TESL REPORTER

Teaching English as a Second Language

Published by
Communication and Language Arts Division
Brigham Young University—Hawaii Campus

Vol. 9 No. 4 Laie, Hawaii Summer 1976

IS THE LANGUAGE LABORATORY DEAD

by Lynn E. Henrichsen

Once upon a time the language laboratory was a mighty oak in the verdant field of audiolingualism. The prognosticators predicted a rosy future for this marvelous teaching machine. Manufacturers of lab equipment flourished as language teachers scrambled to get labs installed in their schools.

That was a generation ago. Today, cognitive learning psychology is in, and behaviorism is out. Communicative competence is the byword, and pattern practice is often regarded with a sneer. An inspection of many rooms which once contained glittering machines and neat rows of student carrels would now reveal dust and dilapidation. Although some labs are making valiant efforts to survive, many modern-day prognosticators write off the language lab as a doomed relic of the audio-lingual past. Hence the question: is the language laboratory dead?

An examination of the lab and its history will help in answering that question. Great things were expected of the language laboratory when it first appeared on the scene with its gleaming steel, sparkling glass, molded plastic, and wonderful wires. Many teachers hoped it would be a cure-all for their language teaching problems.

These great expectations were later followed by an even greater feeling of disillusionment when it was discovered that the lab would not do everything. Besides not being a cure-all, the lab itself created some new problems of its own. The machines seemed to be always breaking down, and who knew how to fix them? Electronic repairmen cost money, and that wasn't in the budget. Machines which break and are not fixed do not aid in the teaching/learning process. They only frustrate. Frustration leads to disenchantment and eventual abandonment.

The original lab tapes were designed to relieve the teacher of conducting pattern-practice drills and to provide an untiring, unfluctuating, native-speaker model for the learner to imitate. The student could go to the lab and repeat patterns until they came

CONTENTS

Is the Language Laboratory Dead
By Lynn E. Henrichsen .... Page 1

Pronunciation Problems Different and Similar Among Cantonese and Mandarin Speakers
By Mo-Shuet Lee .... Page 3

Discrete Structure-Point Testing Problems and Alternatives
By Kenneth G. Aitken .... Page 7

Proverbs and Propredicates in English
By Yao Shen .... Page 10

Goldy Locks or Chocolate Cake?
By Gary R. Oddous .... Page 13

out of his ears. This was good behaviorism. But when the learning theory changed, the tapes, in general, did not. The result was that, even today, whenever anyone thinks of the lab, the repetition of pattern drills come to mind.

Besides becoming outdated, the %@*&$% tapes also broke, got all tangled up, and occasionally even slipped away and unrolled down the aisle. And of course there was always the bother of threading them onto the machine correctly. As the tapes and records gradually wore out, sound quality deteriorated, and there were no more grants to buy new materials.

In retrospect, it is no wonder that the language lab was abandoned by so many. Machines were often not maintained, and they became obsolete as technology advanced. Materials also failed to keep pace with trends in teaching. And, to top it all off, when teachers tired of their new gadgets, they relegated them to lab assistants who were usually minimally-trained, part-time, student workers. Who could expect anything except dissatisfaction? What would happen to any part of a language teaching program if it continued to use generation-old books with torn and missing pages in classes taught only by student assistants?

What is being argued here is that the language laboratory is a tool, and the success or failure of any tool depends upon the way it is used. Used well, the tool should be valuable to more than one teaching method. In other words, the fact that the language laboratory was developed in the heyday of audio-lingualism does not necessarily mean that it is inextricably bound to that method of language teaching and that method only. With a few modifications in the equipment and some imagination and effort on the part of teachers and materials producers, the lab may be just as useful today as it ever was. It is encouraging to note that many current textbook producers are recognizing this fact and providing new types of tapes and tapebooks along with their modern classroom texts.

Concurrently, several advances have been made in recent years in the area of hardware which make laboratories more reliable and manageable. Most notable among these are cassette-style tapes and players and solid-state electronics.* Even "wireless" headphones are available. What the future holds is anyone's guess. Predictable advances include an expanded role of television with video tape cassettes and even video discs being used in language teaching.

Another encouraging fact is the increasing familiarity with electronic sound equipment among the general public and, consequently, among teachers and students. Tape machines are no longer so intimidating, and the idea of a teacher producing his own, high-quality taped materials from "on the street" interviews, radio broadcasts, television programs, and narrated short stories and drama for use in the lab is no longer unthinkable.

Space being a limitation, it will not be possible in this article to discuss all the possibilities of using the language laboratory to support classroom activities. However, those who are contemplating investing in a laboratory or those who now have a lab and are trying to decide whether or not to keep it may be interested in the following candid discussion of advantages and disadvantages of the laboratory. No attempt has been made to order the items as to importance, and a "sales pitch" approach has been avoided. It should be helpful to those who are trying to decide whether or not to expend the effort to bring a dead or dying laboratory back to life.

Mr. Henrichsen, former ESL-Media specialist for the University of Tulsa's English Institute for International Students, is now with the Division of Instructional Development, Department of Education, Pago Pago, American Samoa.

LANGUAGE LAB ADVANTAGES

HIGH VOLUME CAPACITY. Few respectable programs would even think of assigning twenty, thirty, or even forty students to one class-

(continued on page 16)

*Note—At this point it may be important to mention that, despite advances in the field of audio electronics, the student-proof, wear-proof lab has not yet been invented. Anyone who invests in any sort of electronic media support for any educational program should realize that replacement of materials and maintenance and repair of equipment is a factor which cannot be ignored.

PRONUNCIATION PROBLEMS DIFFERENT AND SIMILAR AMONG CANTONESE AND MANDARIN SPEAKERS

by Mo-Shuet Lee

Time and again teachers of foreign languages are reminded of the importance of being aware of the difference between languages, for differences constitute learning problems. The advice is certainly wise and sound. However, the same advice should be carried a step further. Teachers of foreign languages should also be reminded of the importance of being aware, if possible of the nature of the native dialects of their students. Different dialects even of the same language create different learning problems. When Chinese students are taught English, they are thought of as one faceless mass. Too often it has been assumed that they invariably have the same difficulties. The assumption is far from being justifiable, for there are many dialects in the Chinese language.

The major modern Chinese dialects may be divided into the following six groups: Mandarin, Wu, Kan-Hakka, Min, Canton and Hsiang. The Mandarin group may be further divided into three sub-groups: Northern, Southern and Southwestern. The Northern subgroup is spoken in Manchuria, north China proper, Sinkiang, Kansu and parts of Hupeh, Anhwei, and Kiangsu provinces. The dialect of Peking is the best-known member of this sub-group. The Southern subgroup is spoken along the lower Yangtze region in parts of the provinces of Anhwei, Kiangsu, and Hupeh. The Southwestern subgroup is spoken in Szechuan, Yunan, Kweichow, and parts of Hupeh and Kwangsi provinces. The Wu group, which includes the dialects of Shanghai, Wenchow, and Soochow, is spoken in Kiangsu, Chekiang, and eastern Kiangsi provinces. The Kan-Hakka group is spoken in southern Kiangsi provinces and parts of Kwangtung provinces. The Min group, which includes the dialects of Foochow, Amoy, and Swatow, is spoken in northern Fukien and eastern Kwantung provinces, Hainan Island, and Leichow Peninsula. The Cantonese group is spoken principally in Kwangtung and Kwangsi provinces. The Hsiang group is spoken principally in Hunan province. Besides these major groups, there are certain isolated dialects spoken in southern Anhwei, Hunan, and northeastern Kwansi provinces (See Shou-Jung Chan, *Elementary Chinese,* 2nd Edition, Stanford: Stanford University Press), p. xiii.) These dialects are quite different from one another and speakers of different dialects may not be able to understand one another at all. If there were not the same written language, there would be little reason why these dialects should not be recognized as different languages—just as French is a different language from Italian or Spanish.

Mo-Shuet Lee, formerly at San Francisco State University and California State College at Hayward, currently teaches ESL and Mandarin at the City College of San Francisco.

The interest of this paper lies mainly with Cantonese and Mandarin. This is an attempt to highlight some of the similarities and differences between Cantonese and Mandarin with might in turn have an important effect on the language acquistion process of speakers whose native dialects are Cantonese and Mandarin.

One major difference between Cantonese and Mandarin is that Cantonese has preserved the final consonant -p, -t, -k of ancient Chinese, but Mandarin has dropped them. Both Cantonese and Mandarin have stops in their consonants, but whereas Cantonese has these stops both in the initial and in the final positions of a syllable (these stops are unexploded when in the final position) Mandarin only has them in the initial position. In the final position of a Cantonese

syllable, either a vowel, or a nasal or an unexploded /-p/-t/-k/ may occur. The nasal may be either a bilabial /m/, dental-alveolar /n/ or a dorsal-velar / ŋ /. In the final position of a Mandarin syllable, only a vowel or a nasal may occur. The nasal can only be either a dental-alveolar /n/ or a dorsal-velar / ŋ /. Notice that the bilabial /m/, though active in the initial position of a Mandarin syllable, does not occur in the final position. The /n/ in Mandarin is also considerably further back than the Cantonese dental /n/. The combination within a Cantonese syllable, particularly the nature of the syllable final, tends to give Cantonese a rather harsh and staccato characteristic, as compared with the mellow and soft effect produced by Mandarin. Foreigners have often suggested that Cantonese sounds more like German while Mandarin sounds more like French. Compare the following:

	Cantonese			Mandarin		
C V Stop+ Vowel	/ ta/	打	'to hit'	/ t'a/	打	'to hit'
C V Stop +Diphthong	/ tou/	倒	'upside down'	/ tau/	到	'until'
C V C Stop+Vowel+Nasal	/ t'im/	添	'to add'			
	/ t'in/	天	'heaven, sky'	/ t'an/	貪	'to be greedy'
	/ t'i /	停	'to stop'	/ t'a /	湯	'soup'
C V C Stop+Vowel+Stop	/ tap/	答	'to answer'			
	/ pat/	八	'eight'			
	/ pak/	百	'hundred'			
C V C Nasal+Vowel+Nasal	/ nam/	男	'male'			
	/ nan/	難	'difficult'	/ nan/	男	'male'
	/ man/	蠻	'barbarous'	/ man/	蠻	'barbarous'
	/ ma /	盲	'blind'	/ ma /	忙	'(be) busy'
	/ an/	眼	'eyes'			

Also, a velar nasal / ŋ / occurs both in the initial and final positions of a Cantonese syllable, but it never occurs in the initial position of a Mandarin syllable, only in the final position.

As a result of these differences in the format of a syllable in their own dialects, Cantonese and Mandarin speakers are faced with dissimilar problems when they are trained to master the English language. Since Cantonese speakers are used to having stops in syllable final positions, they have no difficulty in the initial acquisition of the pronunciation of stops in syllable final position in English. However, as the stops in syllable final position in Cantonese are unreleased, it is impossible to produce a voiced-voiceless contrast. Therefore the speakers of Cantonese are conditioned not to perceive or produce this important contrast in English. The habit of the unreleased stop automatically preceded by a short vowel transferred to English produces many homophones: "rope" and "robe" are often pronounced [rop]; "mate" and "maid" are pronounced [met]; "dock" and "dog" are pronounced [dok]. This habit is undoubtedly the most prominent feature of Cantonese English: it characterizes the speech of many and is the hardest to overcome. Others may have better control with the English diphthongs in front of the stops, but nonetheless still show difficulty in perceiving or producing the voiced-voiceless contrast in the syllable final position.

On the other hand, Mandarin speakers are faced with a totally different language habit when they find stops in the syllable final position. As has been explained, stops only occur in the syllable initial position in Mandarin, before a vowel. Their natural reaction to the new language is one of the following two. They either tend to miss out the stops altogether if there are nasals preceding the stops as in "wind" and "bank"—"wind" [wɪnd] resembles [wɪn or [wɪŋ], and "bank" resembles [bæn] or [bæŋ]. Or they add /ə/ to all the stops. For example, they will pronounce "map" [mæp] as [mæpə]; "Jude" [dʒu d] as [dʒu də]; and "coke" [kouk] as [koukə]. When the syllable final is an [m] in English, the Mandarin speakers might substitute it with an [n], e.g. "sum" [sʌm] as "sun" [sʌn].

The second major difference between Cantonese and Mandarin is that Cantonese does not have any retroflexed articulation, but Mandarin does. The absence of the retroflexed articulation in Cantonese results in the speakers' inability to perceive the /l–r/ contrast in English as in "loyal", "royal"; "collect", "correct"; "play" and "pray". Even when they can perceive the contrasts, they have difficulty showing the contrasts when they attempt the pairs. The English /r/ is often replaced by an /l/. In this respect, the Mandarin speakers have an advantage. They have retroflexed articulation in their native dialect. For instance, [ˊren] 人 'a man'; [run] 潤 'moist' and [ˊrou] 柔 'soft, gentle'.

Cantonese and Mandarin also differ in that Cantonese has one fricative fewer than Mandarin. Cantonese only has the dental-alveolar fricative /s/; Mandarin has both the dental-alveolar fricative /s/ and the palato-alveolar / /.

	Cantonese			Mandarin		
/s/	[sam]	三	'three'			
	[san]	山	'hill'	[san]	三	'three'
	[sa]	生	'to give birth to: be unfamiliar with'	[sa]	喪	'funeral'
				[an]	山	'hill'
				[a]	商	'commerce, trade'

Consequently, Cantonese speakers encounter difficulty in separating in perception and production such pairs as "see", "she"; "parcel", "partial". "Sugar" [ʃʊːgə] is ever so often mispronounced as [sʊːgə]. Even after perception improves, there is difficulty in articulating these contrasts. Mandarin speakers, naturally, are fortunately spared another burden generally suffered by Cantonese speakers.

In spite of the disparities already described between Cantonese and Mandarin, there is nevertheless some common ground where Cantonese and Mandarin speakers fight the same battle. It has been pointed out that Cantonese has one fricative less than Mandarin, but still there are several more fricatives that English has which both Cantonese and Mandarin do not have. Cantonese has the labio-dental voiceless /f/, dental-alveolar voiceless /s/ and the glottal /h/; Mandarin has the labio-dental voiceless /f/, dental-alveolar voiceless /s/; palato-alveolar voiceless /ʃ/ and the glottal /h/. English, however, has both the voiced and voiceless labio-dental /v/ and /f/; voiced and voiceless interdental /ð/ and /θ/; voiced and voiceless dental-alveolar /z/ and /s/; voiced and voiceless palato-alveolar /ʒ/ and /ʃ/ and also the glottal /h/. Both Cantonese and Mandarin speakers therefore are inclined to replace fricatives in English absent intheir own dialects with those that are present. They often replace /v/ and /θ/ by /f/; and /s, z/—for Cantonese speakers also /ʃ/—by /s/. Because of the dental quality in the Cantonese and Mandarin [t], /ð/ is often replaced by the unaspirated /t/. /ʒ/ is often replaced by a retracted variety of /s/ which

is very close to /s/. Also interesting to notice is that the voiced labio-dental /v/ is not only substituted by its voiceless version of /f/; it is also frequently substituted by the semi-vowel /w/, so that no distinction is preceived or produced between such pairs as "vest", "west"; and "vain", "wane".

Cantonese and Mandarin also share the similarity that they do not have voiced stops in their dialects, such as /b,d,g/ in English. They are aspirated and unaspirated /p,t,k/ instead. With English stops, aspiration is not phonemic, but determined by the phonetic context. In the initial position of a syllable, /p,t,k/ are generally aspirated as in "pin" [p'in], "tin" [t'in], "kin" [k'in] and "akin" [ək'in]. No aspiration occurs when the voiceless stops /p,t,k/ are preceded by /s/, e.g. "spin" [spin], "sting" [stiŋ] and "skin" [skin]. In Cantonese and Mandarin, the aspiration in /p,t,k/ is phonemic, as shown in the following minimal pairs:

	Cantonese			Mandarin		
[p]	/ pi /	兵	'soldier'	/ pa /	幫	'to help'
[p']	/ p' /	拼	'to struggle'	/ p'a /	膀	'swollen'
[t]	/ t /	丁	'a male'	/ ta /	當	'to act as'
[t']	/ t' /	聽	'to hear'	/ t'a /	湯	'soup'
[k]	/ k /	經	'to pass by'	/ ka /	剛	'firm and strong'
[k']	/ k' /	傾	'to incline'	/ k'a /	康	'health'

Since /b,d,g/ do not exist in Cantonese or Mandarin, the speakers often substitute unaspirated /p,t,k/ for these phonemes. The unaspirated /p/ in "spring" [spriŋ] and the voiced /b/ in "bring" [briŋ] are indistinguishable to the Cantonese and Mandarin speakers.

The English dark /l/ is also a common problem for both Cantonese and Mandarin speakers. The English phoneme /l/ has the two allophones of clear [l] and dark [ɫ]. The use of the allophones is determined by the phonetic environment. Clear /l/ is used when /l/ occurs initially or in an intervocalic position, and dark /ɫ/ for final positions or followed by another consonant. The /l/ in Cantonese and Mandarin, on the other hand, is always a clear /l/. It is a sound which does not occur finally in Cantonese or Mandarin. Therefore, the Cantonese speakers and Mandarin speakers often have difficulty in articulating the final /l/'s in English words. They often replace the dark /l/ by a clear /l/ or a variety of /u/ because of the acoustic affinity of [u] and [ɫ], both being produced with the back of the tongue raised towards the velum.

Finally, length and tension are not phonemic in both the Cantonese and Mandarin vowels. Consequently, speakers of both dialects tend to be unable to perceive and recognize the difference between long and short vowels in English. Much too often, they pronounce as homophones the following pairs in English: "fill", "fell"; "sit", "seat"; "wick", "weak".

In summation, it should not be assumed that all Chinese native speakers have the same learning problems with English. Chinese is a language with many dialects and some dialects may differ as much from some other dialect as do some languages from some other language. For example, it is not unusual for Cantonese and Mandarin speakers to converse in English in order to be mutually intelligible. Cantonese and Mandarin are vastly different in several areas, though similar in some others. It is advisable for the teacher of English to be aware of this fact and thus be better quipped to help these students.

DISCRETE STRUCTURE-POINT TESTING: PROBLEMS AND ALTERNATIVES

by Kenneth G. Aitken

This paper is intended to present some reasons for reconsidering the use of discrete structure point tests of language proficiency. It is also intended to suggest an alternative basis for designing proficiency tests.

Perhaps to begin it would be useful to define some terms used in language testing. Language tests have been divided into four categories based on their use. Language aptitude tests are used to predict probable success or failure in certain kinds of language study. Language achievement tests are used to determine how effective teaching has been, or how much of what has been taught has been learned. Diagnostic tests point out areas in which a student requires additional concentrated teaching and study. Language proficiency tests indicate whether or not an individual is proficient enough in a language to perform certain tasks or undertake certain training programs in the target language. As we previously stated, the focus of this paper is on proficiency testing.

John B. Carroll (1961) has divided proficiency tests into two types: "discrete structure point" (or "discrete point") and "integrative" tests. "Discrete point" tests are based on the assumption that there are a given number of specific structure points, the mastery of which constitutes "knowing" a language. On the other hand an "integrative" test is one based on the premise that "knowing" a language must be expressed in some type of functional statement such as, 'He knows enough English to read the paper, but not enough to follow the news on television!' (Spolsky 1968).

Discrete point tests tap those areas that linguists include in linguistic competence: vocabulary knowledge, recognition of correct grammatical structures, sound discrimination, etc.–in other words, the mechanics of the language. Integrative tests, Jakobovits (1970) contends, tap communicative competence factors–i.e. those factors crucial to how a language is used for communicative purposes.

There is reason to believe that the discrete point approach to language proficiency testing, one of the primary tools of disciples of the audio-lingual method of teaching a foreign language, is based on erroneous assumptions. The discrete point approach is fundamental to the approach taken by Fries (1952) and Lado (1957) who pioneered the audio-lingual method.

The discrete point approach to language teaching and testing rests on both traditional verbal learning theory (Dulay and Burt, 1972) and American structuralist linguistic theory (Oller 1973 a). The basic assumptions are:

(1) The surface structure of a language can be systematically described, and its elements listed and compared with any other language, similarly described.

(2) The mastery of a language may be divided into the mastery of a number of separate skills; listening, speaking, reading, and writing. These skills in turn may be divided into a number of distinct items. It assumes that to have developed a criterion level of mastery of skills and items listed for that language (e.g. 50,000 discrete items) is mastery of the language.

(3) The contrastive analysis hypothesis, (which states that if language learning is habit formation, where L2 is similar to L1 there will be a positive transfer of learning, and where L2 and L1 differ there will be a negative transfer: i.e. mother tongue interference) is true.

It has been convincingly argued by others that on theoretical and empirical grounds the contrastive analysis hypothesis is unsound (Dulay and Burt 1972, Upshur 1962, and Wardhaugh 1970). In this paper we will focus our attention on assumptions (1) and (2) as these ideas continue to prevail while the number of adherents to the CA hypothesis dwindles.

There are serious theoretical objections to assumption (1) because it assumes that knowledge of a language is finite in the sense that it is possible to make a list of all its items. However, if such an impossible task were completed, and a discrete point test constructed based on a representative sample of the language the test would be too long to be practical. On the other hand anything less than a representative sample of the total language would significantly affect the validity of the tests as a determiner of language proficiency. The criterion for composing the representative sample would have to be on the basis of functional necessity, which involves defining the functional load of ability, for example, to recognize the appropriateness of a given verb form. Spolsky (1968 b) argues that to do this we would have to collect a list of minimal pair utterances in which the distinction is vital: that is, where a single linguistic difference in a given situation will lead to complete misunderstanding--an extremely rare situation. The rarity of such a situation is the result (and theoretical cause) of the redundancy of natural languages.

The second assumption is, according to Spolsky (1968 b), crucial to this approach to testing:

> The key assumption of the discrete-point approach is that it is possible to translate sentences. . . .(like) "He doesn't know enough English to write an essay, but he seems to be able to follow lectures and read his textbooks without much trouble.". . . .into a list of sentences. . . . .(like) "He is unable to distinguish between the phonemes /i/ and /iy/.",. . . .The key requirement of discrete point testing is that we could quantify "He knows the words on this list." (1968 b:92)

Research by Spolsky et al. (1968) and other psycholinguists has isolated the ability to utilize the redundancy of natural language as a factor in "knowing" a language even in situations of reduced redundancy. Redundancy is the property of natural languages that allows one to predict missing elements from the context (Carroll 1964:44-65). Highly redundant messages tend to be repetitive and to contain relatively little information per element. By "information" is meant the informativeness of the elements (Shannon and Weaver 1949). Since the redundancy factor in natural language allows us to predict missing elements in a message or utterance, then the greater the redundancy, the greater the chance the message will be comprehended. A model of understanding speech must then include the ability to make valid guesses about a certain percentage of unknown items in the language.

Kenneth G. Aitken, a former BATESL major at Church College of Hawaii (now Brigham Young University-Hawaii Campus) is an ESL instructor at Vancouver Community College in Vancouver, B.C., Canada, where he is working on the testing and placement of ESL students.

Spolsky (1968 a) contends that this raises some serious theoretical questions about the value of deciding a person knows a language because he knows certain items in the language, i.e. assumption (2). The principle of redundancy suggests that it will not be possible to demonstrate that any given language item is essential to successful communication, nor to establish the functional load to any given item in communication as discussed previously.

Looking at it from another angle, we note that assumption (2) has roots in the hypothesis that the meaning of a linguistic form is defined as the situation in which the speaker utters that form and the response it calls forth in the hearer (Bloomfield 1933:139). Oller, Sales and Harrington (1969:318) argue that this definition is both misleading and inadequate. The meaning of a linguistic unit in any communicative situation, they state, cannot be adequately construed as a given speaker's situation and hearer's response; rather it is dependent on (1) at least one individual's history of experience with that unit in other situations, and (2) the inductive-deductive

processes which enable that individual to relate the information from his history of experience to the situation in question. This definition places a premium upon the role of one's personal experience bank in language use. Assumption (2) does not take into account the role of previous personal experience in the assignment of meaning in language use. Counter evidences to this assumption are utterances like "Why don't you wipe that silly grin off your face," which rely heavily upon the listener's previous personal experience to provide him with the criteria for an appropriate response.

As Belasco (1969) has observed, many points of grammar all well learned, but learned separately and unrelatedly do not constitute proficiency in a language. In fact, they cannot in principle. Language is essentially different in type from any list of discrete items. The essence of discrete point fallacy, argues Oller (1973), is the incorrect assumption that a test of many isolated and separate points of grammar or lexicon is a test of language in any realistic sense.

It seems that the discrete point approach to objectively test language proficiency is not the pedagogical panacea many language teachers had assumed. It is unfortunate that so many have made the much stronger claim that the discrete point approach is the best basis for language test design.

Having examined some of the theoretical problems relating to the discrete structure point approach to testing, we shall turn our attention to the integrative test approach. Our object, we must remember, is to develop an approach to testing that can be used in making proficiency examinations. Proficiency tests, we defined as being used to tell us whether or not an individual is proficient enough in a language to perform certain tasks, or to undertake a certain training program in that language. Our previous discussion suggests the impossibility of determining language proficiency in linguistic terms. A more promising approach might be to work for a functional definition of levels of proficiency. In other words, we do not aim at how much of a language the student knows, but rather, we test his ability to operate in a specified sociolinguistic situation with specified ease or effect.

Spolsky (1968 b) suggests that starting with functional statements of this sort, the language tester's task is to find a reliable, valid, and economical method of rating a student's proficiency in these terms. He proposes a two stage research strategy. First, ignoring costs in time and money, the tester should have the subject evaluated by trained panels of judges in situations of the sort described functionally in the rating scale. Then these evaluations become the yardstick to which more economical measures are correlated. The degree of correlation will reflect the value of the ad hoc tests and make clear the degree of doubt that must be kept in their interpretation.

Oller (1973 b), realizing that language teachers cannot wait for linguists to solve all the problems and theoretical issues involved, recommends several tests of integrative skills, especially cloze tests and dictation, both types of tests requiring control of the natural redundancy of language. Another integrative test involving error recognition was recommended by Sibayan (1971).

Cloze tests (Taylor 1973), originally conceived as reading comprehension and/or readability measure, are constructed by systemetically deleting every n-th word from a prose passage. In foreign languages, every seventh word is usually deleted over a passage of about 375 words, leaving the first and last sentences intact. The subject must read the mutilated passage and, based on his comprehension of it, and his language experience, guess the deleted words. The score is based on the percentage of correct guesses. Another scoring method involves accepting any contexually acceptable answer. Answers in both scoring methods must not violate any grammatical restrictions. Oller (1973 c) and his reference provide an excellent background and review of the use of cloze in ESL, including several validation studies.

Cloze tests can be constructed that are criterion based in relation to the situation in which the students are being trained to function (Aitken 1975). For example, if we were preparing a group of foreign engineering students to enter a post-graduate program in civil engineering, the prose passages we used to create the cloze test might be chosen from

(continued on page 18)

PROVERBS AN

by Yao Shen

This is the last of three related articles by Dr. Yao Shen, Profes

Proverbs and propredicates are features in grammar. Similar to pronouns (pro-nouns) which substitute for nouns, proverbs (pro-verbs) substitute for verbs or verb strings, and propredicates (pro-predicates) substitute for predicates. Such substitution is one of the grammatical functions of the auxiliaries and the modals in English. In this article, auxiliaries: *do, have,* and *be*; and modals: *can* and *will* are used to illustrate this function of substitution.

		Verb	
1a.	My mainland friends	*gobble*	macadamia nuts the way
b.	they	*do*	peanuts.

		Verb	
2a.	John	*likes*	Hawaii the way
b.	he	*does*	the mainland.

		Verb	
3a.	Mary	*respected*	her teachers the way
b.	she	*did*	her parents.

In each of the following examples, auxiliaries: *do, have,* and *be*; and modals: *can* and *will* in the second simple predicate (b) substitute for the verb string in the first one (a).

1 a. My mainland friends *do gobble* macadamia nuts the way
b. they *do* peanuts.

2 a. John *does like* Hawaii the way
b. he *does* the mainland.

3 a. Mary *did respect* her teachers the way
b. she *did* her parents.

4 a. Men *have learned* from books they way
b. they *have* from each other.

5 a. Men *are living* in houses they way
b. termites *are* in mounds.

6 a. Children *are loved* by their parents the way
b. they *are* by their teachers.

7 a. Some people *can eat* with chopsticks the way
b. others *can* with knives and forks.

8 a. John *would protect* his friends the way
b. he *would* himself.

9 a. Mary *has been studying* with Alice the way
b. John *has (been)* with Paul.

D PROPREDICATES IN ENGLISH

sor of English as the University of Hawaii, author of numerous articles and publications and a frequent contributor to the TESL Reporter.

10 a. Passengers *are being examined* at the airport the way
b. packages *are* at the post office

11 a. Our compositions *would have been graded* by the professors the way
b. our sentences *would (have been)* by the assistants.

In each of the following examples, the auxiliary or the modal which is the predicate of the second simple sentence (b) substitutes for the predicate of the first one (a).

1 a. I *think* the way
b. you *do.*

2 a. Martha *studies English* the way
b. Mary *does.*

3 a. John *felt adversely toward smoking* the way
b. Paul *did.*

4 a. John *has lived frugally* the way
b. you *have.*

5 a. I *am flying to the mainland* the way
b. everyone else *is.*

6 a. The windows *were closed securely* the way
b. the door *was.*

7 a. Martha *can do anything here*
b. if Mary *can.*

8 a. John *will catch the bus to school*
b. if Jim *will.*

9 a. John *has been calling Mary* as *frequently* as
b. you *have (been).*

10 a. Students *are being taken care of* as *much in detail* as
b. their papers *are.*

11 a. John *could have gone far*ther than
b. you *could (have).*

12 a. Martha *would have been studying* as *hard* as
b. Mary *would (have).*

13 a. The women *would have been paid* as *adequately* as
b. the men *would (have been).*

Five different kinds of situations (A-E) in which propredicates often occur are given below. Needless to say, they are not the only five in the English language in which a propredicate may occur.

A. Answers to yes-no questions usually occur with a propredicate.

Yes-no questions	Answers:	
1. *Did* Peter *come?*	1. Yes, he *did.*	No, he *didn't.*
2. *Do* you *speak English?*	2. Yes, I *do.*	No, I *don*'t.
3. *Has*n't Mary *done the dishes?*	3. Yes, she *has.*	No, she *hasn*'t.
4. *Was* the door *closed* on time?	4. Yes, it *was.*	No, it *wasn*'t.
5. *Are*n't they *finishing* their work?	5. Yes, they *are.*	No, they *aren*'t.
6. *Could* Larry *give me a ride?*	6. Yes, he *could.*	No, he *couldn*'t.
7. *Will* they *be on the plane?*	7. Yes, they *will.*	No, they *will* not.

B. Tag-questions normally occur with a propredicate.

1. Kathie *paints, does*n't she?
2. Carol *didn*'t *buy anything, did* she?
3. Juliet *hasn*'t *seen her teacher, has* she?
4. The letter *was typed by the secretary, was*n't it?
5. Henry *was having fun, was*n't he?
6. Mark *can pick me up, can*'t he?
7. Joe *will not go away, will* he?

C. Statements are often responded to with a propredicate.

Speaker A:	Speaker B:	
1. Martha *dances.*	1. She *does.*	1. She *does* not.
2. John *knew English.*	2. He *did.*	2. He *did* not.
3. Mary *has finished her work.*	3. She *has.*	3. She *has* not.
4. Dinner *is being served.*	4. It *is.*	4. It *is* not.
5. I *was thinking of you.*	5. You *were.*	5. You *were* not.
6. We *can go home now.*	6. We *can.*	6. We *can*not.
7. They *would laugh at me.*	7. They *would.*	7. They *would* not.

D. When two affirmative statements with the same simple predicate are joined by . . .*and.* . .*too,* the second statement often occurs with a propredicate.

1. Teachers *study,* and students *do* too.
2. I *saw John,* and you *did* too.
3. Henry *has gone home,* and Carol *has* too.
4. The cookies *were baked yesterday,* and the pie *was* too.
5. John *is coming to the party,* and Mary *is* too.
6. Michael *can take me in his car,* and Larry *can* too.
7. Alice *would help me,* and Paul *would* too.

E. When two negative statements with the same simple predicate are joined by . . . *and*. . .*either,* the second statement often occurs with a propredicate.

1. Teachers *do*n't *study,* and students *do*n't either.
2. I *did*n't *see John,* and you *did*n't either.
3. Henry *has*n't *gone home,* and Carol *has*n't either.
4. The cookies *were*n't *baked yesterday,* and the pie *was*n't either.
5. John *is*n't *coming to the party,* and Mary *is*n't either.
6. Michael *could*n't *take me in his car,* and Larry *could*n't either.
7. Alice *wouldn't help me,* and Paul *would*n't either.

In an expanded sentence, the tense in the proverb or in the propredicate in the second simple sentence need not be the same as the tense in the first simple one.

1. Our parents *loved* us the way they *do* their grandchildren now.
2. Few Hawaiians *live* now the way they *did.*
3. John *called* Mary every week, and he still *does.*
4. Students *have* been studying the way they *had* (been).
5. John *was* teaching, and he still *is.*
6. Mary *could* speak English fluently the way you *can.*
7. I *will* tell Mary the story the way you *would.*

In an expanded sentence, the proverb or propredicate in the second simple sentence need not be the same auxiliary or modal as that in the first one.

1. I *have* always liked my teachers the way I *do* my parents.
2. Mary *is* teaching conscientiously the way she always *has.*
3. John *can* be asking for you the way he *did* a while ago.
4. I *will* study harder than you *are* now.
5. Alice *would* have finished the shopping sooner than you *have.*
6. Paul *did* work faster than vou ever *could.*

In an expanded sentence, the proverb or propredicate in the simple sentence need not be the same in the affirmative or negative as that in the first one.

1. I *have not* cooked with electricity the way you *have* with gas.
2. John *is* having a good time the way Mary *is not.*

Proverbs and propredicates help a person's English from being repetitious, cumbersome, and monotonous through grammar. They merit attention in English language learning.

BOOK REVIEW

Anderson, Cora *English Idioms and Idiomatic Expressions, Workbook 1* 219 pp. paperback Book Marketing Ltd.

This very practical book of sixty lessons on the English idiom should prove useful to both ESL teachers and students.

Each lesson has five idioms with explanations and examples, a fill-in exercise, a writing exercise, and three idiomatic expressions with definitions. At the end of ten lessons, there are five Review Lessons compiled from two lessons each. Included in these lessons are fill-in exercises for both idioms and idiomatic expressions, and a composition exercise (where students must write original sentences using the idioms).

Chinese students may find the idiom index with approximate Chinese translations for all idioms and idiomatic expressions helpful.

This book may be ordered direct from Book Marketing Ltd. Tung Chon Factory Building, 653 King's Road, 9th floor, North Point, Hong Kong.

No price was quoted, but the editor was assured the books would be less than $1.50 American currency.

Alice C. Pack

GOLDY LOCKS OR CHOCOLATE CAKES?

by Gary R. Oddous

Goldy Locks or chocolate cakes may not have an integral part in most classrooms, but they have become ways to actively interest and engage students in meaningful and imaginative conversation.

As many other authors have noted in the *TESL Reporter,* conversation is only progressive to the point that it interests and encourages the student in an active expression of the target language.

Having taught ESL to the French people, adults and teenagers, I have found that "story telling," and the demonstration of a student's favorite recipe, are two ways to activate the student's desire to speak and learn a language.

Story telling is based on the idea that both student and teacher are somewhat familiar with the story to be told. Universal children's stories are excellent for this, such as *Goldy Locks, The Three Bears,* etc. Familiarity with the story gives both the student and teacher a framework from which to work. Before—usually the day before—each story is told, the students are warned which story will be chosen so that they can refresh their memories and mentally prepare the dialog of the story.

When first introducing this method, I have found it best to group four to six capable students in front of the class as a demonstration group. The teacher starts, then calls on each succeeding student in the group so that each might have an equal part in telling the story. The purpose of such a demonstration group is only to show the other students how it is done.

There are two variations of the story telling method which I have found to be successful. One is to place a group in front of the class (like the demonstration group) and, after the story is told, class members ask previously prepared questions about the story which they direct to specific members of the group who told the story. Students are encouraged to ask imaginative questions. For example, with *The Three Bears,* students have asked: "How old was the baby bear?" or, "What color was the bear's house?" Such questions are not contained in the actual dialog of the story, but encourage the students to think on their own. Such a method also facilitates a conversation between fellow students. They become the instigators of conversation, not the teacher. It also gives the narrators a chance to hear and understand a fellow student's question, then to provide, or invent, an answer. The teacher must preface, however, that they answer in complete sentences.

Another variation possible is to break the class up into groups of four or five students, and to have each group tell an assigned story. However, students should have the chance to choose their stories first. Then, instead of asking each other questions, the students are encouraged to be imaginative and to add details to the story that aren't actually in it.

The underlying theory of such a conversational method is two fold: 1) The student will speak more easily if the dialog is already familiar to him, thus encouraging success which begins to carry over into more original, spontaneous speech. 2) Each student sees himself as an integral part of the goal to complete a story, and most of all, to do it well. Each student begins to take pride in his part, making it as flawless as possible, and use his imagination, both by inventing details within the story, and by asking imaginative questions.

This conversational method has proved to aid students who are shy, as well as those who are more bold. Shy students find this method easy and fun. They have a pretext to speak. They don't have to answer the teacher; instead, they answer and converse among themselves. Once they gain confidence in themselves, and are aware that others see and hear

them speak, they shed their shyness and become some of the most enthusiastic students.

On the other hand, the more bold students begin to perfect their already mildly fluent speech. They can use their minds to delve deeper into imaginative situations, which usually means delving deeper into English grammar and idiom.

Another method to encourage conversation is through the demonstration of a favorite recipe. Each student is asked to prepare his favorite recipe in English, and to demonstrate it in front of the class explaining the process and going through the motions of its preparation. Such a demonstration requires the student not only to learn new vocabulary, but to explain a process, which requires transitional elements and often requires the use of many English idioms.

Gary Oddous, a student at the Provo Campus of the Brigham Young University, is currently completing an M.A. in TESL.

In order to help create situational language use, the teacher should bring some basic culinary utensils to class which the students can use while demonstrating the recipes.

Male and female students alike find this an enjoyable way to use the language. It is interesting for every one to hear these recipes from different parts of the world.

Several variations as sequential follow-ups can result from the original demonstrations: 1) The next week, each student who demonstrated a recipe can actually bring the product for others to taste and see what the demonstration represented. 2) Students observing the demonstration can be asked to take notes on the demonstration then try to make the dish at home and bring it the following week. (This tests the exactness of communication between demonstrator and observer.) 3) The recipe can be duplicated and handed to each student after which already prepared foods from the recipe are given to the students to try.

The emphasis on the actual preparation of the recipes is to give a meaningful insistence to the simulated demonstration. Students enjoy using language for meaningful purposes. The psychological aspect of a physical representation, such as food, of one's efforts in a second language, is rewarding to the students. It creates a real-life situation and a relaxing and sometimes humorous atmosphere results in the language-learning setting.

Such methods as these, however, obviously are not answers to all of the conversational needs of the ESL classroom. Rather, they are examples of an underlying theory much needed in the ESL setting. The demonstration of a recipe, an explanation of how to repair a flat tire, and a story-telling experience in which the student is an integral link, provide the student with a meaningful experience of involvement in the target language.

The teacher himself must feel he has an important part in the act of the student's language acquisition. A book with blanks requiring lexical fills does not create a meaningful experience for the student—teachers can and must create those experiences for students. The classroom is a place in which the student should learn for himself that a second language isn't just a classroom language, but one that can be meaningful *outside* the classroom and one that actually exists to be so used.

TESL REPORTER

A quarterly publication of the Communication and Language Arts Division of the Brigham Young University—Hawaii Campus.

Editor . . . . Alice C. Pack
Staff . . . . Kenyon Moss
Lorraine Swapp

Articles relevant to teaching English as a Second Language in Hawaii, the South Pacific and Asia, may be submitted to the editor through Box 157, Brigham Young University Hawaii Campus, Laie, Oahu, Hawaii 96762. Manuscripts should be double-spaced and typed, not exceeding six pages.

BOOK REVIEWS

Richard A. Via. *English in Three Acts* Price $5.95

The University Press of Hawaii, 1976 paperback 180 pages

This carefully planned text is a must for teachers of intermediate and advanced students of oral English.

Richard Via, a theatre professional for twenty-three years, explains and helps the teacher with the preparation so necessary for successful use of drama in the classroom.

In addition to seven original plays and numerous other suggested plays which teachers may want to use, the book explains the purpose of drama in the classroom, gives numerous preparatory suggestions–including breathing and voice exercises, improvisations, and other classroom exercies.

Amateur dramatists will find the book's numerous suggestions for ESL casting, scene study, makeup, etc. extremely helpful. Included, too, are twenty-two answers to questions often asked by ESL teachers who want to add drama to their other oral teaching skills in the classroom.

This excellent text fills a long felt need in the ESL field.

Alice C. Pack

Jean A. McConochie. *Twentieth Century American Short Stories* Price $2.60

Collier Macmillan, 1975. paperback 123 pages

This is a good supplementary text for advanced reading students. It consists of nine American short stories from this century. Three of these are divided into two parts. Each of the twelve chapters contains accompanying material to be used in furthering student understanding of the material read. The glossary for each story contains words or idioms that are usually not familiar to even vanced student. Vocabulary, grammar, and syntax exercises accompany each section. Biographical notes on each of the story authors are found at the end of the book.

Kenyon Moss

Bertha C. Neustadt. *Speaking of the USA: A Reader for Discussion.* Price $4.95

Harper and Row, 1975 paperback 275 pages

An intermediate to advanced level text with 21 chapters in seven different areas: libraries, American government, the news media, the arts, education and the family, politics, and a conclusion. The seven sections each have at least two chapters. Each chapter is followed by exercises designed to help increase vocabulary in addition to reading and listening comprehension. There are also discussion and composition topics at the end of the chapters.

Additional exercises on vocabulary appear at the end of each section. Dictation and listening comprehension relating to each chapter are located at the end of the book.

This reader is designed to prepare students for college by helping them develop study skills needed at the university level. It also introduces them to some cultural aspects of of America.

Kenyon Moss

IS THE LANGUAGE LAB DEAD?

(continued from page 2)

room or teacher; yet this number of students is what a language laboratory normally handles. This means economy in the long run. The initial hardware and software costs are offset by savings in the area of teacher salaries.

HIGH FACE VALUE. A language lab look impressive in program brochures and to visitors. It makes even a new and inexperienced program appear professionally established. Students also feel that they are getting more for their money when they see all the expensive equipment available for their use.

COINCIDENCE OF PROGRAMS. Most labs are able to play several programs at once and allow the students or teacher to select the one they need most. Thus, the experienced lab teacher can conduct several classes at the same time.

INDIVIDUALIZATION. Especially in a library-style laboratory, the student has more freedom in choosing his own program of learning and is able to move ahead at his own rate of speed.

LAB AS AN EXTRA. Students who might never sign up for an eight-hour class do not seem so awed by a four-hour class supplemented with an additional four hours of lab, especially if an attempt is made to make the lab work interesting and meaningful.

SCHEDULING FLEXIBILITY. Students do not always have to go to lab together with all the other members of their particular class. The scheduling of "lab hour" may be flexible and fit into their class schedule wherever it is most convenient.

EXPOSURE TO NATIVE SPEAKERS. This is a particular advantage to programs located in areas where very few or no native speakers of the target language are available. Lab exposure to native speakers may be in drill or in communicative situations.

EXPOSURE TO A VARIETY OF SPEAKERS. Even in programs which have native-speaker teachers, the exposure to different native-speaker pronunciations and voices is a definite advantage in preparing students for the real world.

CONSISTENCY OF INFORMATION. All students who listen to the same tape hear the same lesson, regardless of their position in the classroom, the hour of the class, or the mood of the instructor.

ACCOUNTABILITY. Although the value of some types of laboratory practice may be debated, there is little argument about the definite accountability of laboratory practice. The student who has been to a well-supervised lab for an hour has had an hour of practice. There is no guarantee that the student sent out on his own "to talk to people" has done anything worthwhile.

TEACHER FREEDOM. Without interrupting other students in the group, the teacher is free to concentrate on an individual student and his particular problems while the group's teaching program continues.

SENSE OF ISOLATION. The use of carrels and headphones gives a sense of isolation which is often helpful. Shy students who avoid speaking in a classroom group situation need no longer be afraid of others hearing their errors. This sense of isolation is often an effective aid to concentration also.

PHYSICAL FACILITY. A large, acoustically well-designed room with individual carrels may be useful for more than listening to tapes. It is often an ideal area for testing (listening comprehension or other skills). The privacy afforded by carrels makes looking at another student's paper less of a temptation. Also, in a program using a number of small classrooms it may be the only large room and a reasonable substitute for an auditorium.

LANGUAGE LABORATORY DISADVANTAGES

EXPENSE. The cost of quality materials and equipment is increasing along with everything else. Although the lab may pay for itself in saved teacher salaries over a period of time, the initial cost is sometimes prohibitive for small or beginning programs. The continual expense of materials replacement and equipment repair must also be taken into consideration.

OUTDATED MATERIALS. Many of the available commercial tapes are pattern-practice relics which, besides being at odds with many current teaching methods, are usually boring to students and deadening to their motivation to learn.

STILTED SPEECH. Many voices on prepared tapes are artificial in both pronunciation and grammar. Although there are encouraging moves to a more natural style of speaking by some producers, care should still be exercised. All lab materials should be thoroughly examined before purchase.

BINDING COMMITMENT TO CHOSEN MATERIALS. Once lab materials have been purchased or produced, there is a great commitment to that particular set of materials. Deleting a few inapplicable parts of a lesson or adding a few more questions is very difficult. On-the-spot improvisation is next to impossible.

EQUIPMENT FAILURE. No piece of equipment will serve forever without ever needing repair or maintenance. Some brands are worse than others and require constant repair work. It is wise to check equipment thoroughly for durability and to provide for proper maintenance beforehand. *Caveat emptor.*

DIMINISHED AUDIO QUALITY. Even with today's electronic technology, sound quality is rarely as good in a lab as it is in real life. This problem can be minimized by insisting on top-quality equipment and materials and regular maintenance.

LACK OF PERSONALITY. Person-to-person, eye-to-eye contact is not available with an impersonal machine. The result may be student apathy and loss of motivation. Interesting materials and individual teacher attention may help remedy the situation.

LOSS OF EXTRA-VERBAL SIGNALS. In the typical audio-only setup, the student is unable to observe important gestures or facial expressions which may be important to the meaning of an utterance. Television provides one solution to this problem, but is beyond the means of most labs.

INDIVIDUAL MONITORING. Individual student monitoring is not always an advantage. While listening to one student, the teacher must ignore the other thirty-nine (see Hammerly:1974).

DUAL TRAINING OF PERSONNEL. The laboratory teacher must be skillfully trained in two areas: language teaching and laboratory operation. To have an effective laboratory, a trained lab instructor should be in control. Turning everything over to part-time student assistants is just asking for trouble. This does not mean that student assistants should not be utilized at all. It only means that they should be under the direction of an experienced lab director.

MINDLESS REPETITION. After long periods spent in the lab listening to pattern drills, many students develop a talent for mindless repetition. They parrot an utterance perfectly while thinking about a completely different subject. Careful selection of materials and activities is the only way to avoid this bad habit.

PHYSICAL INFLEXIBILITY. Although portable models are available for small groups, a full-scale language laboratory is very difficult to move or store in a closet. Likewise, it is hard to conduct a normal language class in a room of carrels. In other words, having a lab means dedicating one room to permanent laboratory use.

REFERENCES

Croft, Kenneth (1972). "The Language Laboratory: Uses and Misuses." in Kenneth Croft, ed. *Readings on English as a Second Language.* Winthrop Publishers, Inc., Cambridge.

Hammerly, Hector (1974). "The Myth of Language Laboratory Monitoring." *The Modern Language Journal*, vol. 58 no. 7 pp. 336-338.

Haynes, Charles S. (1973). "The Language Lab Love Story." *English Teaching Forum,* vol. 11 no. 4 pp. 14-18.

Janousek, Miroslav (1973). "Lexico-Literary Programs in the Language Lab." *English Teaching Forum,* vol. 11 no. 1 pp. 14-18.

Kono, Kinoru (1974). "What the Language Lab Can Do: Report for Japan." *English Teaching Forum,* vol. 12 no. 3 pp. 13-18.

Potts, Jim (1974). "Talking Guitar Blues or The Joys of the Language Lab." *English Teaching Forum,* vol. 12 no. 3 pp. 6-7.

Sotiroloulos, George (1974). "On Utilizing Machines." *English Teaching Forum,* vol. 12 no. 3 p. 40.

Stevick, Earl W. 1967). "The Modular Mousetrap." *TESOL Quarterly* vol. 1 no. 3 pp. 3-10.

Discrete Structure Point Testing

(continued from page 9)

current journal literature in the field of civil engineering. On the other hand, if the group is comprised of new immigrants who are studying English and plan to become citizens, perhaps, having discussed national geography, government, culture and history in their lessons, we might select a passage from some of the appropriate literature on these topics for the cloze test.

Dictation as a test has had its ups and downs in popularity among professional language test writers. After many years of relative unpopularity, dictation is now being recognized as an effective diagnostic device for the classroom teacher, and an excellent integrative test to include in a language proficiency test battery (Oller 1973 b). Of course, many of us knew it all the time.

Dictation passages may be presented in a number of ways. Valette (1967) recommends one effective technique of administering a test dictation.

> "First, the whole passage is read at normal speed. The students are told not to write, just to listen carefully. Then the passage is read a phrase at a time, with pauses during which the students write down what they have heard. At this time the teacher may read each phrase either once of twice, as long as he is consistent. (At the teacher's discretion, punctuation marks may be given in the target language.) Finally, the entire passage is read again at normal speed, and the students are given a few minutes for final revision. It is imperative that the teacher never repeat a particular phrase at a student's request." (p. 140)

Scoring the dictation may be done in various ways. One method is to start with a total score of 20 and deduct half a point for each spelling error and one point for each other error. Another method would be to give one point for each word correct in the passage transcribed. A third method would be to give a certain number of points per phrase transcribed correctly.

Typical student errors in taking dictation include omitting words, using the wrong word, putting the words in the wrong order, and using ungrammatical phrases and sentences. For further discussion the reader is referred to Oller (1973 b) and his references.

Like the cloze passages, dictation passages can be criterion related; that is chosen from any appropriate context in which the students are preparing to function. Dictations of lists of items, or short chunks of data, as suggested by some teachers, may be appropriate for testing comprehension in some areas, but overall proficiency is probably best tested with a passage dictation.

Error recognition tests of the type recommended by Sibayan (1971) are somewhat more difficult to construct than the other two integrative tests, yet they are still simple enough that valid and reliable items can be constructed by an ESL teacher with little experience in test construction. Each item consists of four choices, the first three being statements in which grammatical elements, capitalization and punctuation are critical. The fourth choice is (D) No mistakes. The directions to the student are as follows:

> Each item below contains three sentences. These sentences may be correct, or one of them may have a mistake in grammar, punctuation, or capitalization. If all the sentences are correct, mark (D) on your answer sheet. If one of the sentences contains an error, mark the letter of that sentence on your answer sheet.

There are two ways to construct the choices in the item. One could choose any three potentially difficult sentences for the first three choices. However, if one were to make the three sentences into a continuous thought progression, the degree of integration of language skills would be extended. The following test item is an example of this type of integration.

A. Since Jack was five years old he has played the piano.

B. Jack was hoped to become a famous musician.

C. Unfortunately, Jack never learned how to read music.

D. No mistakes.

Harris (1969:73) recommends error recognition tasks, combined with sentence completion tasks, as valid objective measures of writing ability. To the extent that cloze tests are sentence completion tasks, the combination of cloze and error recognition tasks is potentially a powerful proficiency test. However, a search of the literature on second and foreign languge testing reveals no published research on error recognition tasks of the above mentioned type. At this point there appears to be a need for extensive research in various types of error recognition tasks in ESL testing.

> "In production of language, expectations are formed as to what the output should look like, and the output is modified until it conforms to the expectations. In reception of language, expectancies are constantly generated as to what is likely to follow in a given sequence, and are modified to match received input. The first process is actually one of synthesis-by-analysis and the second is one of analysis-by-synthesis. In both cases there is a matching of physically realized signals to expectancies generated on the basis of an underlying grammar." (p. 8)

We can contruct a test that does not separate language from its use, allowing us to test communication in contexts similar to, if not the same as contexts the students would normally encounter in the real world. The real world outside our language classrooms is not concerned particularly whether the language skills are refined to the n-th degree, as much as it is concerned about how effectively one employs the vast number of linguistic, paralinguistic and non-linguistic strategies available to the individual in the context of the communication act.

Oller (1973 a) proposes a theoretical base for integrative tests. In any normal use of language, he explains that the sequence of linguistic elements that occur is restricted by various kinds of context.

To sum up, we have tried to suggest some of the weaknesses of the current trend of using discrete point tests to determine language proficiency in second languages. The discrete point basis has been falsified by revealing the theoretical flaws in its foundation. A functional approach based on effective language use in appropriate situations has been proposed. Finally Oller's theory of a grammar of expectancy, which incorporates the redundancy utilization factor, has been introduced to provide a theoretical base for an integrative approach to testing.

It remains to be seen whether any institute or body of applied linguists will develop a scale of functional language use as proposed by Spolsky. It also remains to be seen if Oller's pragmatic approach—grammars of expectancy—has been defined in theoretical terms that can be falsified, and if they are so defined, whether they can be falsified. These problems are beyond the scope of this present paper.

REFERENCES

Aitken, Kenneth George. (1975)
"Problems in Cloze Testing Re-examined," *TESL Reporter*, vol. 8, no. 2.

Bloomfield, Leonard. (1933)
Language, Toronto: Holt Rinehart and Winston, 1933.

Briere, Eugene J. (1971)
"Are We Really Measuring Proficiency with Our Foreign Language Tests?"*Foreign Language Annals*, vol. 4, no. 4 (May 1971), pp. 385-391.

Carroll, John B. (1964)
Language and Thought. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1964.

Carroll, John B. (1961)
"Fundamental Considerations in Testing English Proficiency of Foreign Students," *Testing*, Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1961, pp. 31-40.

Fries, Charles C. (1945)
Teaching and Learning English as a Foreign Language, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Harris, David P. (1969)
Testing English as a Second Language. Toronto: McGraw-Hill.

Holtzman, Paul D.
"English Language Proficiency Testing and the Individual" in *Selected Conference Papers of the Association of Teachers of English as a Second Language*. (Washington): NAFSA, 1967.

Jackobovits, Leon A. (1970)
Foreign Language Learning: A Psycholinguistic Analysis of the Issues. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, 1970.

Lado, R. (1957)
Linguistics Across Cultures. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1957.

Oller, John W. Jr. (1973 c)
"Cloze Tests of Second Language Proficiency And What They Measure," *Language Learning,* vol. 23, no. 1 (June 1973), pp 105-118.

Oller, John W. Jr. (1973 b)
"Discrete-point Tests Versus Tests of Integrative Skills," in Oller and Richards (eds.), *Focus on the Learner,* Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, 1973.

Oller, John W. Jr. (1974)
Expectancy for successive elements: key ingredient to language use, *Foreign Language Annals,* vol. 7 (March 1974), pp. 443-452.

Oller, John W. Jr. (1973 a)
Pragmatic language testing, *Language Sciences,* no. 28 (December 1973), pp. 7-12.

Oller, John W. Jr.; B. Dennis Sales and Ronald V. Harrington. (1969)
A basic circularity in traditional and current linguistic theory, *Lingua,* vol. 22 (1969), pp. 317-327.

Shannon, C.; and W. Weaver, (1949)
The Mathematical Theory of Communication, Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1949.

Sibayan, Bonifacio. (1971)
"Elements to Test in English as a Second Language," in R. Cherrier (ed.). English *Language Testing: Report of the RELC Fifth Regional Seminar Bangkok 25-30, May, 1970.* Singapore: Regional English Language Centre.

Spolsky, Bernard. (1968 b)
"Language Testing—the Problem of Validation," *TESOL Quarterly,* vol. 2 (1968), pp. 88-94.

Spolsky, Bernard; Bengt Sigurd; Masahito Sato; Edward Walker and Catherine Aterburn. (1968)
"Preliminary Studies in the Development of Techniques for Testing Overall Second Language Proficiency, *Language Learning,* Special Issue no. 3 (August (1968), pp. 79-101.

Spolsky, Bernard. (1968 a)
"What Does it Mean to Know a Language, or How Do You Get Someone to Perform His Competence?" Paper presented at the Second Conference Problems in Foreign Language Testing. University of Southern California, November 1968.

Taylor, Wilson S. (1953)
"Cloze Procedure: A New Tool for Measuring Readability. *Journalism Quarterly,* vol. 30 (1953), pp. 415-433.

Upshur, John A. (1962)
"Language Proficiency Testing and the Contrastive Analysis Dilemma." *Language Learning,* vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 123-127.

Valette, Rebecca. (1967)
Modern Language Testing: A Handbook, New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1967.

Wardhaugh, Ronald. (1970)
The Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis, *TESOL Quarterly,* vol. 4, no. 2 (June), pp. 123-130.

TESL REPORTER
Box 157
Brigham Young University
Laie, Hawaii 96762

Non-Profit Organization
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
Laie, Oahu, Hawaii
Permit No. 1