason for making this distinction is pedagogical. Our own teaching experience has shown us that, in the absence of a clearly indicated distinction, non-native learners tend to confuse what takes place in speech and in writing. In general, they are not aware of the limited degree to which standard orthography can be used in representing blended speech, assuming that contractions and blendings parallel each other. As a consequence, they are prone: 1) to overuse contractions, e.g., they contract a sequence such as what are to what’re, presumably because a) they analogize what’re to what’s; and b) they often hear the two words what are pronounced in blended form so that they sound very much like the single word water; 2) to underuse blendings, e.g., they fail to blend common words like him and her since these words cannot be contracted in standard orthography. Even worse, they fail to develop a receptive competence for the blending of words like him and her, thereby limiting their capacity to understand everyday speech. Given these problems, we urge that blending and contraction be sharply distinguished not only in an analytic description such as this but also in the ESL classroom itself.

We also do not use the term blending in a technical sense (i.e., we do not specify an exact set of phonological correlates by which a particular spoken sequence of two words can be described as either blended or not blended). In one sense, all boundaries between spoken words, when compared to those between written words, tend to be obscured, for the blank spaces between words on a page are not paralleled by pauses in speech. In most speech, words form a continuous stream of sound with relatively few pauses. Nevertheless, the degree to which individual word boundaries are obscured varies a great
deal. Consider, for example, the following pairs of words: 1) *it is*, 2) *this is*, 3) *strong one*.

The first pair ordinarily coalesces as a single syllable in everyday speech (/ɪts/). Whenever the vowel is deleted in *is*, the remaining sibilant moves backward across the syllable boundary, joining with the /t/ to form a syllable-final cluster (/ts/).¹

In the case of the second pair, a monosyllabic coalescence is not possible since the first word ends in /s/. (A sibilant cannot move across a word-boundary to form a cluster with another sibilant.) Nevertheless, the boundary between the two words is often obscured in natural speech, since the final sibilant in *this* can be at least partially transferred to the following syllable, given the initial vowel in *is*. In this article we describe such transfer as *partial resyllabification*, although we prefer the term *bridging* for the ESL classroom.²

In the third pair of words, however, the word boundary tends to remain relatively unobscured, since there cannot be even partial transfer of elements across it. The final /ɒ/ of *strong* cannot be transferred to the following syllable (*/ʌw .../), nor can the /w/ of *one* be transferred to the preceding syllable (*/... ʌw/). In presenting the above pairs of words to non-native learners of English, we would describe the first two as blended and the third as unblended. At the same time, we would point out that only the first pair can be contracted: *it’s* vs. *this’s* and *strong’ne*.

Textbooks dealing with multiple strands of information cannot be expected to deal with any particular strand in a sufficiently detailed manner; teachers need to be able to develop and extend the information provided. Without such amplification, the presentation of contractions in ESL materials would tend to produce complications, given that contractions are primarily used to introduce common patterns of blending.

There are two main reasons for these complications. First, blending is a far more widespread phenomenon than contraction. There are only ten words in English that can be contracted: three forms of BE (am, is, are), the three forms of HAVE (has, have, had), two modals (will and would), the negative word not, and the pronoun us, and these words cannot be contracted nearly as frequently as they can be blended. Moreover, there are many words which are consistently blended in speech, but cannot be contracted in writing. In An Introduction to the Pronunciation of English (1962), Gimson provides a list of forty-six words which he describes as consistently “linked” with the preceding word—words such as and, or, of, him, and her. If ESL materials use contractions as the primary means of representing blending, they run the risk of ignoring

¹ Considered from a historical vantage point, the /t/ can also move forward across a syllable boundary and form /təz/, a coalescence that may be represented by ’tis (e.g., “tis the season to be jolly”).

² This concept, like the broader one of blending, is not technical. Avoiding theoretical questions concerned with syllable boundary, we find that a display such as the following is useful for non-native learners:

| /ɪz/ | this is |
the multiple patterns of blending in which these other words are involved, which, after all, are just as common as those in which contractable words are involved.

Second, the constraints that determine whether a particular word may be contracted are manifold (as an extreme example, note that is can be contracted only after the word let). ESL materials have generally failed to provide comprehensive treatment of these constraints, partly, no doubt, due to the difficulty of stating them in a reliable manner. This problem is particularly apparent in the case of the general constraints exercised by sociolinguistic register. There is a register continuum along which the use of contractions needs to be established; at one end, there is formal expository prose which avoids contractions altogether and, at the other end, written dialogue which may even include unusual ones such as why’re, what’d, and I’d’ve. In the best of circumstances, it is quite difficult for ESL materials to convey these sociolinguistic constraints. If, however, they use contractions to introduce blending, they will tend to violate these constraints, overusing contractions in order to focus on blending.

There are also more specific kinds of constraints, many of which are categorical, such as those involving phonology and grammar (e.g., the constraint that blocks the contraction of is after this and are after there). In addition, there are non-categorical constraints on the contraction of particular words. The word is, for example, along with not, is probably contracted more widely than any other word in English. In principle, is can be contracted after a noun as well as a pronoun, but in practice is contracted much less frequently. Hence, in introducing is in beginning materials, there is a tendency, seemingly quite justified, to contract it after a pronoun but not after a noun. This is done, for example, in the Lado English Series (Lado 1970). In order to illustrate some of the complications it may lead to, and to suggest some ways in which teachers may expand materials in dealing with such complications, we would like to examine the first lesson in this series. We have chosen it for illustrative purposes because its potential complications seem to represent quite well those involved in other texts.

In the first lesson, the following set of sentences is introduced:

This is Philip.
Philip is a student.
He’s American.
Philip, this is Helen.
Helen is a nurse.
She’s English.

The contraction of is with a preceding personal pronoun reflects the blending that ordinarily occurs in natural speech (i.e., is is realized as a /z/ which blends with the preceding he or she). In the four sentences in which it is not contracted, however, is would often be blended in speech with the preceding word,

---

3 This difference presumably reflects some principle of information processing which we might describe in the following way: a reduced form tends to occur with a bearer of low information (a pronoun) more frequently than with a bearer of high information (a noun).
either the demonstrative this (/ðɪs/\(\text{az}/\)) or the nouns Philip or Helen (/ˈfɪləp/\(\text{s}/\), /ˈhelən/\(\text{z}/\)). The representation of is in full form here could be misleading to beginning learners since it is possible to contract is after nouns (e.g., Philip’s and Helen’s), but not after this (*this’s). In effect, the verb is contracted in these six sentences in only one of three patterns, even though it can be contracted in two of them (and, of course, it can be blended in all three). The greater frequency with which is is contracted after pronouns than after nouns no doubt contributes, and perhaps rightly so, to the avoidance of the contraction of is after nouns in an initial lesson. It may, however, suggest to non-native learners that contraction takes place only with pronouns, whereas, in fact, it often takes place with nouns as well—although apparently to a lesser extent.

In pronouncing the sequences that are not contracted, a teacher is faced with two options. They may be pronounced in full form, maintaining a consistency between speech and writing, or in blended form, maintaining a consistency in sociolinguistic register. The second option is clearly preferable since it provides a more realistic model of spoken English, in which blended sequences naturally co-occur. /ðɪs/\(\text{az}/\), /ˈfɪləp/\(\text{s}/\), and /ˈhelən/\(\text{z}/\) would be introduced along with (hiyz/ and (siyz/\(\text{z}/\), all blended sequences maintaining the same informal register. The sentences are, after all, intended to form continuous discourse. In actual practice, a teacher may not be at all consistent in presenting these sequences. We have noted a tendency for teachers to follow whatever the orthography presents; therefore, contracted forms are blended to a considerably greater degree than full forms.

Whichever option a teacher follows may result in confusion for non-native learners. If the uncontracted sequences are blended, the learners may assume that the blendings can be represented orthographically and thus write *this’s, a common error among ESL students. If these sequences are not blended, they may assume that blending is impossible there and thus acquire only a small number of the natural speech patterns that they should master. Even if the sequences are all blended, the students, particularly if they are visually oriented learners, still may not acquire control over them, given the lack of any overt representation comparable to that provided by contraction.

In dealing with this initial set of sentences, the teacher needs to present the following two patterns: 1) in natural speech the verb is tends to be blended with the word that precedes it, and 2) the verb is can be contracted after personal pronouns and nouns but not after this. In addition, the teacher may wish to convey that is is contracted less frequently after nouns than pronouns, though this point is perhaps too refined for an initial lesson.

In order to do this, various systems of visual display could be built into the materials. A symbol such as a ligature can be used to represent blending,
even in the absence of a contraction (e.g., *This is Philip*). To show the constraints on contraction, the following visual display (Figure 1) might be used:

**FIGURE 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Pronoun:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>he</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Noun:  
| Helen Philip | + is          | Helen’s Philip’s | (less frequent) |

| Demonstrative Pronoun: | this | + is | ø |

As soon as that, the other singular demonstrative pronoun, is introduced (many ESL materials present *that is* as well as *this is* in the initial lesson), the possibility of the contraction *that’s* needs to be presented along with *this’s*. And when the plural demonstrative pronouns are introduced, the constraints on *these’re* and *those’re* can be incorporated into the same display (Figure 2):

**FIGURE 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demonstrative Pronouns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>this is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that is</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>these are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>those are</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moreover, once all the personal and demonstrative pronouns are introduced, a display of the personal pronouns + BE (Figure 3) can be juxtaposed with the above display (Figure 2).

If the patterns of blending for BE with both sets of pronouns have been presented along with the patterns of permissible contractions, the constraints on contracting *this is, these are,* and *those are* need not be presented arbitrarily. The students will be in a position to infer that, at least with respect to these pronouns, a contraction is permissible only where blending results in loss of a syllable.

We suggest that teachers supplement materials with *contraction paradigms,* such as the one presented in Figure 2, which lead students to focus visually

---

5There are, of course, instances where a contraction is permissible even though a blending does not result in loss of a syllable (e.g., *what’ll* — [wádl]).
Blendings that are not represented by contraction have not been given systematic coverage in ESL textbooks. Some materials occasionally use phonemic transcriptions to indicate such blendings. Others introduce non-standard spellings along with standard ones, showing, for example, “what-er they here for?” after “What are they here for?” (Praninskas 1975: 11). However, neither device has been used extensively.

In our own teaching experience, we have found that non-native learners are often confused by the mixing of standard and non-standard spellings.
Pronunciation manuals do provide more extensive coverage of blending, notably, among the traditional ESL manuals, *Pronunciation* (Lado and Fries 1954), and, more recently, *Patterns of English Pronunciation* (Bowen 1975), *Speaking English* (Wright 1973), and *Pronunciation Practice* (Byrne and Walsh 1977). None of these, however, attempts to relate contraction and blending in any systematic way, even though the three recent books (in contrast to the audio-lingual approach of the Lado and Fries manual) generally encourage the integral teaching of pronunciation and spelling. Given the limited number of contractions available in English, this failure to relate the two is understandable. In fact, it can be argued that contractions should be totally withheld during the early stages of an ESL curriculum, thus allowing non-native learners to master the wide range of blendings which take place in natural speech (representing these with some marking such as a ligature). Then, at some later point, learners could be exposed to the extremely narrow range of blendings which can be represented by contractions.

We would like to claim, however, that contractions can be efficiently used, despite all the complications we have dealt with, in introducing blending to non-native learners. In the first place, they are quite salient since they provide visible traces in the orthography that blending does take place, and we are committed to the principle that orthographic cues should be maximally exploited in the teaching of pronunciation. Furthermore, the words that can be contracted in English are basic and, for the most part, are best presented in the initial stages of any ESL curriculum. Consequently, they can be used to introduce certain common patterns of blending which parallel other common patterns not represented by contraction. For example, *n’t* and *and* often parallel one another in blended speech, each often realized as /ən/ or even a syllabic nasal (/ŋ/). These parallels can be effectively used in the ESL classroom in moving from orthographically represented blendings to non-orthographically represented ones.

If contractions are to be used in introducing blending, however, it is important that they be presented as only the tip of an iceberg. We have found the following display to be useful in introducing to non-native learners the contrast between contraction and blending:

**FIGURE 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Writing:</th>
<th>Contraction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speech:</td>
<td><strong>B l e n d i n g</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This display reinforces a basic principle that we attempt to communicate to non-native learners from the very beginning: English orthography tends to operate at the lexico-gramatical level rather than the phonological level, or as Chomsky and Halle (1968) have put it, English orthography tends to preserve underlying lexical form, abstracting away from the operation of phonological rules.
Section II

Let us now consider more systematically information on contraction and blending which can be used by ESL teachers to supplement their classroom materials. Given the current flexibility of thinking about ESL curricula, we have not arranged this information according to a particular pedagogical sequence or presented sample materials but rather have provided teachers with information that they can present in a variety of ways. We would like to stress, however, that the information outlined needs to be presented early in the program.

Since we have not followed a curricular approach, we have decided to present the information on contraction and on blending in separate sections, even though cross-references will be necessary. We first present 1) constraints on the contraction of BE, HAVE, and the modals, and 2) constraints on the contraction of not. We then present: 1) common parallels between orthographically represented blendings and non-orthographically represented blendings, and 2) common patterns of blending that are homophonic with single words.

Contraction

There are three levels of delicacy at which information on the contraction of BE, HAVE, and the modals can be displayed for non-native learners of English. First of all, there can be a mere listing of the words that can be contracted (Figure 6A). As indicated by Figure 6, a label such as X-word (Allen 1972) can be used to indicate a general class to which these words belong (i.e., a class of words in the VP that can precede as well as follow the subject). For the sake of clarity, the display of X-words that can be contracted might also include X-words that cannot be contracted (Figure 6B).

It is necessary to make clear the following points:

(1) Some reference manuals present the contractions ‘ll and ‘d as representing shall and should as well as will and would; we prefer, given the context of teaching American English to non-native learners, to present these as representing only will and would.

(2) Throughout this paper, we use HAVE to refer only to the contractable auxiliary HAVE. HAVE in its possessive sense may be contracted in British English, but generally not in American English (e.g., ?I’ve a problem). HAVE in its other meanings as main verb cannot be contracted in either (e.g., *She’s an audition tomorrow).

(3) Although the X-words listed as non-contractable are not themselves contracted, most of them can function as the initial component in a contraction with n’t as the second component.

At the second level of delicacy are listed not only the contractable X-words but also the major classes of words that precede them within contractions:
This display makes available to non-native learners the most general parameters that control the contraction of X-words. It does not, however, provide any information on the frequency of occurrence within contractions of either the X-words or the words that precede them. (This largely depends on the complex range of registers that can be expressed in writing.) Nor does it indicate specific constraints based on phonology (e.g., *amn't).

Figure 8 displays the third level of delicacy, incorporating register constraints on contraction. The classes of words in initial position (in the column
FIGURE 7
Contraction of X-Words

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preceding Word</th>
<th>X-Word</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>I</em></td>
<td><em>we</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>you</em></td>
<td><em>you</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>he</em></td>
<td><em>they</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>she</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>it</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>am</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>is</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>are</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WH-Words</th>
<th><strong>HAVE</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>who</em></td>
<td><em>have</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>when</em></td>
<td><em>has</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>why</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>what</em></td>
<td><em>had</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>how</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>where</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demonstrative Pronouns</th>
<th><strong>Modals</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>this</em></td>
<td><em>will</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>these</em></td>
<td><em>would</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>that</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>those</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>there</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Nouns | Alice, *book*, *rice*,... |

FIGURE 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(is)</th>
<th>Will</th>
<th>Has</th>
<th>Would</th>
<th>Had</th>
<th>Are</th>
<th>Have</th>
<th>Am</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Pronouns</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wh-Words</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrative Pronouns*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential Predictor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nouns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*is does not contract after *this* nor *are* after *were* or *there*)
on the left) and the X-words (from left to right at the top) are both listed according to the frequency with which they occur in contractions.

As indicated by the wide solid lines, is, will, has, and would tend to contract most widely. In principle, they can be contracted with members of any class. In practice, however, has and would tend to contract only with personal pronouns and, to a lesser extent, WH-words, except when a relatively informal register is represented, a constraint indicated by a narrowing of the solid lines. Had, are, have, and am tend to contract even less widely. In principle, they are contracted only with personal pronouns. Given a highly informal register, however, they may be contracted with members of other classes, as indicated by broken lines. The blank space indicates that am can contract only after a personal pronoun (i.e., I) or a WH-word.

As to the vertical ranking, personal pronouns are clearly the class of words most frequently involved in contraction. It is much more difficult to rank the other classes, since their individual members vary considerably in the degree to which they initiate contractions. For example, the WH-words that end in a vowel (e.g., who) are especially vulnerable to blending and hence tend to appear quite often in contractions. Still, some of them do not contract easily with particular X-words. The contraction why’s, for example, is not very common, even though it involves a vowel-final WH-word and the X-word that contracts most frequently. We have not dealt with such delicate constraints in our ranking, attempting to reflect contraction frequencies for the entire class and not for individual members within it.

In addition to register constraints, there are phonological constraints on contraction. One constraint may be described as dissimilatory: A contraction does not ordinarily take place if it leads to adjacent homorganic consonants (i.e., consonants produced at the same place of articulation) at a word boundary. Hence the following specific contractions tend to be barred: 1) is or has after nouns ending in a sibilant; 2) are after there; 3) will after a noun ending in /l/; and 4) would or had after it, what, that, or nouns ending in an alveolar consonant.

We would like to emphasize that the constraints listed above are by no means rigid. Certainly there are writers who, when representing informal dialogue, would contract, say, is, after a noun ending in a sibilant, particularly one not spelled with an s (e.g., Liz’s coming over tonight).

There are also constraints based on stress. One such constraint operates on BE in WH-questions: When BE occurs before an unstressed pronoun in a clause-final position, it must bear stress and therefore cannot be blended—or contracted—with the preceding word (e.g., *Hón’s he? and *Whéré’s she?). In certain instances, however, the final pronoun in a WH-question is itself stressed and the preceding BE, remaining unstressed, can be blended and hence

---

7 These frequency rankings are somewhat tentative; they are based only on a limited survey of usage patterns among graduate students in the ESL and Applied Linguistics Programs at Teachers College, Columbia University.
contracted. For example, in a game of hide-and-seek, children may shout Who's it?, placing stress on the final pronoun. (In terms of its information-bearing properties, however, this it can be considered as functioning nominally rather than pronominally.)

In addition, there are constraints based on stress, where the X-word bears stress as the result of a syntactic process. The general rule that underlies such constraints may be stated as follows: If BE, HAVE, or the modals occur in a position bearing stress by virtue of ellipsis or front-shifting, they cannot be blended with the preceding word, and, therefore, cannot be contracted. For non-native learners, a list of the basic syntactic structures which involve ellipsis and frontshifting can be quite useful.

Ellipsis:

1) Affirmative Short Answers to Questions
   BE: Are you going? Yes, *I'm.
   HAVE: Have you finished? Yes, I've.
   Modals: Would you like to go? Yes, I'd.

2) Compound Sentences Bearing Additive or Contrastive Information
   BE: Sarah's going, and I'm too.
   HAVE: Elizabeth hasn't gone, but they've.
   Modals: Kathleen won't go, but he'll.

3) Comparative Sentences
   BE: Bill's more tired than Joan's.
   HAVE: Joan's worked harder than I've.
   Modals: Bruce'll work longer than they'll.

4) Sentences Containing Nominal Clauses Which Function as a Complement to Verbs such as think, know, say, and wish
   BE: I think she's.
   HAVE: I know they've.
   Modals: I wish he'd.

Frontshifting:

1) WH-Initiated Nominal Clauses Which Function as an Included Question
   BE: I don't know what time it's.
   HAVE: I don't know why they've.

2) Relative Clauses
   BE: That's just the way that I'm.

In addition to these phonological constraints, there is a constraint that may be best described as syntactic: A contraction is generally not allowed where a noun or personal pronoun, functioning as the second member of a plural subject, precedes a verb with which it does not agree. Hence are or have does not ordinarily contract after a singular noun or the third person singular pronoun:

---

8 Zwicky claims that the syntactic processes govern the constraints. He argues that stress is a conditioning factor, but not a consistent one (1970: 334-335).

9 In the refrain for “Bidin’ My Time”—a song written for Girl Crazy in 1930—Ira Gershwin violated this constraint in a memorable way:
   I'm bidin’ my time
   'Cause that’s the kinda guy I’m—
nor does are ordinarily contract after I:

She and *I're going.

In addition to these constraints on the contraction of BE, HAVE, and the modals, it is necessary to point out one further pattern of contraction for have not represented in Figure 8; have is occasionally contracted after a modal, as illustrated by the following sentences:

1) I would’ve finished if I’d known.
2) I will’ve finished by this time tomorrow.

In rare instances the contraction of have may occur after a modal that has itself been contracted, as in the following versions of the sentences listed above:

1) I’d’ve finished if I’d known.
2) I’ll’ve finished by this time tomorrow.

In presenting these double contractions, it should be pointed out that they are possible only because double blendings are possible, as shown by the transcriptions /əydəv + kάm/ for I’d’ve come and /ələv + Kάm/ for I’ll’ve come.

This double contraction of \[
\frac{\text{would}}{\text{will}} \] + have is not possible, however, when not follows one of the contractable X-words. This constraint appears to arise directly from phonology, for an X-word and not cannot be maximally reduce in the same phrase. as can \[
\frac{\text{would}}{\text{will}} \] and have. In effect, there cannot be a double blending in a sequence such as she is not, It can be pronounced either as /šıyz + náat/, a blending which may be represented by she’s not, or as /šıy + ızant/, a blending which may be represented by she isn’t. It cannot, however, be pronounced as *ʃıyəzənt/, a double blending which would be represented by *ʃe’sn’t.\footnote{Certain fast speech pronunciations appear to approach such reduction, but we hear them as if they reflect two stressed syllables. A double blending is possible, though, when not, like will or would, immediately precedes have (e.g., /kədəv/). Hence a negative sentence such as He couldn’t have come can, in principle, be represented as He couldn’t’ve come, though, in fact, it rarely is.}

In turning from this powerful constraint on a double contraction of an X-word and not to specific constraints on the contraction of not, we will begin by making two fundamental observations. First, relative to the X-words, not tends to be contracted with great frequency. (Only is and will appear to contract with comparable frequency.) Second, there seems to be no appreciable differ-
ence in the frequency with which \textit{not} contracts after various X-word classes. Hence the vertical order in Figure 9 does not reflect a frequency ranking:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X-Word Classes</th>
<th>contractable Word</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| DO             | \begin{itemize}  
|                | do                |
|                | does              |
|                | did               |
| BE             | \begin{itemize}  
|                | is                |
|                | was               |
|                | are               |
|                | were              |
| HAVE           | \begin{itemize}  
|                | has               |
|                | have              |
|                | had               |
| Modals         | \begin{itemize}  
|                | will              |
|                | should            |
|                | would             |
|                | might             |
|                | can               |
|                | must              |
|                | could             |

It should be pointed out that certain X-words are not included in this display, such as the modals \textit{shall}, \textit{may}, \textit{dare}, \textit{need}, and \textit{ought to} since they are rarely contracted with \textit{not} in American English; if contractions such as \textit{shan't} and \textit{dassn't} come up in an ESL classroom, they are best dealt with on an ad hoc basis. Secondly, \textit{am} has not been included since \textit{amn't} is not a permissible contraction. This constraint appears to be dissimilatory, somewhat parallel to the one involving adjacent homorganic consonants (e.g., \textit{this's}, \textit{there're}). In this instance, however, the dissimilation is based on the feature of nasality (i.e., a feature involving manner of articulation rather than place of articulation). As indicated by the permissible contraction I'm not, these consonants are more dissimilated—and hence more perceptible—if they occur in separate syllables (/æm + nát/) rather than within a single syllable (*/æmnt/) or in a disyllabic sequence with a single stress (*/æm+t/).
In the case of negative questions, this constraint on “amn’t” leads to a rather striking irregularity: the use of *are* with *I*. Any *not* that immediately follows an X-word lacks stress and hence is necessarily blended with it. Given this pattern of blending, *not* is necessarily contracted in writing:

| DO:      | Didn’t [dɪd̚t] he like it? |
| BE:      | Isn’t [ɪzn] he coming?      |
| HAVE:    | Hasn’t [hæznt] he found it? |
| Modal:   | Can’t [kænt] they come?     |

Since the blending represented by “amn’t” is not permissible, *aren’t* tends to be used in the first person singular form of a negative question, a relatively rare form that primarily serves an exclamatory function, and in tag questions:

aren’t I crazy!
I’m crazy, aren’t I?

One final point on *not*: We have found that non-native learners of English often contract *not* as ‘nt rather than ‘n’t (an error also found in the writing of native speakers, particularly children). There are at least two reasons for this error. First, the apostrophe is in initial position within all other words that contract in English—hence ‘nt is consistent with contractions such as ‘re and ‘ve. Secondly, this error may be motivated by the blending pattern in which *not* is involved. When *not* is blended with a preceding word, /nt/ may be realized as a final consonant cluster. Thus ‘nt may appear to be a more faithful rendering of this cluster.

Blending

In turning from contractions to major blending patterns involving the X-words and *not*, we will be primarily concerned with demonstrating how these patterns are parallel to ones that do not involve contractable words, thus keeping with our major rationale of providing a base for planning materials that relate orthographically represented blendings to non-orthographically represented ones. We will present two kinds of parallels between contractable words and non-contractable words that terminate blendings, the first based on common phonological processes (e.g., the omission of /h/ in *have* and *him*) and the second on homophonous—or nearly homophonous—realizations (e.g., the realization of *am* and *him* as /əm/ or even /əm/).

First, however, we would like to note certain relations between speech tempo and blending. In general, more blendings occur as the tempo of speech increases. For example, while *him* may be realized as /əm/ or even /əm/ when the speech tempo is relatively normal, *them* would ordinarily be realized as /əm/ or /əm/ only when the tempo is relatively fast. We use the terms normal speech and fast speech respectively to characterize the tempo of speech within

---

11 Just as pronunciation may contribute to an orthographic error, orthography may contribute to a pronunciation error. Some non-native speakers, perhaps influenced by the contraction *n’t*, attempts to preserve a syllable-initial /n/ in blending *not* with a preceding word (e.g., haven’t to /hævnt/).
which these two pronouns are likely to be realized as a homophonous parallel to *am. Not only do more blendings occur as the speech tempo increases, but those which occur tend to be more extreme. For example, *I would have may be realized as /ây wâdâv/ when the tempo is relatively normal, but reduced to /âydâv/ or /âyda/ if the tempo is increased. Although we do not deal with these variable realizations systematically, we would like to call attention to the fact that speech tempo exerts subtle controls on the *nature as well as the number of blending patterns in everyday speech.

Our use of the terms *normal speech* and *fast speech* to distinguish the blending of words like *him* and *them* is not based on empirical research and hence is, no doubt, subject to revision. Obviously the use of these two terms would be more effective if they were established, by future research, as the poles of a continuum like the following one:

![Gradual Increase in Blending](image)

Still, our own limited use of these terms can have a certain pedagogical utility. Non-native speakers may be encouraged to develop a productive competence for normal speech blendings, but only a receptive competence for fast speech blendings. However, we have found in our own teaching that non-native learners engage in a certain amount of playful production of fast speech blendings in order to develop even a receptive competence. Given a motor-theory of auditory perception, such spontaneous production seems to be involved, to some extent, in developing receptive competence.

Figure 10 outlines various parallels between contractable words and non-contrastable words in blended speech, primarily according to common processes that are at work within these words. First, various forms of vowel weakening are presented and then various forms of consonant weakening. All the processes may be viewed as occurring in normal speech, except where we note that they tend to occur only in fast speech.

The deletion of a final consonant (Figure 10) depends upon what follows the contractable or non-contractable word. In general, a final consonant is more likely to be deleted if the following word begins with a consonant, particularly one with which it cannot form a syllable-initial cluster (e.g., /k/ in *IIB—*/vk/ and */tk/). If, for example, the following word begins with a vowel, the final consonant may be resyllabified. Although such resyllabification may be total or partial, we identify it for non-native learners by placing the transferred consonant above the ligature joining the two words:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>contractable Word</th>
<th>Non-contractable Word</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*/v/</td>
<td>*/v/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He could have eaten.</td>
<td>I don’t know the name of Eric’s new wife.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 10
Blending Represented by Contractions

I. Vowel Weakening
A. Reduction to /æ/:
The vowel in all contractable words can be reduced to /æ/.

B. Deletion: ( /v/+/ø/
The vowel in all contractable words can be further reduced to /ø/, where the remaining consonant(s) can be absorbed into the preceding syllable:

1. don't → /dɔːnt/
2. he's → /hɛz/

1. The vowel in any contractable word where the remaining consonant is a resonant and hence can function as a syllable consonant.
a. Nasal
   i. /m/
      am: What am [wʌ[m]] I doing?
   ii. /n/
      nôt: He didn't [dɪ[d]t] want it.
b. Liquid
   i. /ɾ/
      are: What are [wʌɾ] you doing?
   ii. /l/
      will: John'll [dʒl] come over tonight.

2. The vowel in non-contractable words can be further reduced to ø only where the remaining consonant is a resonant and hence can function syllabically.
a. Nasal
   i. /m/
      him: Don't hit him [hɪ[m]].
   ii. /n/
      end: Ed and [ɛnd] Joe came.
b. Liquid
   i. /ɾ/
      her: Don't hit her [hɪ[ɾ]].
   ii. /l/
      No non-contractable word can be realized as /l/. The word all is ordinarily realized with the vowel /ɔ/, although in fast speech it occasionally approaches /ɔ/ and hence can be confused with will.
II. Consonant Weakening

A. Initial Consonant

1. Deletion: /C/→/ø/
   a. /h/→/ø/

2. Movement to Final Position

B. Final Consonant

1. Deletion of Single Consonant:
   /C/→/ø/
   /v/→/ø/

2. Simplification of Consonant Cluster:
   /cc/→/cø/
   /nC/→/nø/
Another major process may accompany resyllabification. Wherever a final /s/, /z/, /t/, or /d/ precedes a /y/, palatalization tends to take place (particularly where /y/ is the initial consonant of an unstressed syllable). This process is quite common in English, given the frequency with which words such as you and your occur after not, is, has, had, and would in questions.

This palatalization cannot be directly represented by a contraction since the contractable word, if present, is blending with a following word rather than a preceding one. Palatalization often occurs, though, when a contractable word is already blended with a preceding word. In a negative question, for example, not is often involved in a double blending:

Don't you [dɔntʃəʊ] want to come?

On the other hand, in positive questions a contractable word often palatalizes with a following word when it is clause-initial and hence not blended with a preceding word:

Would you [wudzu] like to come?

The major patterns of palatalization in which contractable words are involved are parallel to patterns that involve suffixes as well as non-contractable words. Therefore, Figure 11 includes three columns labeled contractable Word, Non-contractable Word, and Suffix, respectively. These suffixes reflect certain parallel patterns of morphophonemics variation. Just as is or has can be realized as /s/, /z/, or /z/, so can the suffixes for the plural, the possessive (singular and plural) and third person singular form of a simple present verb. In the case of had/would and the past tense suffix, this morphophonemic variation is only partially parallel: The past tense suffix can be realized as /t/, /d/, or /zd/, but had and would only as /d/ or /zd/. Included in our table are patterns where /t/ precedes /s/ and /d/ precedes /z/, thus leading to the formation of the affricates /tʃ/ and /dʒ/ rather than the fricatives /s/ and /z/ (we have found that non-native learners experience particular difficulty with such affricates in blended speech).

In dealing with common processes reflected in the blending of contractable and non-contractable words, we have already called attention to certain homophonous realizations for these words (e.g., in Figure 10, IB, for words that terminate in a resonant). We would now like, however, to outline a more complete set of such homophonous—or nearly homophonous—realizations. For non-contractable words, we will present homophonous realizations in two columns, one labeled normal speech and the other fast speech.

As indicated by the phonetic symbols in Figure 12, the parallels between contractable and non-contractable words are not based on an identical range of variable realizations, but rather on an overlapping one. For example, does, like is and has, can be realized as /s/, /z/, or /z/, but as and was can be realized only as /z/. In addition, there is a more fundamental difference: Any contractable word can coalesce monosyllabically with a preceding word wherever that word terminates in a vowel or consonant that can absorb the
### FIGURE 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Palatalization</th>
<th>Non-contractable Word</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>contractable</td>
<td>Does (tends to palatalize only in fast speech)</td>
<td>Suffix for plural, possessive (singular and plural), and third person singular form of the simple present verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. is, has</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. /s/ → /ʃ/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick's your říkšar</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>He picks you [piško]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher.</td>
<td></td>
<td>every time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. /ts/ − /tʃ/</td>
<td>What does your wátšar</td>
<td>It fits you [fišo].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It's your fštšar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. /z/ → /ʒ/</td>
<td>Where does your weržšar</td>
<td>He sees you [sišo].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He's your hýžšar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. /dʒ/ → /dʒ/</td>
<td>These are the beds your [běštšar] sister gave me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ned's your měžšar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It may be helpful for advanced ESL students to note that /dʒ/ may be produced even when a /d/ is not overtly present. Whenever an /n/ precedes a /ʃ/, a parasitic /dʒ/ may be produced in fast speech.

- When's your wěnžšar mother coming? When does your wěnžšar brother study? He wins your wěnžšar money every time.

Finally, it may be noted that a final /ʃ/ in non-contractable words like as and was may be realized as /ʒ/ in blended speech:

- Mine's not as good as yours [vžórz].
- He was your [važšar] teacher.

The final sibilant in these words cannot, however, be realized as /ʃ/ or /tʃ/, since it cannot be devoiced. Furthermore, the preceding vowel cannot be deleted and hence it prevents a parasitic /dʒ/ from being realized in a final /dʒ/.

2. would, had          | did (tends to palatalize past tense suffix) only in fast speech |
| /d/ → /dʒ/            |                                                             |                         |
| How had your háwadžšar work been going? | How did you háwadžo like the play? | He played your pléyadžšar favorite song. |

In fast speech the vowel can be deleted before did but not before had or would. Hence an initial monosyllabic /huad/, /hawd/, /wayd/ necessarily signals who did, how did, or why did. Although the final /d/ in would or had cannot be realized as /t/, there is one contractable word that involves the /t/ → /tʃ/ pattern of palatalization.

3. not                 | at, it past tense suffix |
| /t/ → /tʃ/            |                                                             |                         |
| Can't you káŋtišo      | He's at your aššar | He helped you káłptšo. |
| finish the work?       | sister's place.                                            |                         |

remaining consonant (s) of the contractable word into a single syllable. However, a non-contractable word generally cannot coalesce monosyllabically with a preceding word, even though the phonological conditions may be appropriate.
A few non-contractable words can, however, coalesce monosyllabically with the preceding word in fast speech (e.g., *did* with a preceding WH-word).

Other non-contractable words tend toward monosyllabic coalescence in fast speech, though we process them as realizing a separate syllable. This tendency may be illustrated by the following examples (in the phonetic transcriptions :\(n\) is used to represent this partial coalescence):

1. He's [hiyz] tall.
2. I see as *[siyz] well as he does.

In addition to the homophonic realizations outlined in Figure 12, there are many blending patterns represented by contractions where the entire twoword sequence is homophonous or nearly homophonous with a single word. If we consider the various blending patterns that involve a noun and a contractable word, such homophony is nearly unlimited. Consider, for example, the numer-
ous lexical items such as *pat* or *rock* that can function as a noun or a verb. Whenever *is* follows one of these items functioning as a noun, the two-word blending that results is homophonous with 1) a single verb formed by combining the item with a third person singular simple present suffix and 2) a single noun formed by combining the item with plural or possessive inflection (see Figure 13).

![FIGURE 13](image)

Two-Word Sequence | Single Word
-------------------|---------------------
Noun + *is*: Pat’s over here | He pats his dog too much. His dog gets too many *pats*. Pat’s book is over here.

Apart from these blendings involving a noun, there are many others involving a pronoun or a WH-word that parallel a single word. In Figure 14, a ligature is used to represent blendings of a pronoun or a WH-word with a contractable word wherever a contraction is not ordinarily used:

![FIGURE 14](image)

I. Personal Pronoun + contractable Word

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Two-Word Sequence</th>
<th>Single Word</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I’ll</td>
<td><em>isle, aisle</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you’re</td>
<td><em>your</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you’ll</td>
<td><em>yule</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he’ll</td>
<td><em>heel, hill</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he’d (he had, he would)</td>
<td><em>heed</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we’ll</td>
<td><em>will</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we’ve</td>
<td><em>weave</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they’re</td>
<td><em>their, there</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*He’ll can be pronounced with either a tense or lax vowel and hence can be homophonous with either *heel* or *hill.*

II. WH-Word + Contractable Word

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Two-Word Sequence</th>
<th>Single Word</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>who’s</em></td>
<td><em>whose</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>who am</em></td>
<td><em>whom</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>what’s</em></td>
<td><em>watts</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>what are</em></td>
<td><em>water</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>where’s</em></td>
<td><em>wears</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>where are</em></td>
<td><em>wearer</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>why is</em></td>
<td><em>wise</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>why are</em></td>
<td><em>wire</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>why have</em></td>
<td><em>wife (v.)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>why had</em></td>
<td><em>wide</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>why will</em></td>
<td><em>while</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>how’s</em></td>
<td><em>house (v.)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>how will</em></td>
<td><em>howl</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are additional parallels produced by certain variant patterns of pronunciation used in major American dialects. When, for example, non-native learners listen to speakers of the dialect in which /s/ and /z/ are neutralized before a nasal, the blending patterns represented by when’s and when are may be homophonous with wins and winner. Moreover, given limitations on the receptive competence of non-native learners, some blending patterns may appear to be homophonous with common words when, in fact, they are not. Consider, for example, the widespread problem of non-native learners in distinguishing /iy/ and /iːː/: his may be heard as homophonous with the blending represented by he’s. Non-native learners also confuse the written forms his and he’s since they tend to associate an apostrophe with a possessive form (they confuse whose/who’s, your/you’re, and their/they’re for the same reason). In observing ESL teachers presenting the pairs your/you’re and their/they’re, we have sometimes heard them focus on a vowel distinction as a means of keeping the two members of each pair separate. We would suggest that such a distinction not be used, since it tends to be neutralized in the blending of you or they with are. We would also suggest that teachers, when dealing with the homophonous patterns we have noted, follow a principle which our colleague Robert Allen has insisted on in teacher-training programs at Teachers College, Columbia University: related forms should not be initially presented together or confusion may be fostered where none exists.

The various patterns of homophony or near homophony that we have briefly outlined can be particularly troublesome for non-native learners of English, for one of the most arduous tasks they face in comprehending natural speech is appropriate chunking of blended sequences. In order to develop their capacity to chunk appropriately, the parallelisms outlined can be used to construct a wide range of comprehension tasks which require that syntactic and semantic cues be used in discriminating homophonous or nearly homophonous sequences. (Bowen (1975) presents a limited number of discriminatory tasks involving parallel blending patterns.) By working with these parallels, teachers can use a relatively limited number of contractions as an efficient means of introducing non-native learners to the wide range of blendings which they need to master.

Conclusion

In order to help teachers solve some of the problems that result from working with current ESL materials, we have presented detailed information on contractions and blending. We have suggested that teachers, wherever possible, use contractions as a means on introducing blending, thereby maintaining maximal use of orthographic cues in teaching pronunciation. In addition, we have suggested that teachers deal with a wide degree of blendings, distinguishing between those which can be orthographically represented and those which cannot. Finally, we have suggested that teachers distinguish between normal speech
blending and fast speech blending, encouraging students to develop productive controls over the former but only receptive control over the latter.
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The Dictionary and Vocabulary Behavior: a Single Word or a Handful?*

James Baxter

Choosing the most appropriate dictionary for students in the ESOL classroom is a recurrent problem. So as to provide a context for dictionary selection, this article presents a view of vocabulary referred to as vocabulary behavior. By making an explicit distinction between spoken and written English, this view reveals the relation between dictionary use, classroom vocabulary behavior and student success in meeting their communicative needs.

An argument in support of the choice of a monolingual English learner’s dictionary is presented. Whereas a bilingual dictionary tends to encourage the employment of a single lexical item, the monolingual dictionary demonstrates that definition is an alternative. Through use of a monolingual dictionary, students are led to the use of conversational definition in speech and thus benefit from the full range of resources offered in spoken English.

Questionnaire data is presented describing the dictionary habits and preferences of a population of Japanese university students of English.

A man who uses a great many words to express his meaning is like a bad marksman who instead of aiming a single stone at an object takes up a handful and throws at it in hopes he may hit it.

After thus defining the poor verbal marksman, Samuel Johnson, that articulate lexicographer, would no doubt have suggested use of a dictionary to improve one’s aim.

In the ESOL classroom, students and teachers have great faith in the dictionary as a stock of “single stones.” Yet the dictionary is not always seen as a blessing by teachers, due to the recurrent problem of choosing the most appropriate dictionary for students. Without adequate evaluation criteria, many teachers avoid dealing directly with the selection problem, leaving students to choose for themselves, a situation which can have negative consequences. Students commit considerable time to dictionary use, and this use, if unguided, can have an adverse effect on learning. Furthermore, avoidance of the problem generally parallels a failure to integrate the dictionary into the teaching/learning process.

This article argues in support of the choice of a monolingual English learner’s dictionary. Several central questions will be answered: What are the needs of students? What are their present dictionary habits and preferences? What are the essential differences between a bilingual dictionary and a mono-

* This article is based on a presentation given at the TESOL Convention, San Francisco, 1980. The author would like to thank Takashi Okuhara, Dennis Hoener and especially Guy Butterworth for their kind help with the questionnaire discussed in the paper.

Mr. Baxter is a Professional Associate at the East-West Center, Culture Learning Institute, Honolulu, Hawaii. He has previously published in Cross-Currents and Modern English Teacher.
lingual English dictionary? Between a monolingual learner’s dictionary and one designed for use by native speakers?

First, it is necessary to discuss the nature of vocabulary itself, both as a component of language and as an area of language instruction. One argument put forth in recent years is that vocabulary instruction and learning are secondary to grammar. Yet students outside the classroom find themselves at a loss for words and consequently become embarrassed and frustrated. The solution, it is argued, is to teach the words and phrases which students will need. There is thus reference to “massive vocabulary instruction” (Judd 1978) and to the need to provide students with “all possible means of amassing more items for their second language lexicon” (Kopec 1979). The view of vocabulary underlying this argument—let us call it the quantitative view—corresponds quite closely to the everyday notion of vocabulary: a poor vocabulary and a small vocabulary are synonymous; a good vocabulary is perforce a large one. This notion of vocabulary is readily associated with admonitions such as, “Build your vocabulary!” and “Increase your word power!” Students, ever striving to acquire more and more items, seem to believe that it is in quantity that fluency is to be found.

According to the quantitative view, if students find themselves at a loss for words, this is because the meaning they need to communicate is beyond the capacity of their lexical resources. The suggestion, then, is that students be given more lexical items, more ammunition, and helped to become good marks-men, in Johnson’s sense.

But this view fails to take into account the fundamental differences between spoken and written language, and between spoken and written English in particular (Abercrombie 1963; Hirsch 1977). The distinction is most clearly revealed in terms of time and addressee feedback (Brown 1978). Of course, if a writer should be unable to think of a particular word, there is ample time to refer to a dictionary, a thesaurus, and so forth. The speaker, on the other hand, must operate within the temporal flow of the conversation. Compensating for this lack of time is the fact that the spoken exchange occurs in a situational context. Gesture, prosody, paralinguistic clues and, most importantly, addressee feedback and cooperation can be relied upon. Written English lacks this situational context, there being no immediate speaker-addressee interaction, and this lack is reflected in the norms of the written form, i.e., in what is expected and considered acceptable in that form (Hirsch 1977:22). For example, written English is lexically explicit and precise. There are no blanks in a text, followed by, “Well, you know what I mean.” “Sort of” and “kind of” are rarely employed to indicate that a word or phrase is not exact but is an approximation of what is meant, “You know,” calling for increased addressee cooperation, does not occur at all in prose. The preceding do occur in spoken English, and what is more, they are well within the norms of that form.

Johnson’s marksman, able to hit the target with one stone, is either a writer or a well-prepared orator. And proponents of the quantitative view of vocabulary
consider like Johnson, only the lexical norms of written English. The norms of the spoken form do not call for unvarying lexical explicitness nor for constant precision. A handful of words is often the best means of expressing one’s meaning, for the target is not as fixed as Johnson would have it. The addressee very obligingly moves it into place.

A more useful view of vocabulary is one which goes beyond a depiction of vocabulary as a list of items which are learned, stored in the memory, and eventually used; it is a view which admits that speakers do not have a mental lexicon consisting of items of equal accessibility, immediately recallable. Instead, there are a variety of reasons for which a word may not be available for use, especially in spoken English with its limited time for word searching. Consider the following examples, taken from actual recordings of spoken discourse.

(Signs: / = tone unit boundary; •, -, -- = unfilled pauses (short or long); a, an = filled pause.):

1) you think you’re in bad condition / - I used to be in really good shape / · ‘n’ now I’m just completely -- am - skinny / I’m just skinny /
2) he’s been to the la • to oh / • the last / two or three world cup / • world cup / • mat things / you know / • tournaments / (Crystal and Davy 1975:19)
3) for quite a while he didn’t work / and was more or less the a • mother of the house / • he did all the cooking ‘n’ everything ‘n’ /
4) I’d say that Ford would be / ‘cause he’s been in office / ‘n’ I think he’s - more m • am I dunno / more m • in it / more matured / or more • with it / • ‘cause he’s in there already /

There is evidence that syllable structure, stress patterns and phonological segments are not stored as one unitary word representation (Clark and Clark 1977:287). Similarity between word representations can block accessibility to the intended item. In example 1) the speaker wanted to say, with typical American hyperbole, that he was “completely emaciated.” The word which came to mind was “emancipated.” At a loss for the desired word, then, he pauses in order to move to the near synonym, “skinny.” Notice that he uses a filled pause, “am,” thereby avoiding an inappropriate long silence. This example shows that a synonym is not only a word we use when we cannot spell the other, but also a word we use when, for various possible reasons, we cannot remember the other.

The World Cup Tournament is usually referred to simply as the World Cup. In 2) however, perhaps due to the plural, the speaker wants to use the full name. “Tournament” is not immediately accessible. The speaker pauses very briefly, repeats “world cup,” then tries another word, “matches,” in place of “tournament.” The World Cup is not a match, but consists of several soccer matches. “Matches” is then cut off, with only “mat” having been articulated, Without any pause, the speaker then uses a general noun, “things,” followed
by “you know.” This latter is a signal to the addressee that special attention will be needed in interpreting “world cup things.” The speaker, after all this, finally remembers “tournaments,” but by this time it is redundant—the addressee will have already understood the message.

In 3) the speaker does not quite know what to call an unemployed man who stays home to take care of the house. Using the metaphorical “mother of the house,” he indicates by “more or less” that this only approximately conveys his meaning. He continues with an explanation, “he did all the cooking and everything,” subordinating this prosodically to the preceding tone unit. Perhaps today the speaker in 3) would not have needed such a handful of words, since the lexicon of American English presently contains “househusband” and “houseperson.”

The speaker in 4) is trying to express why she believes that Ford would be the best choice for President. She starts to say, “I think he’s more matured,” but apparently feels that this does not express her meaning adequately, and actually voices no more than the initial [m]. The following “an I dunno” indicates that she is going to opt for the type of lexical imprecision characteristic of spoken English. She again hesitates over “matured,” then finally does use it after having tried “in it.” She follows with “more with it.” What we have then is, “I think he’s more in it, more matured, or more with it, because he’s already in office.” Other words may have done service here, such as “tried,” “experienced,” “seasoned or “expert,” but even Johnson would have been hard put to hit the target with a single word. Note here that lexical imprecision does not entail imprecision of meaning: as in the other examples, the meaning is clear in 4).

These are typical examples of vocabulary behavior in spoken English. The speakers, although momentarily at a loss for words, nevertheless are able to find an acceptable way in which to express what they have to say. Operating within the norms of spoken English, they make use of available, appropriate devices: pauses, both filled and unfilled, movement to a synonym or general word such as “thing,” expressions such as “more or less,” and signals such as “you know” and “I dunno,” telling the addressee to increase participation in the mutual speaker-addressee process of communication of meaning.

Speakers know that expression of meaning is not limited to the use of unit lexical items. 1 Although it may be possible to complete “I think he’s———” with a single lexical item, the norms of spoken English allow that blank to be filled by “more, I dunno, more in it, more matured, or more with it.” A speaker, without access to “emaciated,” may opt for another lexical item, such as “skinny.” The problem is that all too often, students do not know this type

---

1 The term *lexical item* is used here in the sense of Quirk et al. (1972). Cf. also Lyons’ use of “lexeme” (1977). Thus, *lexical item* is used to refer to all of the following: simplex items, which are morphologically unanalyzable, e.g. *friend*; derived or complex items, e.g. *friendly*; compounds, e.g., *diving board*; complex prepositions, e.g. *in spite of*; multi-word verbs, e.g. *get rid of*; and other idiomatic combinations, e.g., *jump the gun.*
of vocabulary behavior in spoken English. Whether speaking or writing, they try to be Johnsonian marksmen.

Students must be given the means to express themselves in an acceptable manner. If they continually opt for a solution of lexical explicitness and precision, then frustration will indeed be the outcome. In spoken interaction, inability to keep unfilled pauses, i.e., silence, within definite limits means that one’s turn is lost. The speakers in the four examples above employ various means to keep talking, thus holding the communicative channel open and maintaining their turns (Brown 1978).

Therefore, the notion of vocabulary must be understood in light of 1) the distinction between spoken and written English, 2) the full range of devices available to the speaker, and 3) the norms of speaker-addressee interaction. In addition, it cannot be assumed that a speaker will have immediate access to ostensibly known lexical items in every situation. Vocabulary cannot be construed only in terms of an accumulation of items, but also must be seen as including the dynamics of use pedagogically, this means that simply predicting items which may be needed by students, then teaching these items, is inadequate. We must assume that in many instances the items supposedly learned will be unavailable for use; yet students must nevertheless be able to express their meaning in an appropriate manner. In sum, a more realistic view of vocabulary is being proposed here, one which incorporates the quantitative view within a broader framework. This view can be termed vocabulary behavior.

The vocabulary behavior of students in many ESOL classrooms shows is a definite tendency to use unit lexical items in a precise manner. One hears “crosswalk,” but not “a place where people cross the street.” There is a marked absence of superordinate terms and general words such as “stuff,” “thing,” “matter,” etc. Gesture is rare, and addressee feedback and cooperation are almost never relied upon. The strongest indication that students are trying to operate within the norms of the lexical behavior of the written form is the very high frequency of abnormally long pauses. A student, having begun an utterance, will simply stop at mid-point, not employing any of the available devices to keep speaking. This is the phenomenon of the Black Hole: scanning their mental vocabulary lists in search of a word, students find a blank, a nothing so complete that all energy for further expression is pulled into its blackness. Silence. (Brown 1979:25)

Why is it that such behavior is so common in the classroom? There is no simple answer, but there are many possible causes. And there is one particular cause which is rarely recognized despite its being an important factor in the shaping of student vocabulary behavior. This is dictionary use.

Students lack the ability to define. Consider an example from one of the author’s classes in a Japanese university: Reading a text, we came across the verb “to weld.” Asked for the meaning of this, the students opened their bilingual English-Japanese dictionaries. Although they were soon whispering a Japanese word to one another, it took us several minutes before we were able to formulate
something like, “it means to join two pieces of metal together using heat.” The point here is that the students were unable to move from a Japanese translation equivalent to an English definition, implying that if they needed to express the meaning of to weld in conversation, but did not have access to this lexical item, they would have considerable difficulty in finding an alternative expression.

Definition is a fundamental language skill, by no means limited to dictionaries. “World cup mat things you know” is a definition, conveying a meaning which otherwise could have been conveyed by a lexical item. A spoken definition, making use of the devices unique to the spoken form, is very different than a carefully thought out, written dictionary definition.

If students tend to opt for a written solution even when speaking, if they are unable to operate with conversational definition when a particular lexical item is not known or not accessible, one of the principal causes of this is the influence of sustained use of bilingual dictionaries.

There is a fundamental difference, a difference in kind, between a monolingual English (or English-English) dictionary and a bilingual dictionary. The evident difference would seem to be the use of translation in a bilingual dictionary, since much of the information is common to both, such as pronunciation of entry items or grammatical information. More significant than translation is the essential difference in the form of the treatment of the entry word.

weld v a to join (usu. metals) by pressure or melting together when hot (Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English)

In a monolingual English dictionary, the main entry, e.g. weld, is a lexical item, with the definition being a syntactic construction, not itself a lexical item. In Saussurean terms, there is a sign on one hand, a syntagm on the other, the semantic relation between the two being one of synonymy (Hiorth 1957). Definition is possible only because of this dual expression of meaning. The regular user of a monolingual English dictionary learns, through cumulative experience, that if meaning cannot be expressed through a lexical item, an alternative is available. This knowledge, especially if developed through supplementary teaching techniques (Brown 1979), will lead to appropriate use of conversational definition with its combination of verbal expression and gesture, use of the situational context and addressee cooperation, and so forth.

The formal treatment of the entry item in a bilingual dictionary is altogether different.

weld vt. 1 yōsetsu suru, tanetsu suru; . . . (Kenkyusha’s New Collegiate English-Japanese Dictionary; the Japanese has been transliterated here.)

In an English-Japanese dictionary, for example, an English entry item is matched with one or more lexical items from Japanese, the relation being one of translation equivalence. This is not definition. The user of this type of dictionary must therefore continually refer to matchings of lexical items. What is cumulatively learned is that meaning is always expressed through use of a lexical item. Long-term use of a bilingual dictionary will produce in stu-
students the tendency to always seek a given lexical item. If it should be unavailable, there will be no recourse, in speech, to conversational definition.

Having recognized the potential influence of bilingual dictionary use, the next step is to determine the extent to which this influence may actually be operating. For that, more detailed information on student dictionary habits and preferences is needed. Therefore, a study of the use of dictionaries by Japanese students of English was undertaken. A questionnaire was administered in the summer of 1979, to Japanese students at three national, four-year universities in Japan. The total respondent population was 342, with respondents majoring in English numbering 62 (18.1%), coming from faculties of Law and Letters (English and American Literature), Humanities (English Language and Literature), and Education (primarily from the course preparing students for teaching English in junior high schools). Respondents who were not English majors numbered 280 (81.9%), coming from faculties of Education, Economics, Agriculture, and Engineering. The distribution of the total population of 342 in terms of year in university was as follows: 1st year = 19.9%; 2nd year = 57.9%; 3rd year = 13.2%; 4th year = 7.6%; graduate level = 0.3%; not indicated = 1.2%.

The questionnaire first explained to respondents that questions would be asked about monolingual English dictionaries, bilingual Japanese-English dictionaries, and bilingual English-Japanese dictionaries. (In Japan, these last two are generally not combined in one volume.)

(1) When did you buy your first dictionary? 1. junior high 2. senior high 3. university

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHEN:</th>
<th>1. junior high</th>
<th>2. senior high</th>
<th>3. university</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[N= 333]</td>
<td>88.6%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What type was it? 1. bilingual Japanese-English 2. bilingual English-Japanese 3. monolingual

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[N= 333]</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Total % = 104.2%]

(2) How many bilingual dictionaries have you bought since you started studying English?

(The numbers in parentheses refer to numbers of dictionaries bought:)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[N = 308]</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
<th>(7)</th>
<th>(8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3) How many monolingual dictionaries have you bought since you started studying English?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJORS:</th>
<th>[N = 58]</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>1%</th>
<th>2%</th>
<th>3%</th>
<th>4%</th>
<th>5%</th>
<th>6%</th>
<th>7%</th>
<th>8%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NON-MAJORS:
[N = 249] 76.3% 20.9% 2.8% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0%

TOTAL:
[N = 307] 62.9% 25.4% 7.8% 3.6% 0% 0.3% 0% 0% 0%

Nos. 2 and 3, expressed in terms of total volumes bought and average per student:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bilingual</th>
<th>MAJORS</th>
<th>NON-MAJORS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average:</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monolingual</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average:</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(4) Please give the name of the dictionary which you now use most often:

____________________/ What type is it? 1. bilingual Japanese-English
2. bilingual English-Japanese 3. monolingual

(5) How often do you use the following types of dictionaries?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>daily</th>
<th>several times per week</th>
<th>once per week</th>
<th>less often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
a) bilingual Japanese-English | 1. | 2. | 3. | 4. |
b) bilingual English-Japanese | 1. | 2. | 3. | 4. |
c) monolingual English | 1. | 2. | 3. | 4. |


(a) bilingual

Js-Eng:

(1) 4.8% 
(2) 11.3%  45.1%  6.4%  19.9%  1.2%
(3) 28 %  12.3%  7.0%  15.5%  7.8%  1.5%
(4) 54.8%  80.2%  75.5%  19.9%  17.9%

(b) bilingual

Eng-Js:

(1) 79 %  4.0%  17.9%  70.4%  17.9%
(2) 17.7%  82.4%  8.7%  10.3%  8.7%  3.0%
(6) In your studies, what for you has been the most important type of book you have used? 1. bilingual dictionary 2. monolingual dictionary 3. grammar book in Japanese 4. grammar book in English 5. other (Name_________)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJORS</th>
<th>NON-MAJORS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[N = 62]</td>
<td>[N = 280]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bilingual</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
<td>78.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>monolingual</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grammar in</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grammar in</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>1.1%*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Total %) 116.2% 110.4% 111.4%

(*) 3 students listed the following under no. 5 'other': "American hard-boiled pocket books"; Time and Playboy; tapes of native speakers.

The following profile emerges from the questionnaire responses. Students begin their studies of English in junior high school, buying their first dictionary a bilingual English-Japanese one, at that time. Over the next few years, two more bilingual dictionaries are acquired. Only if the university major of a student is English, will a student purchase a monolingual English dictionary. At the university level, as with the lower levels, an English-Japanese dictionary is used most often. Non-English majors rarely if ever refer to a monolingual English dictionary, and while English majors do so more frequently, few of them use monolingual dictionary daily. By comparison, most of them give their English-Japanese dictionaries daily use. Very significantly, students attribute to the bilingual dictionary, in contrast to other reference books, the greatest degree of importance in their studies of English.

Recalling the influence of bilingual dictionary use described above, the conclusion supported by the questionnaire data is that, for this student population, the extent of that influence is considerable.

While the particulars of this questionnaire cannot be generalized, it can be safely assumed that many other student populations exhibit similar pattern of predominant use of bilingual dictionaries. It is clear that, in light of the preceding analysis, increased use of monolingual English dictionaries should be encouraged.

Which type of monolingual dictionary should be chosen for student use? The questionnaire also contained a question asking students to state which type of dictionary, monolingual or bilingual, they preferred, and why. The most common reply was, "I prefer a bilingual dictionary because it is easier to use." Many students criticized monolingual dictionaries, complaining that definitions were difficult to understand. The experience of having to look up
several of the words used in a particular definition was frequently referred to. This is most often the case with dictionaries destined for use by native speakers. The most appropriate choice for students of English is a learner’s dictionary, and more particularly, one in which a controlled defining vocabulary has been employed.

Controlling both the number of words and the meanings of these words used in definitions facilitates understanding. In addition, control of the defining vocabulary also focuses greater attention on the consistent use of the same genus word in the definitions of associated lexical items (Whitcut 1978). For example, “to walk” can serve as the genus verb in the definitions of a wide range of associated verbs, such as “hobble,” “shuffle,” “stagger,” “prance,” “strut,” “tiptoe,” and “waddle.” Students, through regular dictionary use, will build up a knowledge of genus or superordinate terms such as “to walk,” along with the related hyponyms. Knowing that “to walk” is the superordinate, a speaker can use a conversational definition in place of any of the more specific verbs: “The burglar, uh, walked in on his toes.” “He walks sort of like this, you know, dragging his feet.” “She walks, well, kind of like a duck.”

The monolingual learners dictionary, therefore, not only demonstrates that definition is an alternative to the use of lexical items, but it also provides the means to actually employ definition.

It can be strongly argued, then, that students should use a monolingual English learner’s dictionary. A word of caution, however: When students have a background of extensive bilingual dictionary use, their feelings that such a dictionary is easier to use must be given careful attention. Such students will have established definite learning strategies in accordance with bilingual dictionary use and cannot be expected to either want to use a monolingual dictionary, nor to be successful in that use without careful guidance. For example, Japanese students need special training in reading definitions. In dictionary definitions, there is extensive use of restrictive post-modification, oftentimes a relative clause. As the Japanese language would make use of pre-modification in such cases, students understandably have difficulties. Another teaching point for all students would be the process by which one moves from a definition to examples (given in every dictionary of any value), then back to the original context of the item in question. This comparison is a highly complex semantic process of moving from a general, abstract statement of meaning to a highly specific instantial, or text, meaning (Halliday and Hasan 1976:289). By training students in this process of comparison, the skill of using context to determine the meaning of a lexical item, a skill of great value in reading (Twaddell 1973), would be developed.

To reiterate, students need to be able to express themselves and to find acceptable means to do so. Both monolingual English dictionaries and bilingual

---

3 For a discussion of hyponymy, see Lyons (1977:291f). In the pair cow:animal, cow is a hyponym of animal, the superordinate. One function of a lexicographic definition is to assign a given entry item to a superordinate, e.g., “[a cow is a] fully grown female of any animal of the ox family, . . .” (Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary, p. 200)
dictionaries can have an influence on student vocabulary behavior, especially in spoken English. Use of a bilingual dictionary encourages the tendency to always employ a single lexical item. A monolingual English dictionary, by demonstrating that definition is always possible, encourages conversational definition. Students are thus led to use the full range of resources offered in spoken English, thereby gaining a fluency which is not the product of lexical explicitness and precision. It is a fluency evidenced by continuity of expression and successful conveyance of meaning.

A view of vocabulary has been proposed which reveals the interrelatedness of dictionary use, classroom vocabulary behavior, and the success which students will have in meeting their communicative needs. Referred to as vocabulary behavior, this view explicitly recognizes the distinction between spoken and written English and between the norms of lexical behavior in each case. Abercrombie (1963) has warned that failure to differentiate spoken and written language results in the teaching of spoken prose in the guise of spoken English. Teaching and materials have improved since the date of this warning, one example being the substitution of actual recorded discourse for highly scripted dialogue, but even so, the vocabulary behavior found in many classrooms still resembles that of spoken prose. Granted, in certain stylistic varieties of spoken English, as in public speaking, news broadcasts and so forth, the lexical norms do approach those of written English. Such language activity, however, accounts for very little of diurnal spoken English, and certainly is not the type of activity in which the majority of English language students will be involved.

The argument of this article should be placed in perspective. First, students are not encouraged to totally exclude their bilingual dictionaries; undoubtedly, a judicious combination of the two would be the most productive. Second, the quantitative view of vocabulary is correct: vocabulary instruction has not been given enough attention, and more vocabulary items should be taught. And last, Samuel Johnson was certainly right in supporting precision of speech and skill in the use of words, goals worthy of pursuit in every ESOL classroom. Nevertheless, most especially in the case of spoken English, the best advice is still: to express your meaning, hit your target, whether with one word or a handful.
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A Lexical Phrase Grammar for ESL*

James R. Nattinger

Current work in lexical grammars suggests that we need to think of lexicon for ESL classes in much broader terms and must pay more attention to the importance of prefabricated speech routines in language behavior. This article discusses the kind and extent of lexical phrases, using categories from recent work in artificial intelligence, and outlines further research that is necessary to make these speech routines an integral part of the syllabus.

Many linguists currently are developing models for language processing, or what are perhaps better known as performance models. These offer some direct descriptions of psychological categories and processes, and attempt to describe languages in terms of how they are perceived, stored, remembered and produced. (Bever 1976; Bresnan 1978; Chafe 1976; Lakoff 1977.) Emphasizing language processes rather than language structures, performance models are more realistic accounts of language behavior than former competence theories. And what goes on during performance must surely be tied to any theory of language learning. Many of these new models give more importance to the lexicon as a separate component of the grammar than they do to the syntax by greatly reducing the role of transformational rules and enlarging the role of the lexical component. Some models, such as Richard Hudson’s panlexical grammar, go so far as to eliminate the distinction between syntax and lexicon altogether, and describe stretches of language as generated from rules which are lodged only in the lexical units themselves (Hudson 1979).

This way of looking at grammar suggests that we need to think of lexicon in much broader terms and that we need to pay more attention to the importance of prefabricated speech routines in language behavior. These routines, when treated at all in ESL texts, have been much more narrowly defined than they are in current theory and are thus more incidental in our syllabuses than perhaps they ought to be. To suggest the potential of the lexicon, let me begin with what can be described as idioms, or cliches, or as other sorts of fixed phrases, manipulated as a kind of oral formula. Idioms, for example, are usually defined as complex bits of frozen syntax whose meanings cannot be derived from the meaning of their constituents, that is, whose meanings are more than simply the sum of their individual parts: step on the gas, raining cats and dogs,

* A version of this paper was presented to the 1979 ORTESOL conference in Corvallis, Oregon, October, 1979.
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*kick the bucket.* Thus, these phrases are similar to ordinary vocabulary words and are treated as such in most ESL texts.

Cliches are similar to idioms in that they too consist of patterns that are relatively frozen; they are unlike them in that the patterns usually consist of larger stretches of language and that their meaning is derivable from the individual constituents: *there’s no doubt about it; a good time was had by all.*

Non-canonical forms are other sorts of patterned phrases, different from both of the above in that their patterns are less frozen: *the drier the climate the more he likes it; waste not, want not; down the hatch; off with his head.* This last, *off with his head,* for example, is only one variation on a pattern which can take many other forms— *down with the king, on with the show, away with all bureaucrats,* and so on. There seems to be a general pattern, ADV+with+NP, into which different lexical items can fill the category slots, with only the preposition remaining constant. A second peculiarity, and the one that defines them as non-canonical, is the fact that these patterns do not have the typical shapes of English sentences. *Off with his head* deviates drastically from the usual pattern; where, for example, is a verb or a subject NP? These forms appear to be halfway between traditional syntax and lexicon, for they cannot be stored as invariable units, like words, nor can their structure be derived by the traditional rules of syntax since they deviate so from normal English sentence patterns. It is facts like these that are leading many linguists to question the sharp distinction between syntax and lexicon and to search for a framework that could describe all of these data in the same manner.

Thus these fixed patterns are characterized in terms of how variable they are and how possible it is to derive their meaning and structure from the normal rules of syntax. But there is a third characteristic involved which is closely related to the above and which may be even more important for language processing—the storage and recall of these structures as patterns instead of as isolated units that have to be synthesized each time they are used. For quite a while many linguists have suggested that idioms, cliches, and non-canonical forms are stored as patterns, Corder’s “holophrases,” for example (Corder 1973: 131), and have suggested that there is a difference in kind between this sort of patterned speech and more creative speech. Some linguists have further differentiated them by sharply distinguishing, as do Krashen and Scarcella, among “completely fixed routines,” “semi-fixed patterns” and “creative speech,” (Krashen and Scarcella 1978). But it is more likely that what constitutes a pattern and what does not is relative, a matter of degree instead of kind, for one usually finds a continuum in the amount of variation involved, from more invariable and frozen forms (such as idioms and cliches) to less invariable (non-canonical) forms; this is one of the assumptions upon which the notion of lexicon can be expanded, for this view allows many other stretches of speech to be described as patterns than could have been previously.

Whatever the description of pattern, it is generally agreed that the sequence of words in phrases with less variation is more predictable, an extremely im-
important fact in communication which accounts for much of the way we process language. It is a fact that Oller exploits in his “grammar of expectancy” (Oller and Richards 1973; Oller and Streiff 1975). The degree to which words constrain those around them, and the assurance we have that certain words are going to follow certain others, are the facts we use to make sense of language and to create all sorts of subtle variations and surprises. The cliche, *a good time was had by all*, is a relatively frozen pattern, yet *a bad time was had by all, a glorious time was had by all, a good time was had by none* are all possible variations on this basic pattern and would each have its proper effect. The effect comes about because we expect something else, with varying degrees of certainty, in the ADJ or in the PRO slots. The same is true for idioms, but since their meaning exists only as a combination of certain individual units, these units cannot be manipulated quite as easily: *kick the bucket* can become *kick the bedpan* but it would be difficult to vary this phrase in many other ways and still have it make much sense.

With these criteria, we can speak about other kinds of fixed phrases which are different from the above three. These are phrases which are quite canonical in shape and which are also variable, more so than non-canonical forms, and whose meaning can be derived by the traditional rules of syntax: *if I had time I would show you; your health is at stake; a year ago; I’m not sure about that; please close the door.* How then are these different from normal sentences of the language? The claim here is that they differ only in that they are more easily stored and recalled as patterns, and that there is no real difference in kind between them. They are only different points on that continuum, where some phrases are best described as patterns in which the units combine predictably, and some are best described as combinations of units in which the arrangements are more unpredictable, differences only of degree. Described in this way these patterned speech routines can play a much larger part in language than most previous linguistic theory has allowed, although just how large a part they have played in various theories is often unclear since the boundary between habit and rule, which is essentially what is at issue here, has always been most unclear.

The extent of patterned speech will be clearer if we look at it through some categories from current work in artificial intelligence, categories that appear in the work of Joseph Becker in a somewhat different form and describe phrases in terms of their functional as well as structural characteristic (Becker 1975).

a) Polywords: These are short phrases with extremely low variability whose meaning exists apart from syntax. They often are substitutes for single words and are thus almost the same as other vocabulary items. They function as euphemisms, slang, two-and three-part verbs, and idioms: *the powder room, my old man, to call up, for good.* As suggested previously, some of these can be varied, but only with difficulty: *kick the bedpan, step on the oil.*
b) **Phrasal Constraints:** These consist of a small number of words, some of which constrain the variability of others. Many can be varied for expressive effect to show emphasis, irony, sarcasm, and the like, and many on-canonical forms: *by pure coincidence, down with the king, a year ago.* In the last phrase, for example, the words can be varied not only to show a different time unit, *a week ago,* but also to show emphasis, *a long time ago,* sarcasm, *a light year ago,* or metaphor, *a grief ago,* among other things.

c) **Deictic Locutions:** These are short to medium phrases with low variability which can serve as clauses or whole utterances. Their purpose is to direct the flow of the conversations by marking attitudes, expectations, concessions, challenges, defenses, supports, retreats: *as far as I know, don’t you think, if I were you, for that matter, frankly, I mean to say, further to my letter of...*

d) **Sentence Builders:** Phrases up to sentence length, often containing slots for parameters or arguments; they can be highly variable. Their function is to provide a skeleton for the expression of an entire idea: *A gave B a long song and dance about C; Not only A but also B; If I past tense A, then I conditional tense B.* Often non-canonical forms fit here, particularly the long sentence-like ones, for they are not traditional sentence patterns, and they contain elements that vary freely: *the faster you drive the sooner we’ll get there; if he would only stop talking for a minute.*

e) **Situational Utterances:** These are usually complete sentences and can be highly variable. They are the appropriate thing to say in certain circumstances, and may be used out of those contexts for effect. Most cliches fit here, as does much phatic speech, The contexts are among those well-defined situations that have found their way into TESL (In the Classroom, Eating in a Restaurant, Meeting Friends, etc.) though they cover any definable context in which language takes place: *cold enough for you; how can I ever repay you; what time is it; it only hurts when I laugh; I’m very glad to meet you.*

f) **Verbatim Texts:** Memorized texts of any length, which because of their nature have extremely low variability. They are used for quotation, allusion, and occasionally direct usage (like the Swedish opera diva who spoke Italian by piecing together chunks of memorized libretti—“ah, Io sono tradiita/abandonata/etc.”): *better late than never; I ate the whole thing; oozing charm from every pore, He oiled his way around the floor; Cheers; a watched pot never boils.*

As is apparent, all of these amount to much more than just picturesque phrases of infrequent occurrence, and much more than just the basis of phatic speech. What does it all imply? Becker says:

> It implies to me that the process of speaking is Compositional: We start with the information we wish to express or evoke, and we haul out of our phrasal lexicon some patterns that can provide the major elements of this expression. Then the problem is to stitch these phrases together into something roughly grammatical, to fill in the blanks with the particulars of the case at hand, to modify the phrases if need be, and if all else fails to generate phrases from scratch to smooth over the transitions and fill in any remaining conceptual holes (Becker 1975:72).

Becker is not saying that this is the way we acquire language, although some
research does suggest that creative speech develops out of these prelearned patterns. L. Fillmore's work on cognitive and social strategies in language acquisition, for example, suggests that invariable speech routines later become semi-fixed patterns which in turn serve as the basis for creative speech (Fillmore 1976). What Becker means, I think, is that we simply come to use language this way after a while. If so, then foreign language learners will already have developed this strategy in the language they bring to the classroom.

If all of this is near the mark, and it seems a satisfying explanation about a way we process language, there should be much in it to guide the ESL teacher. Perhaps we should base our teaching on the assumption that, for a great deal of the time anyway, language production consists of piecing together the ready-made units appropriate for a particular situation and that comprehension relies on knowing which of these patterns to predict in these situations. Our teaching therefore would center on these patterns and the ways they can be pieced together, along with the ways they vary and the situations in which they occur. We would show that in, the sentences as a matter of fact, if I had the money I would leave for good, there are two short phrases, one a deictic locution (as a matter of fact)—though there would be no need to teach this terminology—the other a polyword (for good), and that both are included in a larger sentence builder (If I past tense A, then I conditional tense B). We would show how these individual patterns can vary within themselves, how they can be differently combined in sentences, and which patterns from the same functional groups can substitute for them. In this way we could help students recognize recurring functional patterns and help them use this information to make predictions about meaning.

It is fairly obvious how a view like this is opposed to a transformational one. For one thing, sentences in TG are generated only by combining the individual constituents, while phrase grammar would put together only some of its sentences from separate bits this way, perhaps fewer than those chunked together. How much was put together fresh would depend on the kind of language used and the situation in which it was used: the more conscious we are of the language, such as in formal speeches and in writing, the more likely it would be put together from scratch.

It is not so obvious though how this model is different from a structuralist pattern practice scheme. After all, a major part of most structuralist texts consists of lists of similar patterns, usually graphed in box-like diagrams, followed by groups of vocabulary items that can substitute for each other. The following is typical: (Wishon and Burks (1968) in Brown and Wardhaugh 1976: 141)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>this is</th>
<th>the house</th>
<th>where Mary was born</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have seen</td>
<td>the village</td>
<td>the murder took place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you ever been to</td>
<td>the place</td>
<td>your grandmother lives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the poet stayed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The overriding concern here is with structure; the boxes are arranged so that any linear combination of constituents will produce a grammatical sentence.
Semantics is useful only to insure that the sentences are acceptable and not anomalous, and functional considerations are completely absent. Any sort of functional analysis of “This is the house where Mary was born” and “Have you ever been to the place where the poet stayed” would describe them as very different sentences indeed. For patterned phrases, on the other hand, one would use semantic and functional criteria almost exclusively for categorizing, and would require that only phrases used similarly in the same situations be classed together. The following, for example, would be grouped since they have several semantic and pragmatic functions in common: the time please; what time is it; would you mind telling me the time; excuse me, would you tell me what time it is; and so on. Obviously, the phrases grouped this way will have quite different structures: some will be parts of sentences, others complex sentences with embedded clauses; some will be invariable phrases like idioms with no part substitutable for another, while others will be highly variable, like certain sentence builders or situational utterances. The result is a display quite unlike a structural one.

As for actual content and organization of a syllabus, the lexical model at present offers only broad guidelines but does suggest some specific and interesting research possibilities. Generally, of course, since patterned phrases are more functionally than structurally defined, so also should be the syllabus. Thus, we would take the desired communicative ability as a starting point, for what people want to do with language is more important than mastery of that language as an unapplied system, as Wilkins suggests (Wilkins 1976). In that way, the items we select to teach would not be chosen on the basis of grammar but on the basis of their usefulness and relevance to the learners’ purpose in learning. The more specialized the course, the more definite the communicative function that we will have to teach. In a very limited course perhaps all there would be time for would be some forms of essential functions the learner requires, like asking directions, ordering a meal, reading specialized texts, etc., particularly those patterns described above as situational utterances (type (e)). There are certain general communicative functions, though, that would be required for almost all courses, like greetings, sympathy, gratitude, judgments and evaluations, and concessions. Each of these would have associated with it a set of common lexical phrases of the sorts I have been discussing, particularly phrasal constraints, deictic locations, sentence builders, and situational utterances (groups (b) through (e)).

But as suggested earlier, we need the results of further research before we can be more specific about the role of patterned speech in ESL classes. First of all we need to know much more about patterned speech in two separate areas which are often lumped together—in language learning and in language use; that is, in what ways patterned speech is used while learning a second language, and in what ways it is used after that second language is learned. These are two quite different aspects of language behavior and it is likely that the role of patterned speech in each will also be different. Another aspect, pat-
terned speech in first language acquisition, is at present the only area that has generated much research. As a second research task, we must determine the differing role of patterns in the production and in the perception of language, for it is quite possible that a speaker and a hearer process language by means of different prefabricated units. Often in linguistic theory, the distinction between speaker and hearer is blurred, yet we are becoming increasingly aware of basic differences in these behaviors. Psycholinguists have shown us that speech production is highly variable but that speech perception is categorical. It is not unlikely, then, that the strategies for language production in general are different from the strategies for language perception. (Forster 1976; Bever 1970). A third task is to investigate various language contexts and discover the amount and kind of patterned speech that occurs in each. So far this is happening only in very limited speech contexts such as in commercial or in sports domains, or in pieces of contexts, such as greetings, attention getters, and other discourse gambits, but as I have suggested above, patterned speech is much too pervasive to be so restricted. A further task here, of course, would be to examine cultural differences in use of these patterns, for presumably different languages would make use of different amounts of patterned speech and would use it in different ways. Finally, we should see if the concept of patterned speech could make notional syllabuses more practical. Wilkins’ categories for a notional syllabus (Wilkins 1976) have been attacked as being too vague to be of much immediate use for teachers. Kelly typically calls this work “cursory;” “much groundwork needs to be done before [Wilkin’s] suggestions can become practicable” (Kelly 1978). Perhaps one way to begin would be to redefine these categories in terms of patterned speech to determine which are manifested most often by routinized speech and which are most often put together analytically. Wilkins’ categories of communicative functions, for example, certainly involve patterned speech, as do his categories of modality, although to a much lesser degree, while his semantico-grammatical categories concern more creative speech behavior, and would surely be taught differently.
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Rhetorical Difficulty in Scientific English: A Study in Reading Comprehension

William C. Flick and Janet I. Anderson

This article presents the results of a study which investigates differences in reading performance on passages of scientific discourse containing implicit and explicit definitions. Both EFL and American students were tested, and differences in performance were examined with respect to 1) implicit-explicit information, 2) level of EFL proficiency, and 3) the EFL vs. American (native) distinction. It was generally found that both American and EFL students found implicit definitions more difficult to comprehend. However, the differential in the difficulty levels remained relatively constant for both groups. Thus, while level of English proficiency increased, differences in scores on the implicit and explicit definitions remained the same. These results suggest that difficulty in comprehending implicitly stated information may not be a problem unique to students of EFL, but rather a more general reading problem which affects native speakers as well.

EFL students in scientific fields often cannot grasp the total meaning of paragraphs they are reading even though they may understand all of the individual sentences that constitute the discourse. Selinker, Todd-Trimble and Trimble (1976) have pointed out that a major factor contributing to this difficulty is that rhetorical information in scientific discourse is often implicitly rather than explicitly stated. The writer of scientific discourse assumes that the reader shares knowledge about rhetorical conventions which permits understanding of rhetorical relationships even when they are not signaled with formal, explicit cues.

Selinker et al. also give examples of rhetorical functions in scientific discourse which can be expressed both explicitly and implicitly. One such example is the definition. Explicitly stated, a formal definition names the concept or phenomenon being defined, states the class to which it belongs, and distinguishes the term from other members of its class. An implicit definition, on the other hand, may mention its defining characteristics before the term itself, which often appears in a following sentence. Further, an implicit definition is often embedded in some other rhetorical function, such as description of a mechanism. Here are examples of explicit and implicit definitions:

(a) Explicit Definition: Negative pressure is that type of pressure whose value is below atmospheric.
(b) Implicit Definition: (definition underlined)

From fluid mechanics it can be shown that as a fluid or gas passes through a venturi, its velocity increases; but its pressure decreases to some value below atmospheric. This negative pressure is greatest at the point in the throat where the fuel pick-up is located.

(Selinker, Todd-Trimble & Trimble: 283)

Selinker et al. feel that while experienced native readers are aware of “implicit presuppositional rhetorical information” (282) which enables them to understand relationships such as those presented above in (b), non-native readers lack knowledge about implicit rhetorical functions which prevent them from grasping the information the author intends to convey.

Although these assumptions have important implications for teaching reading to EFL students in the sciences, they have yet to be tested empirically. However, we felt it would be trivial to test the assumption that implicit definitions are easier for the native reader than the non-native reader, because it is obvious that reading comprehension in general is better for the native reader. Instead, we felt it would be more meaningful to investigate the differential between comprehension of explicit and implicit rhetorical information for native and non-native readers. We also felt it would be of interest to investigate the same differential for EFL learners of varying levels of English proficiency, on the assumption that implicit definitions would be easier to grasp with increasing proficiency in the language. Therefore, we designed a study which tested the following hypotheses: 1) There is no significant difference in comprehension between implicit and explicit definitions for native readers of English scientific discourse; 2) There is a significant difference in comprehension between implicit and explicit definitions for students of English as a second language; and 3) As English proficiency of EFL students increases, the gap narrows between the comprehension of implicit and explicit definitions.

1. Method

1.1. Subjects. The subjects who participated in the study were 67 ESL and 36 American undergraduate students enrolled in English classes at Iowa State University. The ESL students were randomly selected from classes representing 4 levels of proficiency: Level I subjects drawn from intermediate classes in the Intensive English and Orientation Program (IEOP) at Iowa State University, Level II subjects drawn from advanced classes in IEOP, Level III subjects drawn from English 100C, a 3 credit university course which prepares students for freshman composition, and Level IV subjects drawn from English 104F, a foreign student section of freshman composition. The American students were randomly selected from English 104, freshman composition.

1.2. Materials and Procedures. In order to test comprehension of implicit and explicit definitions, ten paragraphs on a variety of scientific topics were selected, each containing one definition. These definitions were rewritten in
order to create two sets of paragraphs: one set containing implicit, the other explicit definitions. The two sets of paragraphs were identical in all other respects. Since the purpose of this study was to examine differences in student performance based on rhetorical differences in the reading passages, the syntax and lexical items were kept as simple as possible. On the other hand, an attempt was made to select topics that were relatively unfamiliar so that the terms being defined would in fact be new to the subjects. Examples of implicit and explicit definitions used in the tests are presented below, followed by the test item, which was identical for both paragraphs.

Explicit definition:

Gaseous exchange in the lungs cannot occur if the surface tension of the fluid which lines them is high. In order to overcome the surface tension the lungs secrete a substance called a surfactant which reduces the tension and allows the oxygen to be dissolved. This substance aids in expanding the lungs because less force is required. It also facilitates the absorption of oxygen into the bloodstream.

Implicit definition:

Gaseous exchange in the lungs cannot occur if the surface tension of the fluid which lines them is high, in order to overcome the surface tension the lungs secrete a substance which reduces the tension and allows the oxygen to be dissolved. This surfactant aids in expanding the lungs because less force is required. It also facilitates the absorption of oxygen into the bloodstream.

(From M. Talaat: Physiology in Medical Practice: 232)

Test Item:

The substance which reduces surface tension and allows oxygen to be dissolved is referred to as the
(a) surfactant
(b) surface tension
(c) solvent
(d) lining fluid

In order to avoid obvious patterns in the testing procedure, five additional scientific passages were included in the test, each containing test items based on features other than definition. These filler passages were randomly interspersed among the ten test passages.

In the administration of the test, half of the subjects at each level received the set of paragraphs containing implicit definitions and the other half received the set containing explicit definitions. Selection was on a random basis and subjects were unaware of any differences in the two sets of passages. The subjects were asked to read each paragraph and to answer the question following it. The test items were printed on the reverse side of each page, and subjects were instructed not to turn back to the paragraph once they had seen the question.

Once the test was administered, scores were computed based on the num-


number of correct responses. The relationships between total score, level of proficiency, and the two types of definition were examined by means of multiple regression analysis. Differences in performance between foreign and American students were investigated by means of the analysis of variance procedure.

2. Results

Table 1 presents the means and standard deviations on both forms of the test for the four levels of foreign students as well as for the American students. Differences in performance on the two tests across level of ESL proficiency were investigated by means of multiple regression analysis. These results are presented in Table 2. The variable accounting for the largest proportion of variance in student performance was level of proficiency. As expected, those students in the advanced levels of proficiency received higher scores than students in the intermediate levels on both forms of the test.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implicit</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100C</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104F</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>7.64</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104A</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>8.56</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The variable test, referring to the implicit and explicit sets of paragraphs, also accounted for a significant proportion of the variance in student performance. Mean scores on the explicit form are consistently higher than those on the implicit form. These results indicate that the rhetorical device of implicit definition did, in fact, constitute a more difficult reading problem for this sample of ESL students at the intermediate and advanced levels.

In order to determine whether these differences in difficulty remain constant or whether they increase or decrease as level of proficiency increases, the
level-by-test interaction was examined. This interaction was found to be non-significant. In other words, while student performance on both forms of the test improved as level of proficiency increased, the difference in difficulty level between implicit and explicit definitions remained relatively constant across the four levels of proficiency tested. These results are represented graphically in Figure 1.

**FIGURE 1**
Regression Analysis: Test Scores Across Level of ESL Proficiency

Finally, a comparison was made between the performances of the American students and the foreign students on both the implicit and explicit forms of the test. For the purpose of this comparison, only the performance of the advanced groups of ESL students (104F) was examined. In this way, it was possible to compare the performances of two groups of students—one foreign and one American—both enrolled in a first quarter freshman composition course during the same academic term. The procedure employed was a two-way analysis of variance. The results are presented in Table 3.

As the table indicates, differences in performance on the two forms of the test were statistically significant. Both the American and foreign students received higher scores on the explicit form of the test than on the implicit form. Differences in performance between the two groups, however, were not
TABLE 3
Two-Way Analysis of Variance Table
(American vs. Foreign Students)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24.43</td>
<td>24.43</td>
<td>6.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>186.26</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>216.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{1}\) = not significant
\(^{2}\) = p < .02

significant. While the mean scores for the American group were somewhat higher than those for the foreign students, the scores did not differ significantly.

3. Conclusion

The results of this study confirmed some of our prior expectations but failed to confirm others. Contrary to our first hypothesis, there was a significant difference in comprehension between implicit and explicit definitions for native readers of scientific discourse. The prediction that there would be no significant difference in implicit and explicit scores was based on the assumption that native speakers’ awareness of implicit rhetorical information would enable them to understand the implied relationships without difficulty. The prediction that there would be a significant difference in performance on the explicit and implicit forms of the test for foreign students was confirmed. The difference in scores, however, remained constant as level of proficiency increased, rather than diminishing, as expected.

It should also be noted that a comparison of American students with the advanced group of ESL students reveals no significant difference in mean scores for the two groups on either the explicit or implicit form of the test. In fact, the explicit-implicit differential was approximately the same for both groups. Thus, differences in difficulty on the two forms of the test remained constant, not only across level of ESL proficiency but also between the American and foreign groups. The fact that the implicit definitions were more difficult than explicit ones to the same degree for both American and foreign students of different proficiencies indicates that implicit definitions are inherently more difficult than explicit ones, regardless of one’s experience with the language. While the implicit definitions presented some problem for students in reading scientific passages, the problem appears to be as relevant for American students as it is for students learning English as a second language.

The foreign students’ relative success at implicit definitions deserves some comment. As mentioned earlier, we had expected a larger difference in scores on the two forms of the test for them than we did for American students. We would like to suggest the possibility that this result was due to a transfer
of rhetorical knowledge from the students’ native languages (several of the ESL students reported that implicit definitions exist in their own languages). In fact language transfer at the rhetorical level represents an area of investigation which may have far-reaching pedagogical implications (cf. Mage 1978).

The results of this study suggest that implicit definitions in scientific English do not represent a problem which is unique to ESL students. It appears to represent a more general reading problem for American students as well as for ESL students. The problem is confounded for ESL students, however, due to their lack of proficiency at the grammatical and lexical levels.

We feel that this study has important implications for teaching and materials development in English for Science and Technology. While ESL materials are frequently graded with respect to grammatical and lexical difficulty, they are seldom graded with respect to rhetorical difficulty. In fact, ESL materials are often simplified rhetorically and do not contain much implicit information. We feel that more difficult materials should be used in order to give students additional practice in discerning implicit relationships in English.
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The Interface of Writing and Reading*

Fraida Dubin and Elite Olshtain

In their attempts to design ESOL programs that will produce mature readers, the authors discovered too little attention has been given to the characteristics of writing in English. Non-native learners need systematic exposure to elements of prose style—to enable them not to become writers but to become better readers.

In this article, the authors set up a model of the relationship between writing and reading which links the work of separate fields of investigation, all of them relevant to reading: prescriptive and contrastive rhetoric, textual discourse analysis, ESP text research, and psycholinguistics and reading. The model suggests how these endeavors remind us of the blind men touching different parts of the elephant.

One area, the literature on prescriptive rhetoric, offers a valuable source for extracting principles which affect writing in English. It indicates a fresh perspective from which to view expository writing—the type with which ESOL readers must be able to cope.

From the literature, the authors isolate two pervasive axioms for writers: planning, and using discourse devices. Within each of these broad areas, they outline how prescriptions for good writing can be translated into strategies for effective reading.

1. Linking the Productive and Receptive Processes: A Model for Writing and Reading

Our motivation to investigate the interrelationship between reading and writing began with our interest in the reading process alone, specifically, reading for ESOL students who must make the formidable leap from reading the grammar textbook and other carefully controlled materials to the real world of unedited, natural texts in English. We know too well that many do not make the jump successfully; many are washed under.

A major trend in language teaching in this era has been to focus on the learner in order to tailor the course to fit specific needs. From this emphasis has developed research into ESP: English for specific purposes. The purpose most often identified has been the reading of technical texts and journals. Still, there are many learners of English who are at a level that we call pre-ESP. Before reading in a particular subject field they must become competent in the complex skill of reading itself, not just deciphering the code, but reading

* We thank the following for helpful comments on the first draft: D. Eskey, C. Goldfus, R. Nir and Y. Tobin.
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longer passages with understanding. This is the domain with which we are concerned in this article.

Our experience has led us to recognize that many learners who are pre-ESP want to read a wide variety of materials. They want to learn—through reading—about both general and specialized areas of knowledge that may lie outside of their fields of study. Pre-ESP learners must be provided with strategies to become mature, effective readers so that they can read both general and specialized material in English.

But if our concern is reading improvement, why bother with writing as well? The answer is simple. Such an approach seems logical both from a communicative point of view and a common sense view. It is accepted that in spoken communication there is a significant relationship between producing speech and understanding speech. Why not adopt a similar approach in written communication?

In the speech act, the producer encodes language and the receiver decodes. What moves between the two is spoken language, or language substance accompanied by various paralinguistic elements. Is there a parallel relationship between the writer and the reader? It is true, the writer and reader do not share the same physical space; indeed they may be very distant from each other in both time and space. Nevertheless a relationship still exists.

Comparable to the model for spoken communication we can develop a model for written communication:

\[
\text{THE WRITING PROCESS} \rightarrow \text{THE TEXT} \rightarrow \text{THE READING PROCESS}
\]

In analyzing the elements in written communication, there is a parallel process between writing and reading that is comparable to the match between speech produced by the speaker and interpreted by the listener. The writer utilizes syntactic, semantic, discoursal and logical devices to encode the message in the form of a written text. The reader must use the same devices to interpret that message.

Three separate areas make up the model. Typically, they constitute three compartmented areas of scholarly investigation, much like the blind men touching the various zones of the elephant. Rhetoric is concerned with what goes into writing; prescriptive rhetoric describes established cultural norms for standards of good writing (Read 1952) while contrastive rhetoric points out the culture-bound dimension to traditions of written expression (Kaplan 1966, 1972). Textual discourse analysis scrutinizes the text itself, motivated by a search for grammar that is not bound by the length of the sentence (Halliday and Hasan 1976). ESP research looks at the text with a more practical application—teaching reading for comprehension. For the most part the efforts have been directed towards a limited genre, scientific and technical writing (Lakstrom 1977; Selinker, Trimble and Vroman 1975; Lakstrom, Selinker and Trimble 1970).
Finally, psycholinguistic research has been concerned with capturing characteristics of the good reader by investigating reading strategies (Smith 1971; Gibson and Levine 1975). Practitioners in ESOL have effectively utilized some of these findings (Clarke and Silberstein 1977; Eskey 1973, Hatch 1973).

1.1. The Writing Process. In looking at the separate fields that are entailed in the writing/reading model, one in particular struck us as a fresh source of insights into the ESOL reading process. Prescriptive rhetoric is a term for those handbooks, textbooks, how-to books that deal with rules for written English. Their history in western cultural tradition goes back to the Greeks who were particularly concerned with cataloging devices or figures of speech use in oratory. This literature offers an important window through which to view what goes into writing. We have drawn on contemporary representatives of the rhetoric tradition: (Strunk and White 1959; Perrin 1950; Read 1952; Hamon 1972; Crosby and Estey 1968; Leggett, Mead and Charvat 1951; Zinsser 1976; and Howe 1972).

A pertinent suggestion regarding this body of literature has been offered by Joseph Grimes:

. . . a very good start on the study of discourse patterns in any of the major European languages could probably be made by simply bringing together systematically all the things that rhetoricians have said that speakers of the language either should or should not do (1975:12).

The understanding that rhetorical patterns differ from one culture to another has been postulated by contrastive rhetoric. While the development of ideas in English expository writing is said to develop in a straight line when represented graphically, writing style in other literary traditions in the world are quite different from English as well as from each other (Kaplan 1966). What appears as a logical sequence of main and supporting ideas by our rhetorical traditions is the result of our cultural conditioning. Similarly, the ways in which English stylistic expects ideas to be expanded and developed are manifestations of culturally conditioned rhetorical traditions.

1.2. The Text. There is an important distinction between the emphasis of rhetoric handbooks and that of textual discourse analysis. The latter is concerned with the finished product—the text itself, while rhetoric is concerned with ways in which to produce a good text. To employ a useful metaphor, the second approach (textual discourse analysis) looks at the characteristics of the photograph while the first (rhetorical traditions) specifies the mechanical features of the camera, how to adjust it for particular situations of light, distance, etc., guiding the photographer to produce a successful photo.

A text is best defined as a semantic unit of language which results from a group of sentences related among themselves by discourse devices. Some of these are grammatical in nature, others are semantic, and others logical. A literate native speaker is aware of the difference between a group of sentences that create a text and a group that cannot be considered a text. The properties of the texture of a text are what is interesting to discourse analysis research.
There is reason to believe that many of the elements of texture are universal in nature, yet the technical devices might differ from one language to another, and from one tradition to another.

According to Halliday and Hasan (1976) texture consists of both structural and non-structural text-forming relations. Such non-structural elements may link together sentences within the same paragraph or paragraphs within a larger text, and are often referred to as cohesive signals. Native speakers master these cohesion elements just as they do other elements of language. Grimes emphasizes this point:

I think it must be granted that part of the speaker’s or hearer’s knowledge of his language includes the capacity to assign or interpret correctly the features that signal cohesion, to recognize aberrations, and to disambiguate—in short, if there is a basis for talking about linguistic competence in the area of content where most of the discussion has taken place, whatever arguments justify it there, also support it in the area of cohesion (1975:272).

The most important characteristic of cohesion is the fact that it does not constitute a class of items but rather a set of relations. These relations are in turn expressed through various overt or covert signals. Thus, for example, reference is a universal relation between items (nouns) that creates cohesion within a text. Different languages employ different signals to create such referential cohesion. Even when they use the pronominal system in seemingly similar ways, various elements may function differently in terms of their cohesive power. Thus in English it is quite common to find that the referential pronoun this in the first sentences of a new paragraph refers back to the whole earlier paragraph. In Hebrew, however, one could not do this. It would be necessary to use a phrase such as “all the facts mentioned above” or “everything that was said until now.”

Information presented in a text is organized in a manner which suits a particular communicative purpose. A narrative usually presents an event or a sequence of events in a chronological order. It centers on the plot and the characters involved. An expository piece of writing is quite different; it concerns itself with a subject matter and the logical development of an argument, a process, factual information and the like. The main theme rather than the main plot is foregrounded in expository writing. Temporal, spatial and thematic orientation is therefore quite distinct in different writing styles.

1.3. The Reading Process. Reading research is a vast area. Within the ESOL field, models for reading programs have been suggested which draw on various psycholinguistic insights into the reading process (Eskey 1970, Clarke and Silberstein 1977). Along with their suggestions, we have found it valuable to make use of the model of the mature reader in English proposed by Gibson and Levine (1975). Basing this aspect of their work on self-reports from successful readers, their outline of the strategies which effective readers employ include the following (pg. 471):
1. The mature reader exhibits flexibility of attentional strategies in reading for different types of information.
2. Strategies shift with characteristics of a text such as difficulty of concepts and style.
3. They shift with feedback . . . as the reader progresses.
4. They shift with newness or oldness of information.
5. They shift with the reader’s personal interests.

So, according to these reading researchers, effective mature readers are able to adjust their reading strategies to the style of the writing. But such adjustment presupposes exposure and familiarity with textual styles. Many ESOL readers have the compound difficulty of a lack of knowledge of the structural and cohesive elements along with little experience with rhetorical styles in English. In trying to help these learners become mature readers in English we must give attention to all of the elements that comprise the interface of writing and reading,

2. How Can Prescriptions for Writing Become Strategies for ESOL Reading?

In this part we set out some important themes from prescriptive rhetoric sources and draw implications for ESOL reading programs and materials.

2.1. Planning. While spoken communication can be planned or unplanned (in most cases it is spontaneous and unplanned) written communication is usually carefully planned. Yet the finished product should appear effortless, even though the birthing process might have been exhausting. Rhetoric handbooks give the repeated advice: write with a plan in order to achieve an effortless effect. The writer plans in order to be effective in encoding the message; can the reader utilize a parallel plan to interpret the text?

Considering the audience: Before the writer sets out to create a text, the audience for whom the text is intended must be considered. One writes differently for a specialized audience as opposed to a general one.

It is useful to think of two broadly different kinds of readers; specialized and general . . . The specialized reader is one who already knows a good deal about a subject. The psychologist writing for a professional journal does not have to define technical terms . . . the general reader is the reader that most writing is addressed to (Leggett, Mead, Charvat 1978: 160).

Mature readers adjust their reading strategies to the purpose of their reading; reading for general information is different from reading for specialized information. ESOL reading instruction must help learners know how to spot the external clues that tell if the material they select is for a specialized or a generalized audience. The characteristics of introductions, title pages, tables of contents and back matter that are the program notes about what is to come should be pointed out.

Organizing ideas: Once the audience has been established, the fundamental aspect of planning is undertaken—the selection of the major ideas to be presented in the text. At this stage the writer makes decisions concerning the overall
scheme to be followed. Many prescriptive rhetoricians supply writers with a
plan for one particular type of writing, as Read does for the composition/essay:

1. A beginning on familiar ground. 2. Announcement of a paradoxical theme,
which is to be the subject of the essay. 3. Development of the theme by appeal to
common experience, etc. 4. Illustration of the theme by anecdote. 5. Deductions
from the illustration. 6. Summary of theme and statement of moral. (1952:71)

An even more reduced form for the composition/essay is the well-known
formula: 1. Tell the readers what you intend to say. 2. Say it. 3. Remind them
what you have said.

The ESOL learner must know that the writer has taken pains to announce
the main theme in the introductory paragraphs since it is crucial for reading
comprehension to pin-point the main idea of the article immediately. Various
strategies need to be suggested and developed to help the learner grasp the
main idea. One technique is to first read through an entire selection without
looking up unfamiliar words, knowing that the purpose of the first reading is
to grasp the overall theme of the selection. Indicating key words or frequently
repeated words prior to the first reading is also valuable. ESOL readers can
also be helped to understand the main theme by being given introductory ma-
terial which sets the stage for the selection. Such background notes help to give
a sense of the point at which the reader is entering the topics.

ESOL materials should even consider offering selections that are related
in thematic content. Reading with understanding implies bringing to the ma-
terial background, knowledge and previous experience. Most ESOL intermediate
and advanced reading texts offer a smorgasbord of themes, on the theory that,
given a wide variety, there will be something to please everyone’s taste. It
seems to make as much sense from a reading strategy point of view to offer
fewer themes but to repeat them, to put together selections that have related
topics so that learners can experience the sense of bringing to the passage in-
formation gained from a previous selection.

A unified point of view: Along with a plan, the writer must have a point
of view, a maxim expressed by various handbook authors:

Your reader should know from what perspective you are describing your
material (Crosby and Estey 1975:49).

What attitude am I going to take toward the material . . How much do I
want to cover? What one point do I really want to make? (Zinsser 1976:48).

Before asking ESOL learners to read a passage and then answer compre-
hension questions, materials developers need considerable groundwork. Learners
should be guided to discover for themselves the author’s plan and point of view.
In the early stages the text should provide the information slowly and carefully.
The ESOL lesson could begin by pointing out the elements that create unity in
the passage. Let learners know what they are getting into before plunging in.
Many separate stylistic elements are utilized by effective writers to maintain
focus on a main theme. Learners need to be directed to look for the main idea, to strive for global reading rather than word-by-word or even sentence-by-sentence reading.

Following a sequence—Developing ideas: The organization of ideas into an outline system is the cornerstone of prose writing in English. It is valuable for ESOL learners to understand the relationship between outlining used synthetically by writers but analytically by mature readers (Martin, McChesney, Whalley and Develin 1977: 216). The process of putting ideas into an outline which ranks main and supporting ideas hierarchically is one side of the coin—the writer’s side. The other side is what readers must be able to do, consciously or unconsciously, to perceive both the sequence of main points and the subordination of the supporting evidence.

The sequence of elements is the most apparent in the narrative. As Howe points out:

> The basic organizational structure of a narrative is chronological. Its range covers broad stretches of territory: from a process description in which for example a scientist may give the details of his recent experiment and the relation of house thermometer breakage to mercury pollution of a city’s water supply, to travel essays, history books, and the fictional short story and novel (1972:54).

The transparency of the narrative sequence suggests that it is probably a good place for ESOL readers to begin when they move into unedited natural selections for reading practice. It seems to be the case, too, that the narrative form, unlike expository writing, is a more universal type of discourse not bound by western writing traditions.

Expository writing, contrasted with narrative, does not follow a chronological sequence but instead a logical one. Writing handbooks expound on how to develop the topics in the outline, since such writing depends on successful elaboration. The explanations in writing handbooks describe how to elaborate by means of stylistic elements such as definition, comparison, relationship, testimony (Hamon 1972) as well as citing examples, illustrations, analytical expansions, comparison, contrast, analogy and hypothetical evidence (Crosby and Estey 1975)). Mature readers spot the paragraphs of elaboration and move over them rapidly, picking out the key words, somewhat like skipping flat stones across the water.

Along with providing the framework through which elaboration takes place, the paragraph functions as necessary visual relief by allowing the writer to present the main ideas in clearly separated sections. In many ways a paragraph can be considered a mini-text, since it contains the features of the larger segment but in reduced form.

The writing handbooks expound on techniques of paragraph writing in great detail:

> Ordinarily . . . a subject requires subdivision into topics, each of which should be made the subject of a paragraph. The object of treating each topic in a paragraph
by itself is, of course, to aid the reader. The beginning of each paragraph is a
signal to him that a new step in the development of the subject has been reached
( Strunk and White 1959:11).

A good paragraph has (1) unity, (2) coherence, and (3) adequate development.

. . . to support a topic sentence clearly and persuasively, you must develop a para-
graph adequately and connect its sentences in an orderly way. (Leggett, Mead,

ESOL learners need to know how to use paragraphs as aids for lifting
meaning from the page in chunks. They need to know that most paragraphs
have a single, controlling idea usually recoverable in a topic sentence. They
need to look closely at how the other sentences of the paragraph support the
topic sentence.

Reading passages that embody rhetorical devices for elaboration and de-
velopment need to be carefully indicated for the ESOL learner. One strategy
is to use marginal sub-headings: “This paragraph expands the topic through
contrast.” Later, learners can be given a chance to supply their own analysis
of the type of expansion utilized in the fragment by selecting from a list.

A general guide to reading improvement for ESOL, utilizing the plan of
the written material as a tool for better reading, is the following overall ap-
proach: 1. Reading a selection through once in order to find the main idea.
2. Work on each paragraph separately to identify the central idea of the para-
graph. See how supporting ideas are related. 3. Try to match the writer’s plan
while reading by continually asking: What is the main idea of each paragraph?
Is there a topic sentence that contains this idea? Is the main idea only implied
in the paragraph? What are the supporting ideas?

2.2. Using Discourse Devices. Writing handbooks emphasize the need to achieve
continuity by reminding the writer to use transition elements, both within each
paragraph and among different paragraphs. As Perrin (1950:193) claims: “There
are two types of transition: one relating each new idea to the topic of the whole
paper and another connecting each such idea with preceding ones.”

Discourse transition is created in a variety of ways: a unifying thread of
reference is maintained throughout; main points and key elements are reiterated
and expanded upon; syntactic features are chosen which give a unified form
to the whole text (tense, voice, etc.); transitional expressions which are recog-
nized as conventional discourse techniques are used to create cohesion and,
at the same time, relate ideas in specific ways through agreement, addition,
contrast, concession, etc. The writer employs these separate devices to weave
the various parts of the paper together. If the effort is successful, the result is
a coherent and logically related passage which the mature native reader can
interpret without difficulty. The ESOL reader, however, needs to be trained to
recognize the transition elements and their functions in order to fully understand
the text.

Reference: Every language employs special techniques for the retrieval of
information, specifically the retrieval of referential meaning. The elements that
signal reference within a text enable us to avoid repetition of something men-
tioned earlier (anaphoric), or something which will be mentioned subsequently (cataphoric), or even something which is known from the situation of context outside (exophoric) the text itself. (Halliday and Hasan 1976). Discourse devices allow the writer to be economical, not too repetitive, and at the same time maintain continuity of reference. These very same devices should help the reader follow the cohesive thread running throughout the passage. In English, the most common referential devices are found in the article system, the pronoun system and the comparatives. The ESOL reader must have an understanding of each of these grammatical systems before coping with their discourse functions. For example, the learner may have mastered the basic form and use of the English demonstratives this and that but have difficulty with the following interpretation of the use of this

The university imparts information, but it imparts it imaginatively. At least, this is the function which it should perform for society. (Whitehead 1929).

In the example above, the ESOL reader might have difficulty recognizing that this refers to it imparts information imaginatively, and thus interpretation is impaired.

Reiteration: Another key device in maintaining continuity of ideas. English rhetorical tradition, however, requires alternation rather than exact repetition. For the ESOL reader, reiteration is often disguised in the form of synonymous expressions or paraphrases. Such a situation creates a degree of opacity in the text from the point of view of the ESOL reader (Berman forthcoming), especially in the case of languages that approve of lexical and grammatical repetition such as Hebrew (Berman 1979) and Arabic (Ostler 1978). The ESOL reader needs special training in recognizing key terms and expressions in the passage and in looking for their occurrence throughout the passage in either the original or a different form.

Syntactic devices: One of the simplest syntactic devices which maintains the thread of continuity within a passage is tense. A narrative, for example, characteristically presents the main events of the story in the past tense. The use of the past form provides the whole passage with the glue that holds it together. In expository writing, however, the use of tenses might be somewhat different. If an experiment is described in terms of the sequence in which it was carried out and the results which were arrived at, the past tense would be most suitable. However, if the author chooses to comment on some basic facts that are true independently of the experiment, the present tense would probably be employed. The ESOL reader must possess a good understanding of these grammatical forms in order to interpret the author’s distinction between the actual experiment described and the independent facts mentioned as background information or as statements of fact.

Transitional expressions: These are the most problematic feature of discourse the ESOL reader faces. First, such transition items serve as mood changers. As Zinsser advises the writer, they can be effective in communicating shifts in direction to the reader:
Learn to alert the reader as early as possible in a sentence to any change in mood from the previous sentence. At least a dozen words will do this job for you: but, yet, however, nevertheless . . . I cannot overstate how much easier it is for the reader if you start with but when you are shifting direction, or, conversely, how much harder it is if he must wait until the end to realize that you are now in a different gear (1976:98).

Zinsser clearly advises the writer to use transition words in order to help the reader in following the author’s flow of ideas, but does the ESOL reader know how to take advantage of these clues? As the writer is trained to use them productively, the ESOL student needs to be trained to use them receptively in interpreting the written message.

Leggett, Mead, Charvat (1951:205-206) present a list of the most common transitional words and phrases, grouping them according to their function. The following are a few examples:

To Indicate Addition—again, also, and, besides, furthermore . . .
To Indicate Concession—after all, at the same time, of course . . .
To Indicate Contrast—although, for all that, after all, in contrast . . .

It would seem practical to simply use such a list in helping the ESOL reader to recognize these transition markers. But there are additional complications. We see from the above limited examples that sometimes the same transitional marker can function in completely opposing situations: the expression after all can indicate either concession or contrast. Still this is not too serious a problem since, by knowing that there are two possibilities, the main clue is apparent. Context will then help account for the particular situation.

Another, more acute difficulty is the fact that some transition markers have more than one function in English. Thus the word since can be the marker of a time clause meaning approximately “from that time on” or it can be a transition marker indicating cause. For example: Since we came here we have heard nothing else. Since he didn’t have enough money he decided to walk home. The ESOL reader has difficulty distinguishing between the two. The requirement for ESOL reading materials is that they provide close attention to the function of transitional markers while, at the same time, pointing out uses that might cause confusion such as in the examples cited above.

3. Conclusion

Linking the literacy skills of reading and writing has typically taken place in ESOL through using the theme of reading selections as the motivation for writing assignments. But the connection between the two holds a more productive potential. In this paper we have explored ways in which reading and writing interface with each other, specifically, how reading strategies for ESOL can draw on standards for good writing. Prescriptions to writers, as found in rhetoric handbooks, can be utilized in ESOL reading materials which guide learners to develop strategies of interpretation at the receiving end of textual discourse. For the reader must be able to extract what the writer puts into the text.
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English Proficiency and Factors in its Attainment: 
A Case Study of Iranians in the United States

Mohammad Monshi-Tousi, Azar Hosseine-Fatemi, and John W. Oller, Jr.

Fifty-five Iranians studying in various fields at the University of New Mexico were tested for proficiency in English. In general their scores fell between levels achieved by fourth and seventh grade native speakers. Subjects also completed a questionnaire designed to elicit data on factors believed important to the acquisition of proficiency in English. Association with American friends and the amount of time spent in the United States emerged as the most important variables. The number of years spent in studying English in Iran (in formal classroom settings) proved to be a negligible factor.

What level of skill in English do Iranians who are currently studying in the United States actually have? A common complaint of Iranians before going abroad is that the English instruction received in their home institutions does not pay enough attention to the demands of communication in real life contexts. Of course, this complaint probably can be heard in many other countries as well and is perhaps equally appropriate to foreign language students studying in the United States, but in Iran, emphasis is traditionally placed on grammar-translation tasks and there is little concern for what is actually learned in the EFL classroom. Little attention is paid also to systematic evaluation of the actual level of English proficiency attained. Until this important question is dealt with, there is little hope of discovering what factors contribute to the acquisition of English either in Iran or after arrival in the United States. In this study we wanted to determine by empirical comparisons what level of English proficiency is exhibited by Iranians already studying at one of the United States’ intermediate-sized universities. Further, we wanted to try to find out which of several probable factors contribute to the attainment of proficiency in English.

Typically, there are three ways that Iranians may enter American universities. Top students take the Test of English as a Foreign Language (Educational Testing Service) before embarking for the United States. Having studied in Iran, in some cases for as little as six months to a year, they may be able to score 500 or better in order to meet the admission requirements of most American institutions. A second option is to come to the United States and enroll in one
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Mr. Monshi-Tousi and Mr. Hosseine-Fatemi are in the Masters Program at the University of New Mexico. Mr. Oller, Professor of Linguistics at the University of New Mexico, has most recently published Language Tests at School.

The data for this study were collected in the spring of 1979, a few months prior to the Iranian take-over of the American Embassy in Tehran. Therefore, the remarks made here should be interpreted as relevant to the period before the recent worsening of relations and the subsequent world-wide escalation of tensions.
of the many English language programs offered as an adjunct to a regular university program or by an independent agency such as ELS (English Language Services). Some of those who take this option complain that such service centers are often more profit oriented than perhaps they should be. In any case, some of those who take this route do eventually end up in some university course of study. A third option is to sign up for courses at an institution of lower quality with lower requirements in the hope of transferring later to the desired university.

No matter which of the above approaches is used, and regardless of the level of proficiency on arrival, even the best students report difficulties with English both in and out of class. Of course this problem is not limited to Iranians, but they are often among those most willing to testify about their difficulties. For instance, some who have studied even for two or three years in an English speaking environment still report substantial difficulty in the fundamental tasks of listening, speaking, reading, and writing. They may have difficulty in understanding lecture materials, or in making themselves understood at the corner grocery or the bank. They often have trouble in making their ideas clear in essay form, and complain that reading assignments are too difficult or time consuming.

For all of the above reasons (among others) and because of the considerable expense involved in acquiring English, not to mention the costs involved in delivering the instruction, the present study was undertaken. The questions addressed include the following: (1) What is the average level of proficiency of more or less typical Iranian students at the university level in the United States in comparison to native English speaking populations? (2) What are the factors which seem to contribute most to the acquisition of proficiency in English for the studied population?

1. Method

1.1. Subjects. Fifty-five undergraduate and graduate Iranian students at the University of New Mexico voluntarily participated in the study. Most of them were studying civil engineering, but a few were enrolled in physics, education, architecture, or biology. Nearly all were males. All were tested on two cloze passages and two dictations for English proficiency, and all completed a 21 item questionnaire about background and experience (these materials are in the Appendix).

1.2. Tests. The first cloze test was taken from Stump (1978:62), and both of the dictations were taken from Stump (1978:59) for two reasons: first we wanted to select texts which would be well gauged in terms of the skill of the Iranians to be tested, and second we wanted to have comparison data from native speakers which Stump’s study provided. The more difficult texts from the Stump study were used (Cloze C, and Dictations C and D) in order to challenge the subjects while still allowing the weakest performers to score more than zero. The second cloze passage was the text of a Newsweek story entitled
“The General Strike in Iran.” It was selected with the expectation that it would pique the interest of the subjects.

The procedures followed in the testing were similar to those described by Stump (1978). For instance, the dictations were taped by a native speaker and were presented three times. The first time subjects were instructed to just listen to get the overall meaning of the passage; the second time they were asked to write exactly what they heard in the pauses provided (see Oller 1979:262-302 for discussion of the technique). Then, the passage was given for the third time while subjects checked what they had written.

The cloze tests were worth 20 points each, for a total of 40 points. The dictations were scored on the basis of one point per word of text not counting spelling and punctuation (for justification of this, see Oller 1979:278-282). There were 76 words in the first dictation and 86 in the second. The cloze tests were scored by the criterion that the responses offered merely had to fit the context (i.e., according to what has been called the “contextually appropriate” criterion, see Oller 1979:367-373).

1.2. Questionnaire. Twenty-one questions were included, among them items concerning number of years of English study in Iran (question 4), number of English speaking friends during the first six months in the United States (question 15), and the number of credit hours completed as of the date of testing (question 18). Whereas the purpose of the testing was to determine level of English proficiency, the purpose of the questionnaire was to try to determine what factors might be contributing to the level attained.

2. Results and Discussion

Means and standard deviations on the English tests are given in Table 1 along with percentage scores and reliability estimates for each of the four tests and the total score. Reliabilities are based on the Kuder-Richardson formula (21). For purposes of comparison with native speakers, Stump’s results with fourth and seventh grade natives (from the Saint Louis school system) are given in Table 2.

The Iranians fell just one percentage point above the fourth graders in their mean scores on Cloze 1 (66.5% versus 65.5%), below the fourth graders by 5.1% on Dictation 1 (70.6% versus 75.7%); and even with the seventh graders on Dictation 2 (both at 65.1%). Of course the comparisons based on the dictations are only rough approximations due to the fact that the test administration procedure (especially the rate of presentation of verbal sequences) could

---

2 It may seem odd to compare adults with children, but it just happens that children are the only native speakers whose English processing abilities are close to the range of abilities exhibited by the subject pool in question. The age difference, of course, should be borne in mind throughout. Surely the adult non-native speakers of English (the Iranians in this study) have abilities which the children (Stump’s subjects) lack. Probably, the reverse is also true in a somewhat different sense. Even children have a great deal of highly specialized experience with their native language that gives them an edge in many respects over adult non-natives. The comparison, therefore, should not be overinterpreted, but taken for what it is, namely, a comparison of certain natives and non-natives on certain language processing tasks.
TABLE 1
Means, Standard Deviations, Percentage Scores, and Reliabilities for Two Cloze Tests and Two Dictations
N=55

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test (possible score)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>KR-21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cloze 1 (20)</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloze 2 (20)</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictation 1 (76)</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictation 2 (86)</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>135.5</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 2
Means, Standard Deviations, and Percentage Scores for Fourth and Seventh Grade Native Speakers from Stump (1978)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Fourth Graders N = 109</th>
<th>Seventh Graders N = 95</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloze 1</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictation 1</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>75.7</td>
<td>68.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictation 2</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

not be made perfectly similar without copies of Stump’s original tapes. As expected, the Iranians did better in each case on the passage we judged to be the easier of the two. However, the fact that they scored equal to the seventh graders on the second dictation (a passage about astrology) may indicate as much about their reading interests as it does about the possible differences in the way the passage was administered in Stump’s study and in this one.³

In spite of the fact that the Iranians studied here place somewhere between the fourth and seventh graders in Stump’s study, many of them were succeeding rather well in university level studies. Perhaps this indicates, as Perkins and Pharis (1980) suggest, that the Iranians (and all adult second language learners) have at their disposal a vast repertoire of general language skills which goes far beyond the surface (spoken or written) forms of the target language which they may or may not have mastered. Nonetheless it is impossible to believe that their performance does not suffer from their lack of skill in English per se.⁴

³ It may be worth noting that interest in the occult practices of astrology has a long history in Iran extending back to the time of the ancient Babylonian (ca. 2700 BC).
⁴ Dr. Thomas Scovel speculates that perhaps knowledge of “technical vocabulary” may help adult non-natives to compensate for low dictation and cloze scores. This may be a possibility worth exploring. However, researchers wishing to investigate it will have to be able to demonstrate a separable vocabulary factor, and this demonstration still eludes us (see Oller and Perkins 1980).
Before going on to look at factors which may contribute to success in learning English, it may be useful to pause momentarily to look first at the relationship across the cloze and dictation tests used here: specifically the question of whether the factor or factors measured by their rather disparate dictation and cloze tasks can reasonably be viewed as a single criterion of English language proficiency. Table 3 reports the correlations across all four tests. By placing the appropriate figures from Table 3 and the corresponding reliability estimates from Table 2 in the Spearman-Brown prophecy formula (given immediately below), we may obtain estimates of the true correlations between each of the cloze tests with each of the dictations:

\[
\hat{r}_{jk} = \frac{r_{jk}}{r_{jS} \cdot r_{kS}}
\]

where \(\hat{r}_{jk}\) is the estimated true correlation between tests j and k; \(r_{jk}\) is the observed correlation between j and k; \(r_{jS}\) is the estimated reliability of j and \(r_{kS}\) is the estimated reliability of k.

If there were a single factor underlying cloze and dictation performances (as Oller and other recent authors have suggested, see Oller and Perkins 1978, 1980, and the Appendix to Oller 1979), we should expect the estimates of true correlations between the four possible pairs of dictations and cloze tests to be near unity (i.e., nearly perfect). Pairing Cloze 1 with Dictation 1 the resultant estimate of the true correlation is 1.06; for Cloze 1 with Dictation 2 it is .89; for Cloze 2 with Dictation 1 it is 1.00; and for Cloze 2 with Dictation 2, .91. The mean of these estimates of the true correlation across these quite different tasks is .97. In fact, if the true correlation were perfect, we would expect the estimates to vary quite randomly above and below the unity mark within the limits of the error of estimates of correlation and reliability. In the present case the rather different tasks studied come very near doing this, and we may therefore proceed with some confidence in regarding the four tests as measures of the same underlying factor of English proficiency.

Using the total score on the four tests then as the criterion measure of English language proficiency, we may go on to consider the secondary question concerning what factors contribute to success in learning English. To answer this question at least partially, we regressed the scalable items from the ques-
tionnaire onto the criterion measure of English proficiency (the total score on the two cloze and dictation tests). A step-wise procedure, selecting first the strongest predictor and subsequently the predictor which accounted for the greatest amount of remaining variance in the criterion once the variance attributable to the first predictor was extracted (and repeated applications of this procedure), revealed two significant predictors: on the first step the number of American friends (question 15) accounted for 36% of the total variance in the criterion \( (F = 9.9, \text{df} = 1,53, p < .01) \), and on the second step the number of credit hours earned up to the time of testing (question 18) explained an additional 16% of the variance in the total English score \( (F = 8.0, \text{df} = 2,52, p < .05) \). By inspection of the raw correlations across items in the questionnaire and correlations with the criterion, it was clear that hours earned (question 18) was also a good indicator of how long subjects had been in the United States (see question 9) as well as how much English they had learned (the criterion). Both questions 9 and 18 were significantly correlated not only with each other \( (.75) \) but also with the criterion \( (.55 \text{ and } .48, \text{respectively}) \). However, the time subjects reported having studied English in Iran (before coming to the United States) was an insignificant predictor \( (r = .18, p > .05) \) of the criterion measure.

We may conclude that the English proficiency of the Iranians tested in our sample is limited (very much as we expected) and is roughly comparable (at least on the tests we used) to the proficiency of fourth to seventh grade natives. While we realize that children in the grade range of four to seven (see notes 2 and 4) lack certain deeper cognitive skills that we expect to find in adults, the comparison in terms of the language processing tasks used in this study still seems appropriate. Also, while our Iranian student sample may not be perfectly representative, it is probably not terribly unrepresentative either, so we may plausibly infer that the English proficiency of Iranian students in the United States is quite limited in comparison to native speakers. This should surprise no one. Apparently adult second language learners are able to fall back on deeper knowledge of the world in order to partially overcome their deficits in handling the surface forms of the second language. According to our findings, the major factor in bringing about the learning of English in the subject pool studied here was an extended opportunity to associate with native speakers. This conclusion is consistent with the findings of Carroll (1967) in connection with American students studying foreign languages here in the United States. It is disappointing but hardly surprising that formal classroom instruction in EFL (which reportedly neglects communicative use of the language, at least in the case of the Iranians studied here) may have a negligible effect on the eventual attainment of proficiency in English.
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**APPENDIX**

**Cloze Tests**

I:

I got up early that morning and went out for a little walk. I think it must have been 7 a.m. It was the second week of January and the temperature was only about 20 degrees above zero. I had to 1.__________________ on a warm sweater and even 2.__________________ heavy jacket because it was so 3.__________________ . I wore gloves and I even 4.__________________ to put a scarf around my 5.__________________ to keep warm and comfortable. The 6.__________________ was fair; I could see that 7.__________________ was going to be a nice 8.__________________ .

I was surprised that there was 9.__________________ outside but me, that seemed quite 10.__________________ ; after all, 7 a.m. isn’t really very 11.__________________ . I asked myself why nobody was 12.__________________ the street: Could my watch be 13.__________________ ? Was it really only 5 a.m., and 14.__________________ ? I really didn’t know.

After 15.__________________ another block without meeting anyone, I 16.__________________ a newsboy who was delivering papers 17.__________________ his bicycle. “Why are the papers 18.__________________ thick today?” I wondered. Like a 19.__________________ of lightning, the reason quickly flashed 20.__________________ my head: It was Sunday.

II: General Strike In Iran

In Paris, the exiled Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini, leader of Iran’s militant Muslim conservatives, called the military government a “maneuver. . . aimed at deceiving the people” and promised to “overthrow the Pahlavi dynasty and end the monarchy altogether.”

In Iran itself, the 21.__________________ cut oil production by 80 22.__________________ in its first two weeks. Most 24.__________________ closed down, and thousands 25.__________________ government workers stayed at their desks 26.__________________ refused to function. “The army can 27.__________________ people to return to their jobs,” 28.__________________ lawyer said. “But it can’t 29.__________________ them to work.”

The stakes for 30.__________________ United States and the rest of 31.__________________ Western world should the chaos continue 32.__________________ enormous. Western Europe, South Africa, Israel 33.__________________ Japan rely heavily on Iranian oil. 34.__________________ crippled or anti-Western Iran would 35.__________________ the stability of the other 36.__________________ in the area, notably Saudi Arabia. “37.__________________ go without saying that the Saudis 38.__________________ scared to death,” a Western intelligence 39.__________________ in Cairo said last week. “If 40.__________________ Shah falls and a radical regime takes his place, the entire Persian Gulf could be up for grabs.”

**Dictation**

I

Yesterday I saw a lady / who was walking down a street near my house. / She looked confused and a little bit lost, / so I asked her if she knew where she was going. / She said that she was looking for Maple street. / I told her that I would walk with her to Maple street, / since it was just a couple of blocks away. / I showed her where the street was and then I walked home.

Length-76 words.
The stars may or may not have a real effect upon us, but these days astrology certainly does. Young people delay their wedding until the zodiac is favorable. Some companies have astrologers who are constantly kept busy. Most newspapers print horoscopes and about forty million people read them. Even skeptics can’t be sure that they are not affected. Now believers and skeptics alike can read what the stars have to say. They can also decide for themselves if astrology is really science, fiction, or science fiction.

Length: 86 words.

Questionnaire

Please answer the following questions by placing an X at the left side of the correct choice:

1. How old are you? A. Less than 20 B. Between 20 and 25 C. More than 25
2. What field are you studying? A. Engineering B. Education C. Art D. Other
3. What is your status at UNM? A. Graduate B. Undergraduate
4. How long did you study English in Iran? A. 6 years B. 7 years C. 8 years D. More than 8 years
5. Had you ever been in an English speaking environment before coming to the United States? A. Yes B. No
6. If yes, for how long? A. Less than six months B. Between six months and a year C. Between one and two years D. More than two years
7. Did you have any native English speaking teachers in Iran? A. Yes B. No
8. If yes, for how long? A. One year B. Two years C. Three years D. More than three years
9. How long have you been in the United States? A. Less than one year B. Between one and two years C. More than two years
10. Had you taken any intensive English courses before entering the university? A. Yes B. No
11. If yes, for how long? A. 8 weeks B. 16 weeks [Eight and sixteen week courses are offered at UNM.]
12. If not, did you enter the university by taking the TOEFL? A. Yes B. No
13. Did you stay in a dormitory when you first came to the United States? A. Yes B. No
14. If yes, did you have an American roommate? A. Yes B. No
15. How many American friends did you make during your first six months in the United States? A. One B. Two C. Three D. More than three
16. How often did you see them? A. Rarely B. Quite often C. Very often
18. How many credit hours have you completed? A. Less than 20 B. Between 20 and 50 C. Between 50 and 100 D. More than 100
19. What is your grade point average? A. Less than 2 B. Between 2 and 2.5 C. Between 2.5 and 3.0 D. Higher than 3.0
20. Do you still have a language problem? A. Yes B. No
21. In your view, does your language problem hinder your grade point average? A. Yes B. No
Reviews


Beginning appropriately with a chapter entitled “Learning a Language,” this work offers a collection of reading selections designed for “low - to low - intermediate-level students of English as a foreign language” (p. xi). The remaining eight chapters are built around such central themes as: The history and description of various areas of science, the history, geography, and social customs of peoples of the world, mini-biographies of adventurers and visionaries, differences in points of view from culture to culture, present-day world problems, and prophecies about the future.

The first selection in each unit, usually a page to a page and a half in length, is written simply and introduces the general theme of that chapter. The three to five additional readings in each chapter vary in length, some as brief as one or two paragraphs and others as long as one or two pages, and level of difficulty. Some were written especially for this text, but most were adapted or taken from contemporary sources such as textbooks, magazines, and encyclopedias. Diverse writing styles, including technical reporting, narrative, argument, and poetry, are represented.

Because themes and variations on themes run through individual chapters and the text as a whole, there is frequent repetition of vocabulary items. Words and phrases which are introduced in the initial reading selection of a unit reappear throughout the unit in the exercises and additional readings and in succeeding units as well. This systematic repetition provides sufficient textual redundancy for beginning students to read the selections with ease, helping them expand their vocabularies as well.

As its title indicates, the book is meant to be both a reader and a workbook, and its pages are perforated so that they can be easily removed. Each unit contains a wide variety of exercise types and suggestions for classroom activities. A chapter, approximately thirty pages in length, typically includes: 1) a set of words to be looked up before reading the introductory reading selection, 2) an introductory reading selection, 3) comprehension exercises, 4) a word association exercise, 5) a modified close exercise, 6) a sentence ordering and paragraph writing exercise, 7) exercises which call for oral and written responses to visual stimuli such as cartoons, diagrams, charts, tables, graphs, maps, etc., 8) puzzles, games, and jokes, 9) questions for discussion related to the chapter theme, 10) additional reading selection and exercises which focus on the vocabulary and promote discussion about the content of each selection,
11) an end of chapter review, 12) further suggestions for discussion and writing, and finally 13) suggestions for related reading and research.

Teachers and students who have used this text have found it both interesting and useful and especially appreciate the author’s choice of themes, the inclusion of reading selections of varying lengths, levels of difficulty, and styles, the recycling of vocabulary, the wide variety of exercises and activities, and the very clearly written and easily understandable directions given throughout the book. Students enjoy the cartoons, puzzles, and games, and teachers find them a delightful way to provoke discussion and at the same time teach or review vocabulary. Students also like the comprehension exercise at the end of each chapter, which serves as an excellent review of the vocabulary and content presented in that chapter and gives them a sense of closure.

My favorite chapters are 6, “Judging Others,” and 8, “Points of View,” since the reading selections and suggested activities in these two units foster cross-cultural discussion. In chapter six students are asked to consider the accuracy of such statements as:

All Spaniards have dark hair and dark eyes. Women are very emotional. Americans eat only hamburgers, hot dogs, and ice cream. (p. 178).

They are also given the opportunity to read and discuss situations like the following:

John, an American, meets Manual, a Brazilian. Manuel stands about 12 inches away from John and begins to talk to him. John moves back and stands about twenty inches from Manuel. Manuel then moves closer to John. John moves away again. Why do they keep moving? (p. 186)

Because there are several reading selections included in each unit, different selections can be used for different purposes. For example, students can quickly read the shorter ones in class, skimming for general ideas or scanning for specific details. These short selections can also be used as timed readings. Longer selections can be assigned for outside reading. Likewise, the comprehension exercises can be used in different ways; they can be used, for instance, as pre-reading or skimming exercises. Or, students can practice questioning by calling on each other for answers during post-reading activities.

Another of the strengths of this book is its wide variety of vocabulary building exercises. Especially useful are those exercises which encourage students to think of words in sets by asking them to associate one word with a group of others or a particular situation. Samples of three such exercise types follow. In sample one, students are asked to match the words in the first column with the correct set in the second column; in sample two, they are directed to scan the reading selection which precedes the exercise in order to find words which describe the phrases listed; in sample three, students are instructed not only to choose the appropriate word from the second column but also to explain why they made that choice.
Reviews

1) rural
news
goods

2) a place to shop
a means of transportation
a place to eat

3) short tall thin
eyes nose mouth
dumb intelligent stupid

glasses ears hat leg
old fat young rich
poor fat smart short

On the whole, I find few drawbacks to the text, although I disagree with the authors’ procedure for introducing new words. While teachers of ESL generally recognize that their students are avid dictionary users, I prefer to discourage my students from seizing their dictionaries each time they encounter an unfamiliar word or phrase, preferring to encourage them instead to try to guess the meaning from the context. Therefore, instead of using the Look Up section which precedes each chapter-initial reading selection, I would suggest introducing new words and phrases in the context of a sentence or two from which students could guess the meaning. I would also avoid asking students to write a sentence of their own using the word, assuming that the emphasis at this point is on recognition of the meaning of a word in a particular context, not on using it in a well formed sentence. For a beginning student, the task of producing a grammatically correct sentence using the word can be very difficult, and the end product is often not worth the time and effort spent.

Granting the importance of introducing students early to techniques for guessing meaning from context, it is also disappointing that the authors included so few exercises which focus on the derivational forms of words as clues to meaning. In particular, the ability to recognize the part of speech signalled by a suffix can be extremely useful for students as they decode written English and should ultimately help them to use different morphological forms of words in their writing and speech as well. But, the many fine features of this book certainly outweigh its minor disadvantages, and I heartily recommend its use for the teaching of adults who are in the beginning stages of their study of ESL.

Betsy Soden
University of Michigan


We can all agree with Adams’ observation that it is “rare in the process of education for the practitioner to meet with the theorist.” As a member of the TEFL Programme at the University of Sydney, Adams observed that her students, themselves teachers of English in their several homelands, often failed to convey intended meaning in English through their inability to approximate the rhythmic patterns of native speakers, who project an “impression of isochrony.” In particular, her students retained the separate and equal identity
of words, produced inappropriate sentence stresses and pauses (because, Adams believes, of their syllable timed mother tongues), and commonly ignored sense groups within utterances.

Many practitioners would turn then to the available literature for help with a problem they have diagnosed. Problems of teaching English sentence rhythm, unfortunately, are much like the weather: everyone talks about them, nobody does much. Consultation of several current handbooks and taped pronunciation courses offers little specific help, beyond elementary information that has been in circulation for quite a long time—this despite the consensus that faulty reproduction of English rhythm is a more powerful barrier to comprehensibility than the misarticulation of this or that phoneme. Having diagnosed a problem, Adams the practitioner consulted Adams the phonologist: the result is a major contribution to experimental phonetics and English language teaching as well, for after determining the problem, Adams developed a controlled teaching experiment based on her own impressive laboratory research.

Part I of the book is an extensive (90 pp.) historical survey of the nature of rhythm in speech, characterizing English rhythm as syllable grouping created by patterns of pitches, durations, and loudnesses. The first of its three chapters is a general treatment, touching on such diverse periods as the Greek and the German between-the-two-wars. The other two chapters, long and fact filled, report English speech rhythm studies, including the critical studies of metre in poetry, and selected work of experimental phoneticians, the final section being a succinct summary of the features of stress timed rhythm. Adams’ position is: basic to sustained utterance is a rhythmic unit known as the breath group (Pulgram 1970, and others).

Part 2, the experimental section of the work, could be replicated or extended in a moderately equipped phonetics lab anywhere in the world. From oral readings of page length selections of written and colloquial prose, poems and folk rhymes, fluency patterns were adduced from laboratory measurements. Rhythm ideals, very similar (p. 112), were ascertained from fluent native language readings in Vietnamese (2 speakers) and English (4 Australian educators; 7 extra for pause data). Then, to establish the character of incipient, partial fluency, the English materials were read by Asia TEFL teachers studying in Australia, all males between 20 and 40 years old, accustomed to communicating, not in English, but in Vietnamese (7), Cambodian (2), Bengali (2), Indonesia (1), or Pilipino (1).

Certain asymmetries in the design of this work urge further research. To determine fluency patterns of age, sex and language experience groups (v. p. 117) —including incipient fluency of English speakers in other languages (p. 221)—would give great relevance to language teaching in general. Although the original measurements show various degrees of fluency (p. 134), sensitivity of fluency to training, described in Part 3, was unfortunately not confirmed by the same laboratory measures, leaving the laboratory description of fluency development to other research. Adams’ underlying premise that “speech rhythm
anomalies” (p. 4) are not always the result of switching languages can be checked by study of rhythm patterns in code-switching. Clearly, the framework established by Adams’ work bears great promise.

Essentials of the instrumentation may therefore be useful. In graphic form (29 figs. shown), the physical measurements consist of concurrent instrument tracings on paper. Photographed electromyographs (EMG’s) show the electrochemical muscle activity of the inner and outer layers or rib muscles during talking. Secondly, there are simultaneous linear oscillographs. The parameters traced out in parallel are: integrated signal intensity (I-meter), speech/silence intervals bars (S/N potentiometer), time markers (.01 sec.), duplex oscillograms (oscillomink; sibilant dips at intense signals above 800 cps etc. locate phonemes in speech stream), and contours of the fundamental frequency (pitch-meter).

A major advance, Adams’ experimental work at last resolves the picture of how the body provides an airstream for sustained speech. The lung cavities are first inflated by inspiration, the outer layers of muscles between the ribs (“internal” parasternals, inclusive, Taylor 1960: 393, 401; cf. Campbell et al. 1970) acting to pull the rib cage halves apart. Then, in fluent speech, a stage of fairly uniform exhalation follows. Early in the breath group, neither outer nor inner intercostals show electrical traces of muscle activity. Instead, the elastic lung tissue acts like a deflating balloon (p. 130), to reduce the air pressure inside to atmospheric pressure. Termed elastic recoil, this automatic deflation stage in extended utterance is obviously a significant contributor to the motor control of airflow during speaking. Further, it explains the enigmatic nonreplicability of Stetson’s motor theory of speech (cf. Hixon 1977, Lebrun 1966, Ladefoged 1967, Stetson 1950) as data on syllable isolates, presumably like the nonfluuent use of word isolate citation forms (p. 132) without the phonetic junctures that meld syllable and word into phrase in sustained speech.

Since “shorter pauses usually had little or no effect on the EMG trace” (p. 130), the fine control of intersyllable length, pause and stress seems to occur above the lungs. Vocal cords and tract (glottis and oronasal articulatorys) accomplish the tricky, language-specific things that produce fluent rhythms. They forge phonetic junctures and close transitions from subtleties of “duration and neutralization, pitch change, aspiration, devoicing, etc” (p. 181). But instead of these, in nonfluuent utterance a typical peppering of irregular and not necessarily short hesitations disrupts the three-stage cycle of inhalation, lung recoil, and thoracic constriction. Hesitations precede semantically original utterances normally (Goldman-Eisler 1964); here, they are seen to be compounded by unfamiliar articulation, vocabulary, and grammar. Even during oral reading, an excess of necessarily innovative articulations makes for arrhythmicity of breath groups—the implication of Adams’ laboratory measures of EFL utterance.

Part 3 of English Speech Rhythm details a carefully conducted teaching scheme to put the experimental findings into practice. A control group and
an experimental group, each consisting of 15 speakers matched to those in the other group, were shown not to be statistically different in a pretest, which consisted of readings of four samples of English discourse. Both the pretest and the posttest were judged double blind—i.e., with test and group status concealed—by a panel of three experienced teachers of English. On the posttest, although both groups had improved during a two month period while classroom instruction continued, the experimental group performance had improved significantly more. The experimental group benefitted from 20 hours of instruction in both the theory and practice of organization and timing of rhythm units in English, with at least four hours of separate individual laboratory practice. The instruction utilized both a cognitive code orientation (the presentation and discussion of rules, with examples from many sources) and an audiolingual orientation, the mim-mem practice of strongly metrical selections, including nursery rhymes, in accordance with Adams’ belief that the latter approach embodies the best means of acquiring automatic control of certain phonetic patterns. Given the careful design of this experiment, the improvement noted in the experimental group is attributable to the instruction they received.

Many important and valuable aspects of Adams’ work cannot be listed, much less discussed in detail. Rather, let it be said that the book is strongly recommended in its entirety, not least as a model for dissertations and theses. Furthermore, each of the three parts is useful on its own, the first to a course on English phonology, the second to experimentalists, and the third to teachers, who will find in it either a program for instructing their own adult students or at least very valuable suggestions for teaching other, dissimilar groups.
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In 1938, Louise Rosenblatt published Literature as Exploration, a seminal work in the teaching of literature, in which she characterized the literary experience as a transaction between a reader and a text. In the book she argued that any literary work gains its significance from the way in which the minds and emotions of a particular reader respond to a text. Her most recent work, The Reader, the Text, the Poem, a refinement of her original thesis, has important implications for the teaching of literature in second language classrooms.

For Rosenblatt, a literary experience involves a transaction between a reader, a text and a poem; in this experience the reader is actively engaged in creating a poem out of a text. The text is “stimulus activating elements of the reader’s past experience—his experience both with literature and with life. . . . the text serves as a blueprint, a guide for the selecting, rejecting, and ordering of what is being called forth; the text regulates what shall be held in the forefront of the reader’s attention” (p. 11). Thus, a text, like a musical score, is a set of symbols which an artist sets forth to guide others in the production of their work of art. A poem, on the other hand, “presupposes a reader actively involved with a text and refers to what he makes of his responses to the particular set of verbal symbols” (p. 12). For Rosenblatt, the poem is a highly unique event: “A specific reader and a specific text at a specific time and place: change any of these, and there occurs a different circuit, a different event—a different poem” (p. 14).

A central question, of course, is in what way does literary reading differ from any other reading. Is not the reader with any text actively engaged in drawing upon his past experience to elicit meaning from that text? Rosenblatt contends that the reader performs very different activities during aesthetic and nonaesthetic reading. In nonaesthetic reading, the reader’s attention is focused primarily on what he can obtain from the text, whether it be information, a solution to a problem, or an action to be carried out. This type of reading she terms “efferent,” from the Latin, “efferre,” “to carry away.” In aesthetic reading, on the other hand, the reader focuses on what happens during the actual reading event: “In aesthetic reading, the reader’s attention is centered directly on what he is living through during his relationship with that particular text” (p. 25). No hard and fast line separates efferent and aesthetic reading; what ultimately alerts the reader to which stance to assume are certain stylistic or formal devices in the text.

In both efferent and aesthetic reading, the concept of a transaction with the environment is central: “A two-way, or better, a circular, process can be postulated, in which the reader responds to the verbal stimuli offered by the text, but at the same time he must draw selectively on the resources of his own fund of experiences and sensibility to provide and organize the substance of his response” (p. 43). A major difference between efferent and aesthetic read-
ing, however, is the degree to which the text allows for the bringing into play of personal associations. According to Rosenblatt, in scientific reading, “the reader must adopt the attitude of mind, the stance, that will lead him automatically to reject or inhibit any personal associations activated by the symbols” (p. 73). For this reason, a paraphrase or restatement of the text may be as useful as the original. With aesthetic reading, in contrast, the text is extremely important. As Rosenblatt puts it, “No one can read a poem for you. Accepting an account of someone else’s reading or experience is analogous to seeking nourishment through having someone else eat your dinner for you and recite the menu” (p. 86).

Rosenblatt contends that the emphasis in teaching reading in the schools has been almost entirely on the efferent stance; this in turn has affected how literature is dealt with in the classroom. The reading of both efferent and aesthetic texts is viewed as the ability to adequately summarize the main ideas, and frequently the text is used to develop syntactic and lexical skills.

Rosenblatt believes it is time that language classrooms begin to recognize the uniquely personal character of a literary experience: “Readers bringing to the text different personalities, different syntactic and semantic habits, different values and knowledge, different cultures, will under its guidance and control fashion different syntheses, live through different ‘work’” (P. 112). Even the successive readings of a text by an individual reader will usually differ since the first experience will influence his sensibilities to the second reading. Although there is a resemblance among the various readings of a text by different individuals, for Rosenblatt it is incorrect to assume that a literary work stands for a single ideal or complete interpretation to which individual readings are only approximations. In the transaction view of literary experiences attention must be given not only to the words of the text, but also to what those particular words stir up within each reader. Ultimately, the text can be used to judge whether a specific interpretation either ignores elements in the text or projects on it experiences for which there is no basis. This reference to the text can be a social experience in which the text becomes a general medium of communication among readers. Rosenblatt characterizes this exchange of experiences in the following manner:

Learning what others have made of a text can greatly increase such insight into one’s own relationship with it. A reader who has been moved or disturbed by a text often manifests an urge to talk about it, to clarify and crystallize his sense of the work. He likes to hear others’ views. Through such interchange he can discover how people bringing different temperaments, different literary and life experiences, to the text have engaged in very different transactions with it. . . . Sometimes the give-and-take may lead to a general increase in insight and even to a consensus. Sometimes, of course, interchange reveals that we belong to different subcultures, whether social or literary. (P. 146-147)

Making a distinction between efferent and aesthetic reading has important implications for the use of literature in the language classroom, particularly second or foreign language classrooms. As Rosenblatt points out, schools have
traditionally given major emphasis to efferent reading and have thus tended to use a similar approach to aesthetic reading. Texts are used to develop language skills, both syntactic and lexical, and comprehension is judged through paraphrase or restatement. Such an approach is perhaps even more prevalent in second or foreign language classrooms because of the concern for developing linguistic proficiency. There is, however, a major disadvantage in using this approach with literary texts. Students may conclude that all texts necessitate the same reader stance, and that ultimately, the aim of all reading is to obtain information, to solve problems, to carry something away. This minimizes the value of the very personal experience an individual reader can have with a literary text.

Encouraging students in a language classroom to assume an aesthetic stance suggests several major differences in the use of literature in the classroom. First of all, students should be allowed greater choice in the literary text they read. For some individuals, reading a literary text at a particular time in a particular place may not provide a satisfactory aesthetic experience. Thus, the student, as with any other aesthetic experience, should feel free to set aside the text and select another. With this in mind, it seems reasonable for teachers to provide for a range of choices in literary texts. Secondly, the classroom sharing of a literary text should differ significantly from the discussion of an efferent text. Rather than starting with comprehension questions and proceeding to use the text as a means for developing language skills, the students should begin by discussing their experiences with the text. As Rosenblatt puts it, “we are used to thinking of the text as a medium of communication between author and reader. . . . Perhaps we should consider the text as an even more general medium of communication among readers. As we exchange experience, we point to those elements of the text that best illustrate or support our interpretations” (P. 146). This approach presupposes that the students have the ability to deal with the text on a linguistic level. It further suggests that a particular literary text be used in a second language classroom only when the teacher believes the students have the linguistic ability to deal with that text.

*The Reader, the Text, the Poem* presents a tantalizing framework for exploring the role of literature in second language classrooms. With students of sufficient linguistic skills, literary texts can provide a very special opportunity for non-native speakers to in Rosenblatt’s terms, “create a poem,” and thus, have an aesthetic experience in a new language. Ultimately this experience could provide the foundation for the sharing of different cultures, temperaments, and life experiences.
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Research Notes

TESOL Research Committee Report

Elaine Tarone, University of Minnesota

The TESOL Research Committee is a group of 16 individuals from various universities from around the world who volunteer their time each year to try to further research in the various areas represented within TESOL. The Research Committee has no budget to fund any research projects, nor are the members of the Committee paid to do research for TESOL members. However, the individuals on this committee each year perform services such as the following: they act as consultants to individuals, who have asked for help with various research projects; they read abstracts of research papers submitted to TESOL conventions; they organize a State of the Art in Research paper presented each year at TESOL; they develop guidelines for research in the field. These are individuals who volunteer their time for these activities over and above their own work.

It is important to note that members of the Research Committee are drawn from every Special Interest Group in TESOL, and that the research interests represented on the Committee are extremely varied. These research interests include English as a second dialect, second language acquisition, ethnography, testing, classroom interaction, and English for special purposes. Represented on the Committee are individuals interested in primary and secondary education, English as a second dialect, adult education, overseas EFL, applied linguistics and university education.

During the year the Research Committee has prepared a set of guidelines of ethical research in ESL. They were written by Elaine Tarone, Chair of the Committee, with input from Andrew Cohen, Ann Fathman, Jackie Schachter, Tom Scovel, Amy Sheldon, Merrill Swain, and many others. At the 1980 Convention of TESOL, the Research Committee approved these guidelines. At the same convention, the TESOL Executive Committee endorsed the guidelines and directed the Committee to publish them in the TESOL Quarterly.

GUIDELINES FOR ETHICAL RESEARCH IN ESL

TESOL Research Committee

1. Introduction

Whenever research is done which makes use of human subjects, researchers are always urged to take special precautions to safeguard the rights of those subjects. Universities, school boards and state funding agencies all require that certain standards be met in the conduct of ethical research. In addition, most professional organizations which encourage research with human subjects also require that such work meet specific guidelines set up by the organization.

Until 1980, TESOL did not have such a set of guidelines for ethical research on language learning and language teaching; the TESOL Research Committee worked from 1978 until 1980 to develop procedures to be followed in safeguarding the rights of second- and foreign-language learners involved in studies on language learning/teaching, materials development, and so on.

Research in our field is unique in that it focuses on a unique sort of human
population—one defined by the Canada Council as a “captive population.” A “captive population” is one for whom a power differential is felt between the population and the experimenter, a differential which could operate to the disadvantage of the subjects. Examples cited by the Canada Council include minority groups, students and children. Now it is quite obvious that most research in the area of ESL is done with subjects who are members of minority groups, or students, or children—or even all three at once. What this means is that because our subjects may feel themselves to be at the weak end of a power differential, they may be less likely to exert themselves to defend their own rights. It is therefore doubly important for the researcher to make every possible effort to be sure that those rights are safeguarded in the study.

In addition to this power differential which usually exists in ESL research, there also is usually a language differential between the experimenter and subject. The experimenter (E) usually is an English speaker studying subjects (S’s) whose native language is not English, and whose proficiency in English may be very poor. In many cases, the E does not speak his S’s native language. As a result, communication problems may be added to an already-existing power differential.

Because of this special nature of the subjects of research on second language learning and teaching, and the subjects of ESL research in particular, the Research Committee of TESOL suggests these guidelines to be followed by researchers in our field.

2. Local Guidelines

First, of course, all local guidelines on the use of human subjects should be followed. Universities, school boards and state funding agencies usually have copies of these guidelines available. Unfortunately, these guidelines are sometimes viewed more as obstacles to overcome than as helpful suggestions to follow. This may be because the rationale for the guidelines is not always given or because concrete examples of recommended procedures are not always provided, so that fulfillment of local human subject guidelines may become a mere bureaucratic hassle with little substance. On the other hand, it is clear that many institutions do go into considerable detail, providing a convincing rationale for the guidelines, and specific suggestions for remedying the problem. These seem to be more helpful.

In any case, the special nature of the population from which ESL subjects are drawn suggests that, in addition to following local guidelines, researchers ought to consider the following suggestions as well.

TESOL Research Guidelines

There are five main areas which need to be considered by any researcher with regard to the safeguarding of subjects’ rights in the study itself, and one area with regard to the safeguarding of the rights of the students who “consume” the results of research. As pointed out above, these six areas become especially important in light of the captive nature of the population in second language learning/teaching research.

2.1. Informed Consent. The simplest and most basic requirement. All research on humans should proceed only with the uncoerced, informed consent of the subjects, in writing if possible. With captive populations, special care must be taken to ensure that the subjects are not being subtly coerced into giving their consent. An exact description of the research project should be given, in the subjects’ first language if necessary. Subjects should be informed that they may withdraw from the study at any time. If research is done in the classroom, special problems arise with students; students should be assured that the test results will not affect their grades, nor will participation/nonparticipation in the study.

1Guidelines patterned upon recommendations in “Ethics”, a report of the Consultative Group on Ethics, the Canada Council, P.O. Box 1047, Ottawa, Ontario K1P 5V8.
Samples of consent forms are included in the appendix of this paper. Having subjects read and sign forms such as these would ensure that informed consent is being given. Note that there are two types of forms: one for adult S's, and one for the parents of children who are subjects. When children are subjects, the informed consent of parents should always be given in writing before the study begins. Furthermore, children should also be asked for oral consent, and should be told that they can withdraw from the study at any time.

2.2. Deception. Defined by the Canada Council as “the intentional misleading of subjects to believe that the procedures and purposes of a research project are not what they actually are.” The Canada Council goes on to point out that in research in the social sciences deception has actually become the norm, as researchers have tried to keep their S's naive about the subject of the study. However, after years of this sort of procedure, it now appears that many, if not most, subjects enter studies expecting to be deceived, and many spend considerable energy trying to guess what the study is really about. Needless to say, suspicious S's are not unbiased S's, any more than informed, non-naive S's are. Thus, for practical as well as for ethical reasons, deception is undesirable and should be avoided; it should never be used if there is risk of harm to the subjects or when debriefing is impossible. Deception is only permissible when the experimenter can show that no other method is possible, and when significant scientific advances would result. Debriefing should then take place immediately. Withholding of a project description (for research purposes) must be at the consent of the subjects. One possibility is to tell the subjects about the research in stages, i.e., tell them enough to keep them involved but not so much as to affect results.

2.3. Consequences. It is the researcher's responsibility to minimize all risks to the subjects, such as anxiety or lower self-esteem. No risk should be taken unless the resultant benefits warrant it. Research in the classroom presents particular problems. Students have paid to be taught, not researched. If the time they have purchased is used, not for teaching, but for research, then the consequences for them may be bad. No study should be allowed to consume class time unless it can be shown to be simultaneously of direct educational value to the students.

In any research in our field, in the classroom or out, there are several procedures to be recommended in that they minimize negative consequences for the subjects. First, in informing prospective subjects about the study, the researcher could suggest benefits or possible outcomes from participation in the study (e.g., greater awareness as to how they perform certain language learning tasks, which in turn they can apply to later learning). Once the project is completed, the subjects should get an oral and/or written report or at least be given the option whether they want such a report. Second, if researchers are working in the schools, they might consider choosing as high priority projects those which would directly benefit the school or the student. Third, every effort should be made to show the subjects that they are not being judged personally (in interviews, tests, etc.). In the testing procedure itself, some tasks should be included which the subjects can easily master in order to reduce frustration and boost confidence; also, there is nothing wrong with making the test itself fun or interesting in order to help reduce the anxiety level. Finally, it might be helpful if the experimenters themselves were subjected to the treatment in order to gain a better understanding of the subjects' position.

2.4. Privacy. Great care should be taken to preserve the subjects' sense of privacy; they should not be required to reveal any more about themselves and their lives than they wish to. Again, the captive nature of the populations in our field is important. Cultures differ in the way they view the concept of privacy. In every case where

---

2 Consent forms were developed and/or provided by Amy Sheldon, University of Minnesota.
the subjects’ viewpoint differs from the experimenter’s as to what constitutes privacy, it is the subjects’ viewpoint which should prevail.

For example, studies which ask subjects to express their personal opinions on various topics may be threatening and viewed as invasions of privacy. Certain kinds of demographic census questions would be construed as investigatory by certain groups—i.e., asking Mexican Americans how many people there are in their home may seem like it’s probing for tax evasion. The cultures of people involved in our studies should be carefully considered before the research methods are chosen. This might mean having cultural representatives available to review our research methods ahead of time from the point of view of invasion of privacy.

2.5. Confidentiality and Anonymity. The subjects should clearly understand that the data collected will be kept confidential, both in its immediate use and in its long-term storage. Pseudonyms, initials or numbers should be used throughout the study for this purpose, and not the subjects’ real names. We should look for efficient means of preserving anonymity without all but eliminating the possibilities of longitudinal work. A set of I.D. numbers (pseudonyms, initials, etc.) should be used and saved over a period of time, while the list of corresponding names should be thrown away, or perhaps in certain cases, kept locked in a secure place. If it is impossible to maintain confidentiality or anonymity, the subjects should be told where and to whom the information will be released and should grant consent for this release.

2.6. Applications of Research. Premature applications of research findings to the teaching of captive populations is also a concern. The researcher should make it clear what recommendations, if any, can be made on the basis of the findings, and which are still at the level of speculation. In fact, not all research in ESL need have immediate applications for teaching. A researcher should not feel pressured to suggest applications in a report. It is better to simply recommend further research possibilities than to give premature recommendations for applications which may later prove to be unfounded and perhaps damaging to students. Those interested in the issue of the relationship of research to applications of research are referred to the newsletter Practical Applications of Research 1, 4 (June 1979).

3. Conclusion

We believe that the value of these guidelines does not lie in their ability to be legislated and enforced. If an outside agency were to try to enforce such guidelines or act as a watchdog on every bit of research done, this would multiply bureaucracy, paperwork and senseless delays in the work we do. In fact, we believe that these guidelines are already followed by good researchers. The helpfulness of specifying and discussing guidelines such as these lies in the central issues the process raises, for classroom teachers and students as well as for researchers. If researchers make it a matter of conscience to adhere to these guidelines as closely as possible—and if ESL students and teachers are aware of these guidelines and the rights they strive to protect—then they will have served their function. The guidelines themselves might be a fruitful topic of discussion in ESL classrooms, highlighting as they do a more basic philosophical concern: the conflict between the need of science to study human beings, and the need of human beings to preserve control over their own humanity. In any case, it is hoped that all segments of the TESOL community will find the guidelines both helpful and thought-provoking.

APPENDIX A

Sample Consent Form for Adult Subjects

You are invited to participate in a study of language learning (language processing). We hope to learn more about the ways in which humans learn languages (respond to these stimuli). You have been selected as a possible participant in this study because you have
normal hearing and are (are not) a native speaker of English (because you expressed an interest in participating in psychological experiments).

If you decide to participate, we will be presenting some verbal stimuli (i.e., sounds, words, phrases, sentences, short paragraphs) to you. We will ask you to pay attention to these stimuli and to perform task in relation to them. The procedure does not involve any risk, is painless, takes about one hour or less, and we hope you find it enjoyable and informative.

Any information that is obtained in connection with this study will be presented in group form. Your individual responses will be confidential and will be disclosed only with your permission. Your performance in no way reflects your intellectual abilities or personality.

Your decision whether or not to participate will not prejudice your future relations with the (Program in ESL) Linguistics Department or the University in any way. If you decide to participate, you are free to discontinue participation at any time without prejudice.

If you decide to participate we will ask you to come for (only this session) (____ sessions of approximately ___ minutes each).

You will receive either extra credit points (2/hr) or monetary reimbursement ($2.00/hr) for your participation in this study.

If you have any questions, please ask us. If you have any additional questions later, Dr. Amy Sheldon, 133 Klaeber Ct. (373-5486) will be happy to answer them.

You will be offered a copy of this form to keep.----- ---—- ----- ---—- ----- -- —-- ----- ----- 

You are making a decision whether or not to participate. Your signature indicates that you have read the information provided above and have decided to participate. You may withdraw at any time without prejudice after signing this form if you choose to discontinue participation in this study.

Signature..................................................................................Date

Signature of investigator

APPENDIX B

Sample Consent Form for Parents of Child Subjects

Dear Parent or Guardian:

The Department of __________ at the University of Minnesota in cooperation with (name of) School, is engaged in an investigation of _________________.

As part of this investigation, we are studying how children do _________________.

In order to understand this problem children are asked to ______

(complete and concise description as possible, using lay terms—use back of sheet if necessary.)

These procedures, as far as our experience with them indicates, do not present any risk to the child.

The child is not required to participate, of course, and may withdraw from the study at any time without any negative consequences to himself or to his schoolwork. In addition, the child is told about the research and is not forced to participate if he does not want to. However, in most cases we find the children enjoy participating and we feel that their participation will contribute toward a basic understanding of ________________, although there is no direct benefit to the individual child.

All results from the study, of course are kept confidential.

If you are willing to have your child participate in this investigation, please sign the following statement and return this letter to the following address:

If you have any questions, please call ________________________

Sincerely,

(Investigator) _________________
Short Research Report

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION: THE EFFECTS OF LIVING WITH AN AMERICAN FAMILY

Gail M. St. Martin, Louisiana State University

This study investigated the degree of English language acquisition of 83 students who were living in English-speaking environments during their 14-week term of formal language study. The purpose of the investigation was to compare rate of English acquisition of these students with that of their classmates who were living in dormitories or apartment situations, usually in close proximity to other speakers of their first language.

Fathman (1976) studied different sorts of second language learning programs and found that, “... (students) making the most marked improvement were in settings where the use of English was encouraged and necessary for communication.” (Fathman 1976:433). Subjects of this study were living with American families, that is, their English was encouraged and necessary for communication.

Additionally, “One of the most important factors (in language learning) is the attitude of the learner to the language and its speakers.” (Spolsky 1969: 271). The fact that living in the American family was elected by the student at slightly higher cost than other housing situations would seem to suggest a positive attitude and motivation.

Hypotheses tested:

H, Mean of TOEFL scores of homestay students = Mean of TOEFL scores of non-homestay students.
H, Mean of classroom grades of homestay students = Mean of classroom grades of non-homestay students.
Materials and procedure: All students took Michigan A or Placement Tests before beginning English instruction. For purposes of pretest and later statistical analysis each of the 83 homestay students was paired with a non-homestay student who had an identical Michigan A or Placement score (±2).

Results: At the end of the 14 weeks of intensive (22.5 hours per week) of English study, all students received classroom grades in grammar, reading, composition and spoken English. Some took the TOEFL. Means for both grades and TOEFL scores appear in Table 1. In all instances those of homestay students were higher. Table 2 shows results of Analysis of Variance applied to the grades and scores. In all instances those of homestay students were significantly different. We therefore could reject both of the null hypotheses, i.e. we had evidence that scores and grades of homestay students were significantly higher than those of non-homestay students.

<p>| TABLE 1 |
| Means of TOEFL Scores and Class Grades for Homestay and Non-Homestay English Language Students |
|-----------------|-----------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Homestay</th>
<th>Non-homestay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOEFL N = 138</td>
<td>440.803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Grades N = 146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoken English</td>
<td>4.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>3.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>3.712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| TABLE 2 |
| Analysis of Variance—TOEFL Scores and Classroom Grades of Homestay and Non-Homestay Students |
|-----------------|-----------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>P &lt; F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOEFL Pairs = 69</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Grades Pairs = 83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoken English</td>
<td>27.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>17.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>17.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition</td>
<td>20.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* significant at p<.05
** significant at p<.001

Discussion: Language learners and teachers have long assumed that the best way to learn L2 was by living in an environment in which it is used. This study lends strong empirical support to this assumption.

What this study does not do is separate the integrative motivation factor which may have influenced students to choose to live with American families from the exposure factor operative during their stay with the families. Future studies need to develop instruments which can make this distinction.
REFERENCES


Conference Announcement

The English Language Institute, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, will hold the IXth Conference on Applied Linguistics, “Language Transfer in Language Learning,” on March 1 and 2, 1981. Papers on any aspect of language transfer are welcome, but papers on language transfer situations where English is not one of the languages involved will be given preference. Please send four copies of a three-page double spaced summary to: Susan Gass, English Language Institute, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109. Partial travel funds may be available. Publication of selected papers is anticipated. Submit abstracts by September 15, 1980. Do not send abstracts also being submitted to TESOL.
The Forum

Comments on the role of foreign expertise in developing nations: A summation of the findings of an exchange of ESL specialists with the People’s Republic of China

The December 1979 issue of the TESOL Quarterly presented an overview of the findings of four American ESL specialists who had been asked to go to China to survey English language teaching and teacher training in that country (“English Teaching in China: a Recent Survey.” J. R. Cowan et al.) As mentioned in their report, several other governments have also been active in promoting English language education in China. We were part of a team of three Canadians invited to conduct a three month teacher training programme at the Guangzhou Foreign Language Institute in the summer of 1979. At the end of this program we met with officials of the Ministry of Education to discuss the China-Canada language teacher exchange as well as English language education in China in general.

Much of the official view concerning the goals and purposes of English language instruction is contained in Cowan et al. However, since the nature of our program was significantly different from that of Cowan et al., we feel that we are able to elaborate on some of their insights as well as give an alternative viewpoint in regard to some specific issues mentioned therein.

Unlike Cowan et al., our purpose was not to travel to the various key institutions in the country and survey the various programs found. Except for our meetings with the Ministry of Education officials in Beijing, we remained for the complete three month period in Guangzhou. Rather than meet briefly with a wide range of individuals in a formal, fact finding setting, we conducted daily classes with a group of 45 language teachers. We were thus able to establish good rapport with this group as well as get a grasp of the workings of the institute. While we did not travel to other institutions and thus did not have the range of exposure that Cowan et al. were fortunate to experience, we did, however, receive a representative view of the language teaching situation in China for two reasons. Our students were from the faculties of various institutes throughout the nation. Some were from key institutes in large urban centers; others were from smaller centers. Further, they represented varying degrees of actual teaching experience. Some had taught for over 20 years, while others were fresh out of teachers’ colleges.

Although three months is by no means an extended period of time in which to adapt to and begin to fully understand a situation, it is evident that our experience in the PRC was of a qualitatively different nature than that of Cowan et al. As with Cowan et al., our conclusions are a reflection of the nature of our
experience as well as our particular personal and professional backgrounds. The American team was sent to make a survey of the various methodologies in use; we were sent to teach methodology. Thus their conclusions are a reflection of their own interests and background in methodology coupled with the official line they received. It is therefore not surprising that one of the criticisms in their article dealt with the lack of training in methodology in the teacher training institutes. We feel, however, that this conclusion needs to be examined more closely.

Cowan et al. state that the English language teaching curriculum in teachers' colleges emphasizes language skills over methodology. The implication is that it is felt there should be more emphasis on methodology. They further state that this is the opinion of the Chinese teachers themselves. Concurrence with this view by the Chinese Ministry of Education is the rationale behind the Canadian exchange. From the information we received before we left for China it was evident that our goal was indeed to present current trends in ESL teaching methodology.

However, it was immediately obvious after we had met and talked to the students that such a program would be inappropriate. With the exception of the one student who was a native speaker of English, the other students, regardless of their level, were unanimous in their desire to have English language classes and not classes in methodology. However, to account for the inappropriateness of classes in methodology by referring to the students' level of competence in English is to fail to recognize the real nature of the problem. To dismiss in this way the problem we had vis-a-vis determining what we actually taught during the three month program is to suggest that with a different group of students classes in methodology would be appropriate.

To assume so would be to maintain that solutions can be proposed for improving English language teaching in China which are based on the idea of direct transferability of experience from the developed to the underdeveloped world. It is our belief that such solutions would be inadequate, for the gap between the system from which we come and the system in which the ESL teachers in China must work is one which precludes the direct transfer of language teaching methodology. Attempts to make such a transfer are inappropriate because they fail to recognize that quality expectations cannot be the same from one system to another, that standards of good and bad education are not absolute, but relative to time and place. By this statement, we do not mean to imply that a system of education cannot hope to improve the quality of that education. We do, however, mean to imply that such improvement must come in stages, and then only if at each stage the goals for the system, or for the teacher, are set in terms of a realistic appraisal of their stage of development.

English language teachers in a developing country such as China are products of the system in which they work. For most of them, their education is unlikely to be self-supporting in the sense that they can improve their knowledge or alter their methodology by reading and studying on their own. They are
always teaching to the limits of their knowledge, and cannot, therefore, use methods which encourage students to ask questions. They teach what they have been taught in the way in which they have been taught. They concentrate on the relatively narrow subject matter they know, and as a result, memorization and repetition take up a good part of an English lesson. Cowan et al. quite rightly identify rote memorization as the salient feature of English language teaching in China, but suggest that it is the teachers’ lack of training in methodology which explains their reliance on rote memory as a basic teaching technique. While agreeing with their analysis of the current situation, we would like to suggest that it is the inability of most of the teachers to cope with meaningful communication in English, and not their lack of training in methodology, which precludes their using what current views in ESL would regard as more desirable methods.

Cowan et al., then go on to make an important point: that the design of the teaching materials (the unified texts) contributes to the Chinese teachers’ preference for rote memorization as their standard teaching strategy. This analysis raises a fundamental question. To what extent can it be assumed that teacher preparation is a more important factor in maximizing success in language teaching than is the design of the teaching materials? The exchange program for which we were recruited, for example, obviously assumed that training in methodology was the key factor in improving English language teaching in China. We are not concerned, in this article, with arguing the relative importance of these two factors in a general sense, but rather with considering circumstances in which the design of language teaching materials is crucial. We believe that properly designed teaching materials can have a significant impact on language teaching methodology in the context of Third World education.

A country such as China, struggling to meet its vast educational demands, is faced with formidable obstacles. Figuring prominently among these obstacles is the need to rely on outmoded curricula and instructional materials. (An overview of the types of materials used at various levels of the Chinese education system can be found in Cowan et al.). While no one would suggest that an introduction of new materials is all that is required to transform a language teaching program, one can identify specific areas in which properly designed materials will have considerable impact. The key factor is that the materials must be designed with specific goals in mind, goals that demand not only an improvement in the quality of education provided by the system, but which are appropriate to the system and therefore attainable. It is this latter quality which is crucial, for teachers with a low level of education and training cannot make use of techniques or materials developed to reach goals appropriate to another system. English language teachers in China cannot move directly from a system of education based on rote learning to a system of education where meaning and understanding are everything.

But they can move there by stages. In an education system staffed largely
by teachers with relatively low levels of education and inadequate teacher preparation, properly designed teaching materials could legitimately be expected both to upgrade the individual teacher’s educational level and to change his or her teaching methods on the job. Properly designed syllabuses and teaching materials could gradually wean teachers from reliance on rote memorization as their sole teaching strategy.

This change will not, however, happen overnight. So while we share with Cowan et al. the hope that interchanges of language teachers between the People’s Republic of China and North America will continue to grow, we also hope that both we and the Chinese consider carefully the appropriateness of what it is we propose to offer. We should contribute to evolution, not revolution, in EFL methodology in China.

Dr. James Patrie  
University of Alberta  
Edmonton, Alberta  

Mr. David A. Daum  
Mount Royal College  
Calgary, Alberta
Announcements

Meetings of Interest to TESOL Members:


November 22-24, 1980. The Japan Association of Language Teachers (JALT), an affiliate of TESOL, will sponsor the Jalt International Conference on Language/Teaching—1980, from November 22 to 24. The conference will be held at Nanzan Junior College, Nagoya, Japan. For information: Paul G. La Forge, Coordinator: JALT 80, Nanzan Junior College, 19 Hayatocho, Showa-ku, Nagoya, Japan 466.

March 1-2, 1981. IXth Conference on Applied Linguistics, “Language Transfer in Language Learning,” held by The English Language Institute, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. For information: Susan Gass, ELI, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. 48109.


July 6-August 14, 1981. 3rd Annual TESOL Summer Institute, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City. Participation may be for the entire six week period or either of two three-week periods (July 6-24 or July 27-Aug. 14). The TESOL Summer Meeting will be on the weekend of July 24. Group (nine or more) project proposals as well as individual suggestions and proposals are welcome; those received before Oct. 1, 1980 will have priority, John F. Fanselow, Director, and Ann M. Frentzen, Asst. Director, can be contacted at: Box 66, TESOL Summer Institute, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, New York, 10027, USA.

Fulbright Awards in English as a Foreign Language

Among the approximately 500 Fulbright awards available in about 100 countries for 1981-82, a number have been programmed in English as a Foreign Language.

Algeria*: curriculum and teacher training; Bahrain: undergraduates and methodology for teachers; China: methodology and special course for teachers; Colombia*; Czechoslovakia; Ecuador#; Gabon*; Italy: in-service-training for teachers; Korea: bilingual instructors (Spanish, French, Russian, Chinese, Japanese, Arabic); Morocco*: ESL and American literature; Nicaragua; Niger*; Pakistan: EFL and remedial English; Poland; Romania: all levels; Rwanda*; Sudan; Sweden: American English; Taiwan: linguistics and drama; Yugoslavia.
In addition, for many countries, applications “in any field” are accepted for lecturing or research.


Applied Linguistics SIG Editor Sought

The Applied Linguistics Special Interest Group will appoint a new newsletter editor, to start in November, 1980. If you are interested in serving, send a letter describing the contents of the newsletter you envision and include 1) samples of your journalistic writing, if available, 2) a sample editorial or other items for the ALSIG newsletter to: Sabrina Peck, TESL, UCLA, Los Angeles, CA 90024.

Announcing a New Journal

*English World-Wide*, a new journal dealing with varieties and functions of English around the world, will begin publishing in 1980. The journal will publish scholarly articles, accounts of research in progress, bibliographies, and reviews in the following subject areas: English as a native, second, additional and international auxiliary language; descriptions of English structures; pidgin/creole/broken English; social significance, attitudes, and domains of different varieties of English; emerging standards and usage problems, language planning, bi-/multilingualism, and language communities; types of texts and their uses; and types of interference and code mixing.

Contact Heinle and Heinle Enterprises, 29 Lexington Road, Concord, MA 01742. (*English World-Wide*, edited by Manfred Görlach, published by Julius Groos Verlag, Volume I, 1980: Issue 1, May; Issue 2, November. Subscription rate for each volume: $28.50.)

Free Publications from ERIC

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics is offering on request a limited number of copies of the following articles. Write to User Services, ERIC/CLL, 1611 North Kent Street, Arlington, Virginia 22209.

“The Role of Colloquial French in Communication and Implications for Language Instruction.” Thérèse Bonin.

“Diagnosing and Responding to Individual Learner Needs.” Diane Brickbichler and Alice Omaggio.


“Rate-Controlled Speech in Foreign Language Education.” Etienne Flaherty.

“Urban Minority Students, Language and Reading.” Clifford Hill.

“Language and Reading Comprehension.” Stanley Wanat.
Publications Received


PUBLICATIONS AVAILABLE FROM THE TESOL CENTRAL OFFICE

Reference Guides . . .


Other TESOL Publications . . .


The Acquisition and Use of Spanish and English as First and Second Languages. Roger W. Andersen, ed. Papers from a two-day colloquium at the 12th Annual TESOL Convention in Mexico City. TESOL, 1979. 181 pp. Paper. $5.50 to TESOL members, $6.50 to nonmembers.

On TESOL '78: EFL Policies, Programs, Practices. Charles Blatchford and Jacquelyn Schachter, eds. Selected papers from the Twelfth Annual TESOL Convention in Mexico City. TESOL, 1978. 284 pp. Paper. $7.00 to TESOL members, $8.00 to nonmembers.


Classroom Practices in Adult ESL. Donna Ilyin and Thomas Tragardh, eds. TESOL, 1978. 209 pp. $4.00 to TESOL members, $4.50 to nonmembers.
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Convention Programs. The following convention programs are still available. Each contains the entire program as well as the abstracts of papers presented at that convention.

9th Annual in Los Angeles, 1975. 183 pp.—$2.00 ($1.75) 11th Annual in Miami Beach, 1977. 256 pp.—$2.50 ($2.00) 12th Annual in Mexico City, 1978. 259 pp.—$2.50 ($2.00) 13th Annual in Boston, 1979. 304 pp.—$3.00 ($2.50) 14th Annual in San Francisco, 1980. 380 pp.—$4.00 ($3.50)
From Other Publishers . . .


Back Issues of the TESOL QUARTERLY

(1967) Vol. 1 #4 ........................................ $1.00 each number
(1968) Vol. 2 #1,2,3,4 ........................................ $1.00 each number
(1969) Vol. 3 #2,4 ........................................ $1.00 each number
(1970) Vol. 4 #2,4 ........................................ $2.00 each number
(1971) Vol. 5 #1,3,4 ........................................ $2.00 each number
(1972) Vol. 6 #4 ........................................ $2.00 each number
(1973) Vol. 7 #1,2,3,4 ........................................ $2.00 each number
(1974) Vol. 8 #1,2,3,4 ........................................ $3.00 each number
(1975) Vol. 9 #2,3,4 ........................................ $3.00 each number
(1976) Vol.10 #1,2,3,4 ......................................... $3.00 each number
(1977) Vol.11 #1,2 .......................................... $3.00 each number
(1978) Vol.12 #1,2,3,4 ......................................... $4.00 each number
(1979) Vol.13 #1,2,3,4 ......................................... $4.00 each number

Total for All Volumes, 1-13 ........................................ $98.00

TESOL Newsletter: The complete set of Volume 12 (5 issues for 1978) available for $2.00 prepaid.

There is no charge for single copies of the following:

1. TESOL Statement on statewide programs of competency testing
3. Guidelines for the certification and preparation of teachers of ESOL in the United States
4. Guidelines for selecting English language training programs
5. Guidelines: English language proficiency
6. A Memo: Educating children with limited English
LONGMAN HAS THE BEST REFERENCES

The LONGMAN DICTIONARY OF CONTEMPORARY ENGLISH

Selected as an "Outstanding Reference Book of 1979"
by the American Library Association.

Cloth 525713

"The Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English is the most complete and useful dictionary now on the market for ESL students.

Dr. Richard Yorkey,
TESOL Quarterly, Vol. 13, No. 3

LEARNING WITH LDOCE Workbook 556074
LISTENING WITH LDOCE (1C-40) Cassette 556295
free TEACHER’S GUIDE TO LDOCE

The LONGMAN DICTIONARY OF ENGLISHIDIOMS

- 5000 idioms defined
- 6000 contextual examples
- 4500 cross references
- Complete grammatical descriptions
- Comprehensive usage notes
- Origins of idioms explained

Cloth 555248

The LONGMAN DICTIONARY OF SCIENTIFIC USAGE
A. Godman and E.M.F. Payne

- 10,000 entries
- Thesaurus format
- Contextual examples and cross references
- 125 semantic sets covering Biology, Chemistry, Physics and the Health Sciences
- Detailed diagrams throughout

Departmental libraries, materials developers, and ESP teachers should treat LDSU as one of the fundamental reference works of EST.

Karl Drobinic,
English for Specific Purposes Newsletter, Issue #38

Paper 52587X

To request a complimentary copy of the TEACHER’S GUIDE TO LDOCE, or Sample Sections of the Longman Dictionaries, contact:

Longman English Language Teaching Division
19 West 44th Street, NY, NY 10036
ENGLISH THAT WORKS

• at their first jobs in the U.S.A.
• at their first experiences with American English.

Help Put Adult Learners to Work

Available in 1981, English That Works offers adult learners their first steps up on the employment scale. How? By making the procedures and situations of actual U.S. employment the subject matter for their study of English.

Informal, non-prescriptive, this brand new three-book program puts English on the job from the first page to the last. Your non-native adults will learn what U.S. work skills are, learn the forms and offices that help them apply those skills, learn the English that will make their job interviews successful.

English That Works provides a basic life-coping program that keeps them learning the language that will help keep them employed.

For more information on this program and other adult learning materials, write: Marketing Manager

Scott, Foresman
Lifelong Learning
1900 East Lake Avenue.
Glenview, Illinois 60025

"Quality Materials for a Lifetime of Learning"
FROM COLLIER MACMILLAN

New Routes to English

by GLORIA P. SAMPSON

Collier Macmillan's most recent ESOL series for upper elementary through high school levels is already receiving wide acclaim.
NEW ROUTES TO ENGLISH is a complete teaching program with the most comprehensive Teacher Guides yet devised.

*Functional Approach* Using a spiral curriculum, linguistic structures and functions are introduced, repeated and reinforced throughout the series.

*Comprehensive Teacher Guides* Thoroughly explain lesson plans; provide key activities, reinforcement and enrichment activities; suggest student grouping, evaluation and how to sustain interest and motivation.

*All-inclusive program* Three-level program with 6 student books, 6 workbooks, tapes or cassettes and 6 teacher guides forms a continuous link though each level is complete within itself. Listening, speaking, reading and writing skills are taught at every level.
What's going on in the life of our favorite character?

Find out in this new and exciting reader, a sequel to **NO HOT WATER TONIGHT**...

**NO COLD WATER, EITHER**

by Jean Bodman and Michael Lanzano

Taking over structurally and lexically where **NO HOT WATER TONIGHT** leaves off, **NO COLD WATER, EITHER** contains the same important features:

- A true-to-life story that reflects the anxieties, emotions, and experiences of big city living. An intriguing mystery guarantees continued interest and motivation.
- An emphasis on coping skills. This time a major concern is an understanding of the American legal system and the basic rights of every U.S. citizen. There are also units on handling emergencies, changing apartments, going on job interviews, and many other situations of daily life.
- Creative exercises in vocabulary, comprehension, and structure that encourage independent progress and skillbuilding.

The situations in these fun-to-read passages will really get the conversations going in your classroom.

Join the hundreds of ESOL teachers who rave about these exceptional readers for mature students. You can order **NO HOT WATER TONIGHT** and **NO COLD WATER, EITHER** from:

---

Collier Macmillan International

a Division of Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc.

866 THIRD AVENUE, NEW YORK, N.Y. 10022
WHAT'S NEW?

COLLOQUIAL ENGLISH. HOW TO SHOOT THE BREEZE AND KNÖCK 'EM FOR A LOOP WHILE HAVING A BALL. BY HARRY COLLIS. ILLUSTRATED BY ARNIE LEVIN. COLLOQUIAL TERMS, EXPRESSIONS, AND RE-DUPLICATIVES TREATED. DUE IN EARLY 1981.

PICTURE IT! SEQUENCES FOR CONVERSATION. HIGH BEGINNING TO INTERMEDIATE STUDENTS CAN PRACTICE ENGLISH BY DESCRIBING SEQUENCES OF PICTURES. DUE LATE 1980.

REACT INTERACT BY DONALD R.H. BYRD AND ISIS CLEMENTE-CABETAS. TWENTY-TWO SITUATIONS TO STIMULATE REAL COMMUNICATION. AVAILABLE NOW.

READINGS IN ENGLISH. HIGH INTEREST, UP-TO-DATE READERS TITLED LEISURE, TRAVEL, CAREERS, AND THE ARTS. FOR HIGH BEGINNING TO INTERMEDIATE STUDENTS. DUE LATE 1980—EARLY 1981.

WORDS, WORDS, WORDS BY W.D. SHEELER AND R.W. MARKLEY. TWO NEW BOOKS ON ENGLISH WORD FORMATION AND USAGE. MODULAR LESSONS, A COMPLETE ANSWER KEY. A HANDY DICTIONARY INCLUDED IN BOOK 1. DUE LATE 1980.
To Build
Solid English Language Skills,
Turn To Holt

A REFERENCE GUIDE TO ENGLISH:
AN E.S.L. HANDBOOK
Alice Maclin, Dekalb Community College
Designed to be an indispensable reference tool
for non-native speakers, this handbook is
arranged alphabetically by subject, and is
extensively cross-referenced. While covering
problems common to all writers of English, the
book stresses problems that are particularly
difficult for non-native speakers.
0-03-053226-4, 356 pages, 1981

KEYS TO COMPOSITION: A Guide to
Writing for Students of English as a
Second Language
Susan S. Johnston and Jean Zukowski Faust,
University of Arizona, Center for E.S.L.
This workbook and handbook, designed for
high intermediate and advanced E.S.L.
students, presents matters of style and
the specific mechanical-grammatical points which
cause problems for non-native speakers in
college-level writing. Numerous sample
paragraphs and outlines provide a coherent
system for teaching the basics of expository
writing.
0-03-057978-3, 368 pages, 1981

FROM COPYING TO CREATING
Controlled Compositions and Other
Basic Writing Exercises
Helen Heightsman Gordon, Bakersfield College
A combination workbook and handbook that
 teaches basic writing skills through a series of
stimulating and easily understood controlled-
composition exercises, and offers numerous
topic suggestions for students’ original
compositions.
0-03-053551-4, 240 pages, 1981

THE COPY BOOK
Mastering Basic Grammar and Style
Thomas Friedmann & James MacKillop,
Onondaga Community College
Using an inductive, step-by-step, “copying”
method, this basic English text teaches
mechanics, grammar, usage, and style in
context by requiring students to rewrite short
essays. The text offers simple directions, hints,
and non-technical explanations as well as
interesting essay material.
0-03-051026-0, 296 pages, 1960

FROM SENTENCE TO PARAGRAPH
Steps to Writing Competency for
Intermediate E.S.L. Students
Robert G. Bander
This text provides extensive practice in the
structural principles of writing an English
paragraph emphasizing the outline, the topic
sentence, the controlling idea, unity, and
coherence. It is appropriate for intermediate
E.S.L. classes and for raising native students to
and beyond the minimum competency level in
writing English.
0-03-045641-X, 256 pages, 1980

AMERICAN ENGLISH RHETORIC, 2/e
Robert G. Bander
For your intermediate and advanced students,
this text combines an intensive expository
writing program with a handbook approach to
punctuation, grammar, and vocabulary skills.
0-03-089979-6, 416 pages, 1978

ADVANCED READING AND
WRITING, 2/e
Exercises in English as a Second
Language
Dennis Baumwoll, Bucknell University & Robert
L. Saitz, Boston University
A reader/rhetor for advanced students who
read well but who need additional practice in
using complex language skills.
0-03-089946-X, 237 pages, 1978

MANUAL OF AMERICAN ENGLISH
PRONUNCIATION, 3/e
Clifford Prator, Jr., University of California, Los
Angeles
Revised by Betty Wallace Robinett, University
of Minnesota
0-03-085641-8, 181 pages, 1972

FOR COMPLIMENTARY COPIES, PLEASE
SEND: COURSE TITLE, APPROXIMATE
ENROLLMENT, PRESENT TEXT, AND ISBN #
ON YOUR LETTERHEAD TO:
MARIBETH PAYNE,
HOLT, RINEHART
AND WINSTON
383 MADISON AVENUE
NEW YORK, NY 10017
materials by and for esl teachers

**Communication-Starters and other Activities for the ESL Classroom** (An idea book for teachers)
by Judy E. Winn-Bell Olsen  $5.50

**Communication and Cognition in ESL**
(A Grammar and workbook for intermediate level students)
by Robert G. Breckenridge  4.50

**Careers for Bilinguals**
(A Career oriented curriculum for Adults or High School)
by Zelda V. Oppenheimer

**Everyday English: Cycle I**
(A Survival Course for Beginning Adult ESL)
by Linda Schurer  Teacher’s Guides 9.95
Student Book 4.95

**Learning Another Language Through Actions**
(Reference text for the Total Physical Response method
reviews research, theory and classroom examples.)
by James J. Asher  7.95

**Live Action English for Foreign Students**
(The first classroom text based on James Asher’s TPR method.)
by Elizabeth Romijn and Contee Seely  3.95

**Rhyme and Reason**
(A Reference Handbook of Vowel Sounds and Spelling)
by Louise Marsh  2.95

**Survival Pronunciation: Vowel Contrasts**
(With problem solving activities, illustrations, games and
translations in Spanish, Vietnamese, Korean and Chinese)
by Ellen Hecht and Gerry Ryan  Teacher’s Guide 6.95
Student Workbook 4.50

**Word Ways Gameboards for Oral Language Development**
(Six gameboards for all levels and ages)
by Bryan Benson and Lydia Stack  6.95

**Word Ways Cubes for Oral Language Development**
(Ten Picture Cubes for building sentences.)
by Bryan Benson and Lydia Stack  6.75

*order by mail or by telephone
(415) 661-1515*
NEW FROM NEWBURY HOUSE

READING IN A SECOND LANGUAGE: Hypotheses, Organization and Practice
RONALD MACKAY, BRUCE BARKMAN, R. R. JORDAN, EDITORS. Divided into three parts—Hypotheses, Organization and Practice—this wide-ranging collection of articles provides a coherent picture of current thought and practice in a branch of ESL that is just now being appreciated. READING IN A SECOND LANGUAGE examines how language, and in particular the reading skill, is learned and the materials and techniques that encourage this learning process. $7.95

RESEARCH IN LANGUAGE TESTING
JOHN W. OLLER, JR. AND KYLE PERKINS. RESEARCH IN LANGUAGE TESTING is a compendium of vital information on second language proficiency certain to become a standard reference for linguists, English as a Second Language and Foreign Language teachers. Based on empirical data gathered from hundreds of subjects with varying language backgrounds, it addresses the significant question: Is learning the mother tongue similar to the process of learning a new language? $14.95

TEACHING LANGUAGES: A WAY AND WAYS
EARL W. STEVICK. A penetrating exploration of the language learning process by the author of Memory, Meaning, and Method. The book offers incisive accounts of the thought of such unconventional figures as Gattegno, Curran and Lozanov. Their points of view are illustrated by clear and detailed accounts of classroom practice and techniques, interpreted by references to Becker, Gallwey, Dostoyevsky and others. On another level, this book is a personal and original statement about the role of the language teacher and the experience of learning a language. $11.95

ESL OPERATIONS: Techniques for Learning While Doing
GAYLE L. NELSON AND THOMAS A. WINTERS. Simple instructions for a variety of everyday operations (from setting an alarm clock to writing a check) which will involve ESL students in active communications practice. As Student A reads the operation to Student B, Student B must focus on the message and demonstrate his understanding by performing the required action. The book is designed primarily to help develop mastery of verb forms. $4.95

These and other ESL text and reference materials available from
NEWBURY HOUSE PUBLISHERS
Rowley, Massachusetts 01969 (617) 948-2704
Language Science • Language Teaching • Language Learning
LISTENING IN AND SPEAKING OUT focuses on spontaneous spoken American English with the aim of bridging the gap between “classroom” English and the English that students are likely to encounter on their own.

With LISTENING IN AND SPEAKING OUT, students are given the opportunity to LISTEN IN on recorded conversations among “real” people: people who hesitate, joke, argue, interrupt and even make natural grammatical errors.

The Workbook contains 12 units, each based on two recordings: the Monolog which consists of a short anecdote, and the Discussion which presents an unscripted conversation among four native speakers. A wide variety of activities based on the recordings help build students’ confidence and motivation to SPEAK OUT in English.

Listening In & Speaking Out: Intermediate
Workbook 797357
Cassette (IC-45) 797365
Special Package: (U.S. only) 797705
Book and Cassette in Plastic Tote
Listening In & Speaking Out: Advanced will be published in early 1981.

Longman
American English
19 West 44th Street, New York, N.Y. 10036