Minnesota Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages

MinneTESOL Journal

Volume 4

Fall, 1984

Minne*TESOL* Journal

Volume 4 Fall, 1984

Table of Contents

ARTICLES

Montessori Language Lessons: The Almost Silent Way 7
Ann Eljenholm Nichols

The Excommunicative Approach (and how to avoid it) 23
George Yule

Some Neglected Vocabulary Needs of ESL Students 43
Tom Richards

The Doughnut that Fell into the Dishwater: Thoughts about Teaching Relative Clauses and other Structures 52
Eric Nelson

REVIEW

Understanding Academic Lectures 70
Abelle Mason
Reviewed by Susan Gillette

Minne*TESOL* Journal

Minnesota Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages

Journal Staff

Eric Nelson, editor
University of Minnesota
Elizabeth Henly
University of Minnesota
Kim Koffolt
University of Minnesota
Diane Pecoraro
Mineapolis Public Schools
Tom Richards
University of Minnesota

Publications Committee

Laura Buchanan
University of Minnesota
Martha Faltesek
Honeywell, Inc.
Adele Hansen
University of Minnesota
Margaret Holper
Adult Community Education
Center, St. Paul
Darlene Kunze
Minneapolis Public Schools
Chris Lindemer
University of Minnesota
Ellen Mamer
St. Paul Community
Education
Vivian Mann
St. Paul Public Schools
John Marston
University of Minnesota
Mary Ostrander
Minneapolis Public Schools
Diane Pecoraro
Minneapolis Public Schools
Kathryn Poethig
Minnesota Literacy Council
Lora Polack
University of Minnesota
Kathleen Roehl
International Institute
for the Handicapped

MinneTESOL Officers
1983-1984

President
Mark Landa
University of Minnesota

First Vice-president
Kim Brown
Macalester College

Second Vice-President
Kathryn Hanges
Concordia College

Secretary
Martha King Faltesek
Honeywell, Inc.

Treasurer
Lisa Boehlke
Minneapolis Public
Schools

Executive Board

The officers and

Joan Bachman
Rochester Public Schools

Leslie Crawford
Moorhead State University

Anne DeMuth
Minneapolis Public Schools

Dick Halverson
Bloomington Public Schools

Ellen Mamer
St. Paul Community
Education

Jean Teigland
CPT

Editorial Policy

The MinneTESOL Journal seeks to pubish articles of importance to the profession of English as a second language in the state of Minnesota. Articles in the following areas are considered for publication: instructional methods, techniques, and materials; research with implications for ESL; and issues in curriculum and program design. Book reviews and review articles are also welcome. Submit manuscripts to the Editor, MinneTESOL Journal, Program in ESL, 152 Klaeber Court, University of Minnesota, 320 16th Avenue Southeast, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455.

Manuscripts

Manuscripts should conform to the guidelines of the TESOL Quarterly. Submit two copies of each manuscript, along with two copies of an abstract of not more than 200 words.

Advertising

Requests concerning advertising should be directed to the Advertising Exhibits Coordinator, MinneTESOL, P.O. Box 14162, St. Paul, Minnesota, 55114.

Membership in MinneTESOL ($10.00) includes a subscription to the MinneTESOL Journal, published in the fall.

FORWARD

The fourth volume of the MinneTESOL Journal includes something old, something new, and three things in between. Old but still fresh and important are the principles of the Montessori method, the subject of our first article. New is the review at the end of the volume, the first to appear in the *Journal*. In between (spatially now, not temporally) are an article about communicative language teaching, one about vocabulary, and one about grammar.

In describing the "Almost Silent Way" that Maria Montessori devised for teaching the so-called "unteachable" students of her day, Ann Nichols reminds us of some fundamental principles that our discipline shares with all types of education: the principles of subordinating teaching to learning, making the difficult understandable, and providing the means by which learners can continue to learn independently. Nichols shows how Montessori methods can be used in ESL and provides sample lesson plans for teachers to adopt or adapt. Readers who know the name *Montessori* only from reading it on school buildings will appreciate this look at an early educational pioneer and her methods.

From the second article of this volume come these words, spoken by a hypothetical student in an ESL class: *I'm coming to school now*, *I was coming to school yesterday*, *I will be coming to school tomorrow*. We can all smile a little at the unnaturalness of an activity that encourages this kind of language behavior. Many of us might, a little smugly, think of our own classes, in which we have largely replaced the recitation of grammatical paradigms out of context with something we call "communicative" or "functional." Our students, we might think, don't recite patterns; they greet, they describe, they explain, they agree and disagree. They don't say *I'm coming now*, *I was coming yesterday*, *I will be coming tomorrow*; they say (quoting again from the article) *I can't agree with you*, *I can't accept your argument*, *I beg to differ*. There is an irony here that we may have missed. A class in which the teacher instructs students to disagree with one another in three different ways in the same breath is not more communicative than one in which the teacher orchestrates choral practice of paradigms. Just what do we mean by "communicative" anyway? George Yule addresses this issue. In trying to pin down and argue for a restricted use of the loaded term "communicative approach," Yule introduces a new term: "The Excommunicative Approach." In his discussion of what is "communicative" and what is "excommunicative," Yule outlines some features of communication, shows how classroom activities often fail to promote (or even work against) the goal of developing students' communicative abilities, and offers advice on how to avoid "excommunication" -- how to help students develop skills that will enable them to participate in the English-speaking community.

Among those skills are the ones that Tom Richards describes in our third article, "Some Neglected Vocabulary Needs of ESL Students." In order to help students to develop adequate vocabularies, Richards argues, we have to go beyond the "quantity" approach to vocabulary (five new words a day!); we have to teach words and phrases, and above all, skills which will help students when they don't know or can't recall a word and when communication breaks down.

My own article, "The Doughnut that Fell into the Dishwater," offers some ideas for teaching relative clauses. More important, it illustrates an approach to grammar in which our understanding of the function of a structure shapes the classroom activities we design.

Finally, Susan Gillette examines Understanding Academic Lectures by Abelle Mason. Gillette's lengthy description of content, her careful evaluation, and her suggestions for using the material will be welcomed by readers who seek depth and detail in a review.

E.N.

MONTESSORI LANGUAGE LESSONS:
The Almost Silent Way

Ann Eljenholm Nichols

Montessori language lessons, which antedate Silent Way methodology by fifty years, offer a solution to some of the problems facing ESL elementary teachers, in particular limited time with mixed-proficiency students. The basic principles of a Montessori lesson, the three period presentation, isolation of difficulty, control of error, and relative silence of the teacher, enable the student to work independently yet purposefully. Sample ESL lessons based on Montessori principles are supplied. A list of Montessori's works is appended.

Most ESL teachers know about Gattegno's Silent Way because of the work of Earl W. Stevick (1980:37-82). Few teachers, however, know much about Maria Montessori, and even Stevick seems not to know of Gattengo's indebtedness to her. I first became interested in Montessori twenty-five years ago. I was a graduate student in linguistics when a friend and mother of two small children gave me a copy of The Montessori Method and asked me if what Montessori said made any sense. Allowing for a certain Italianate style preserved by her translator, she did indeed make sense, particularly in what she had to say about language. First, her description of Italian was linguistically sound; second, what she said about language learning sounded remarkably like some of the work I had just been reading in linguistics. Marveling, for example, at the child's ability to absorb language, she concluded: "This is not the result of conscious work. It is something done at the unconscious level of the mind. It begins and unfolds in the darkest depths of the

---

Ann Eljenholm Nichols teaches ESL at Winona State University.

unconscious, and when it emerges it is as a fixed acquisition" (1967:111).

After twenty years of teaching and relying on a number of Montessori techniques, I can still reaffirm my initial evaluation. Montessori makes sense, not just in a Montessori classroom, but in any classroom. Montessori makes particular sense for ESL elementary teachers who face the sort of problems described by Marsha Santelli (1982:5): low budgets, hostile classroom teachers, limited time with students, and mixed proficiency levels.

Montessori had enormous respect for the child, not a vague, amorphous aren't-children-wonderful sort of respect, but respect for the child's mind. Because of this she believed that all real education was self-education: "Education is not something which the teacher does, but ... a natural process which develops spontaneously in the human being" (1967:8). Because of this respect for the child as an active agent, the adult in a Montessori classroom is never called a teacher, but rather a director or directress, someone who prepares the materials by which children can learn and teach themselves.[1] This may sound incredibly idealistic, but Montessori did not develop her theory in the ivory tower of a middle class drawing room; she developed it working with the SLBP students (students with special learning or behavior problems) of her day.

Born in 1870, Maria Montessori was the first woman in Italy to become a doctor. It was her medical training, more than anything else, I believe, that developed in her an ability essential to good teaching, the ability to observe accurately and objectively. Montessori must have been a very tenacious young woman to pursue studies and succeed in a field that had hitherto belonged only to men. Having completed her studies, she worked at a number of part-time positions, at the Spiritu Sancto Hospital in Rome and also as an assistant at a psychiatric clinic. There she was given what must have been the least attractive work, dealing with what were then called idiot children, the "unteachables." In 1898 Montessori delivered a paper at the Pedagogical Congress in Turin in which she argued that the children she had been seeing as a medical doctor were not unteachable, that what they needed was educational care rather than medical. As a result of this paper she was asked by the Minister of Education to set up a training school for teachers of such children, work that developed into the State Orthophrenic School. There Montessori worked herself from eight in the morning until seven at night. She later referred to the two years she worked there as "my first and indeed my true degree in pedagogy" (1909:32). It was during this time that Montessori first began to produce the didactic materials still found in Montessori classrooms all over the world.

---

[1] Gattegno's position is remarklably similar: "Everyone of us enters school knowing how to be a responsible learner, an independent judge, an autonomous judge. . ." (1970:67); "... no doctoral student in a university has ever done as good a job equivalent to what we all did when we were one and two years of age, finding by ourselves how to acquire the extremely complicated system called language" (1970:11).

CHARACTERISTICS OF MONTESSORI LANGUAGE LESSONS

The Three-period Lesson

In her early work at the State Orthophrenic School, Montessori had read about and been influenced by Seguin's pioneering efforts in sensory education (1812-1880). In his work with the deaf Seguin developed a three-period lesson: first, teach the child to associate a sensory perception with a name; second, test to see whether the child can still associate the name with the perception; and finally, test whether the child can produce the name belonging to the perception. The lesson must focus on only one sense perception at a time.[2] For teaching colors Montessori developed a set of wooden tablets identical except for color. They are introduced to a child as follows.

First Period:	red (or This is red.) blue(orThis is blue.)	The teacher articulates carefully while pointing to each tablet.
Second Period:	Show me the red. Show me the blue.	(or Give me the red tablet.) (or Give me the blue tablet.)
Third Period:	Which is this?	(or Which color is this?)

It is only in the third period that the child must speak. In a second lesson on color the teacher might begin with the second stage for review.

Because the three-period lesson is so simple, teachers sometimes think that it only belongs at an elementary level. Actually it is useful in all disciplines at all levels. All teachers, of course, use the first phase, but many skip phase two altogether, and others use phase three only on test days. I believe that many students would do better at algebra, geometry, biology or chemistry if their teachers used all three phases.

---

[2] Montessorians call this the isolation of difficulty or the principle of simplicity. Stevick aptly calls it the "one thing at a time" principle (1980:44, 78). He has an equally aphoristic label for the three period lesson: "teach then test" (1980:56).

Silence

A Montessori lesson always begins and ends in silence. Furthermore, in the three-period naming lesson the child is not required to produce the new word(s) until phase three. It is now generally accepted that forcing a language learner to speak too soon may be detrimental, that the child learner of a second language, in particular, should be allowed to remain constructively silent (Gingras 1978; Day 1981). Thus contemporary research supports a basic principle of Montessori education. The lesson also proceeds very slowly.

Silence is, of course, what has given Gattegno's methodology its name. Actually, the silence in the Montessori method has always seemed natural to me, unlike that of the Silent Way, which sometimes seems contrived. For example, although a Montessori teacher will often use gestures rather than speech, they are never used just to avoid speech but rather to avoid distracting the child from the object being perceived. Both Montessori and Gattegno are at one, however, in wishing the child to be independent. The silence of the teacher is one of the things that makes this possible. The silence also enables the teacher to observe the students more perceptively. "The teacher whose work is subordinate to the work of her students must be continually learning from them about where they are--must be constantly 'learning them,' so to speak, at the same time that the students are learning the subject matter" (Stevick 1980:45).

A NAMING LESSON

Let us look at a naming lesson in more detail. Say that I wish to introduce the names for the attributes thick and thin to children who have already learned the names of the geometric shapes. I choose for materials a set of attribute blocks - blue plastic circles, squares, rectangles, and triangles, half of which are 1 cm thick, and the other half .25 cm thick. I sit facing the children at a small table or on the floor. I say nothing, but carefully and slowly place the box in the center of the demonstration area. Slowly I remove the lid and put it under the box. Next, and equally slowly, I take out one thick circle, look at it carefully, rub my finger vertically over the side, and then say thick. (If the word involves sounds which are difficult for the children, I repeat the last two steps.) Then I carefully lay the thick circle down. Next I repeat the procedure with a thin circle. The exercise continues until all the thick figures are in one row and all the thin in another. The only words that are spoken are those specified by the three period lesson.

I have noticed that whenever a well-trained Montessori teacher demonstrates such a lesson to adults, they become restless; they are ill at ease, even impatient with the slowness and silence of the presentation. Yet is it the silence that enables the child to isolate a sense perception before a new word is attached to it. This silence is also enormously restful for children bombarded with a strange language at the same time they are trying to cope with teachers and peers in a foreign culture. Montessori loved to quote Dante to her teachers, "Let thy words be counted," or to use her words, "The more carefully we cut away useless words, the more perfect will become the lesson" (1970:108).

ADOPTING AND ADAPTING MONTESSORI IN ESL TEACHING

Once teachers understand the basic principles involved in a Montessori lesson (teach one thing at a time, cut away all useless words), they can easily create their own language activities from materials already available in their schools. (In fact, in some of the best Montessori training schools, trainees are required to make many of their own materials so that they will better understand the principles involved.) Math materials are invaluable for language lessons, for example, attribute blocks, geometric solids, or Cuisenaire rods, the famous colored rods of the Silent Way.[3] The only other materials needed are colored cards for labels, clear contact paper to cover the labels, and storage containers.

THREE MORE SAMPLE LESSONS

Teaching Ordinal Numbers: A Sequence of Lessons

Materials Needed:
- five or six Cuisenaire rods of the same color
- five or six rods, each a different color
- word cards for *first*, *second*, *third*, ... *sixth*
- the box or bag in which the rods are kept

Lesson 1: Use one color of rods -- all orange, for example. Arrange them in a row. Use the three-period naming technique to teach *first*, *second*, etc. Label the rods with word cards.

Lesson 2: Use rods in a variety of colors; follow the same procedure as in Lesson 1.

Lesson 3: This lesson can follow immediately after Lesson 2 or be used for review another day. Give the following commands: *Give* (child's name) *the third rod* . *Put the fifth rod in the box* (or *bag*). *Make the second rod first*.

The last command is more complicated than the others; it was actually produced by a child using the materials and started a marvelous group game. This sort of student-initiated activity is typical of Montessori lessons.

---

[3] Gattegno coauthored a basic manual for the use of the colored rods (1954). The rods, however, were developed by the Belgian G. Cuisenaire and are marketed under his name.

Lesson 4: Additional materials: word cards, several each color, *the*, *rod*, *is*, *blue*, *red*, *orange*, etc.

Lay out the materials as in Lesson 2. Point to one of the rods, saying "Tell me about this rod." Lay out the word cards and construct the appropriate sentence.

Many Montessori activities involve writing and reading, the composing of sentences preceding reading. The "tell me" formula used in this lesson is a useful way of introducing such activities. If the child should respond not in a complete sentence but with something like "second blue," the teacher completes the predication, "The second rod is blue." Since the rod already has the label *second* placed above or below it, the teacher now picks up the label, repeating the word *second*. As the word cards for the sentence are arranged, the teacher should pronounce each word carefully, inviting the child to "read" with her. The cards can then be mixed up, the child rearranging them to form the descriptive sentence. (Since this lesson involves five or six sentences, it is necessary to keep the words sorted, for example, all the color words in one box or Ziploc bag.) Finally, the child can copy the sentence to practice spelling and handwriting.

Once these materials have been presented, children can work independently, arranging the six rods in any sequence and writing sentences about them. Since it takes relatively little time to present the lessons, the teacher is able to work effectively with a number of different students grouped by proficiency. Furthermore, the reading/writing activities can be used independently in the regular classroom while the classroom teacher works with mainstream lessons. All the classroom teachers needs to do is to provide a corner of a shelf where the

ESL materials can be kept. Once classroom teachers realize that these materials make their work easier, a spirit of cooperation between specialist and nonspecialist teachers can develop in place of the wary indifference and hostility so often complained of.

Teaching Fractional Numbers: From Sentence to Paragraph

Materials needed: two each of brown, yellow, and orange rods

word cards:
brown
yellow
orange
one-third] three each
are] three each

Set out the rods in a row in random color order:

brown yellow orange brown orange yellow

Say, "tell me about the rods." (If necessary, ask how many rods there are, what colors they are, and how many there are of each color.) Have the students write out sentences as they compose them. (The lesson may be stopped at this point and continued later. Save the written text so that the random order can be reconstructed.)

Now, without speaking, regroup the rods as follows:

brown brown yellow yellow orange orange

Say, "There are three colors -- brown, yellow, and orange." Label each color group one-third, and compose sentences with the cards:

brown brown yellow yellow orange orange

One-third are brown. One-third are yellow.One-third are orange. Finally, add these three new sentences to the earliest ones.

The result is a model descriptive paragraph, something like this:

> There are six rods. The first and fourth rods are brown. The second and sixth rods are yellow. The third and fifth rods are orange. There are three colors, brown, yellow, and orange. One-thid of the rods are brown, one-third are yellow, and one-third are orange.
>
> Help the child reread the entire paragraph outloud. As the child reads the rods should be rearranged to match the original order: the first and fourth rods are brown, etc. This activity tests both reading ability and comprehension of ordinality.

It is instructive to note a parallel between this typical Montessori activity and recent communication-oriented ESL texts with similar activities. These texts, for example, ask students to label diagrams of physical objects using a written description for data and conversely to write descriptions from a labeled diagram (Allen and Widdowson, 1974; Maclean, 1975).

Once an activity like the preceding one on fractional numbers has been introduced to the children, it can be stored in a tell-me box on the ESL shelf in the regular classroom for independent use. The tell-me label tells the child to repat the activity which the ESL teacher initiated with the phrase, "Tell me about ...." The child constructs a physical model, labels the objects, and writes a description of the model. During the next ESL lesson, the student begins by reading the description and reconstructing the model for the teacher. If the child's penmanship is clear enough, students can exchange descriptions, build models, and check each other's work. In this way the children take control of their own learning activities requiring less and less direct supervision the from ESL specialist at this stage of their work.

If, after an initial presentation of the fractional lesson, the teachers feels that a child needs to review the material, the same six rods and cards should be placed in the tell-me box. Otherwise the ESL teacher should change the colors, number of rods, and the ratios. This particular activity is a popular one with students. In fact, it is not unusual for non-ESL students to become equally fascinated by the Cuisenaire rods, thus providing a common interest for communication between native and nonnative speakers.

Noun Phrase Lessons

In the preceding exercises the physical objects, in addition to providing a perceptual basis for the language lesson, also make the lesson self-correcting. Since it is not always feasible to use such objects, color coding can also control error; for example, in this lesson it focuses on determiner distribution. One color of card is used for the plural count nouns, a second for the nouncount; a later, more difficult lesson would include singular count nouns as well. Quantifier colors match the color of the subclass of noun they pattern with.[4] At the first stage this is primarily a matching activity.

on	a little	snow	on	a few	snowflakes
blue	not much	furniture	white	many	chairs
cards	some	tea	cards	several	cups of tea

Other nouns can be added to the list, particularly those the children meet in their school environment. Once the pattern is acquired, the color coding can be eliminated, all the quantifiers and nouns being written on white card. The learner's initial task is to sort the words into two classes, the quantifiers and the nouns. For independent work it is wise to provide a framework such as a sorting sheet, a large piece of paper on which the work can be done. Grammatical labels are not necessary, though it is easy to see how these materials could also be used in a three period grammar lesson.

---

[4] *A few*, *many*, and *several* can only pattern with plural count nouns; *a little* and *not much* only with noncount nouns. Although *some* has no such limitation, it is included in this lesson because of its common use with noncount nouns.

Figure 1
Sorting Sheet for Noun Phrase Lesson

Words like a little/many	Words like fun/parties
Phrases like a little fun	Phrases like many parties

This type of sorting and classifying exercise is more than a language lesson. It also prepares children to deal with a culture that values classification and for higher education where success in large part depends on the ability to move from the specific to the general and back again.

Similar noun phrase activities can be devised for use with the attribute blocks described earlier.[5] Each of the geometric figures comes in seven editions, large/small, thick/thin, red/yellow/blue. Thus students are able to construct noun phrases with a series of modifiers, for example the large, thick, blue triangle. By selecting different combinations of the blocks, teachers can create about one hundred different activities. For unsupervised classroom use, the teacher can set up simple classifying exercises like "Put all the thick blocks together," or for more advanced pupils add a tell-me paragraph assignment. And the children, too, will create their own activities; I once worked with a group of children who invented a lotto-game with the blocks: Do you have a large, thin, yellow circle? Whenever children take charge of their own education in this way, teachers can be pleased at their success. For the teacher's task, according to Montessori, is not to talk but "to prepare and arrange" activities so that the chld can use inner resources to direct language learning (1909:8).

LEARNING MORE ABOUT MONTESSORI METHODS

Teachers often ask how they can learn more about Montessori methods, and so I have included a Montessori bibliography. However, the best way to learn about Montessori education is to observe it in action. Minnesota teachers are fortunate because of the large number of Montessori schools in the state, particularly in the Twin Cities vicinity. Normally observations are limited, so people wishing to visit should make an appointment in advance.[6] It is advisable, too, to make sure that the school is affiliated with either the AMI (Association Montessori Internatinale) or the AMA (American Montessori Association). Schools without one of these affiliations may bear the Montessori name without practicing Montessori principles.

---

[5] If the school does not have attribute blocks, I would recommend that ESL teachers buy their own sets. Herder and Herder, for example, markets a small edition called Logical Blocks as part of their Mathematics Experience Program.

A MONTESSORI BIBLIOGRAPHY

This list is arranged chronologically by the date of the original Italian edition or the approximate date of composition. Information about later editions appears in parentheses. The first three titles are seminal works.

Early Works

1909. The Montessori method. By 1917 this work had been translated into a dozen languages, including English, German, Catalan, Rumanian, Russian, Japanese, and Chinese. (1970. New York: Shocken Books.)

1914. Dr. Montessori's own handbook. This book, the first to be translated into English, was written shortly after Montessori returned from her first major tour of the United States. (1965. New York: Shocken Books.)

1916. The advanced Montessori method. This work was published in English in 1917 as two separate volumes, Spontaneous activity in Education (1965, New York: Shocken Books) and Montessori elementary material (1973, New York:

---

[6] I have visited Montessori schools in Europe and in a number of different states. I am, however, particularly grateful to Pat and Larry Schafer of the Lake Country Day School in the Twin Cities for what I learned during a two-week visit to their school, and especially to Antoinette Gomez Blane, the directress for eight years of the Delahanty Montessori School in Winona.

Schocken Books).

The Middle Period

1922. The child in the church (by Montessori et al.). E.M. Standing (ed.). An application of methods to the religious development of the child. (1965. St. Paul, Minn.: Catechetical Guild.)
1923. The child in the family. Based on a series of lectures delivered in Vienna. (1970. Chicago: Regnery Co.)
1932-1939. Education and Peace. A selection from a series of lectures delivered to peace conferences during the 30s, first published in Italian in 1949. (1972. Chicago: Regnery Co.)
1936. The secret of childhood. (1983. India: Orient Longman.)

The Indian Period

1948. The discovery of the child. A revised and enlarged edition of The Montessori method. (1972. New York: Ballantine.)
1949. The absorbent mind. A summary of training course lectures in India. (1967. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston) (1969. New York: Dell.)

The remaining works were translated into English and published in India during the 1940s. Some of the works were either not written directly by Montessori or were translations of translations.

1946. Education for a new world. Madras: Kalakshetra Publications.
1948. The child. Madras: The Theosophical Publishing House.
1948. Reconstruction in education. Madras: The Theosophical Publishing House.
1948. To educate human potential. Madras: Kalakshetra Publications.
1948. What you should know about your child. Colombo, Sri Lanka: Bennet.

REFERENCES

(The Montessori works are listed with the dates of current editions.)

Allen, J.P.B., and H.G. Widdowson. 1974. English in physical science. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cuisenaire, G., and Caleb Gattegno. 1954. Numbers in colour. London: Heinemann.

Day, Richard R. 1981. Silence and the ESL child. TESOL Quarterly 15(1):35-39.

Gattegno, Caleb. 1970. What we owe children: the subordination of teaching to learning. New York: Outerbridge and Dienstfrey.

Gingras, Rosario C. 1978. Second language acquisition and foreign language teaching. Arlington, Virginia: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Maclean, Joan. 1975. English in basic medical science. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Montessori, Maria. 1970. The Montessori method. New York: Shocken Books.

Montessori, Maria. 1967. The absorbent mind. New York: Shocken Books.

Santelli, Marsha. 1982. The care and nurturing of the elementary and bilingual teacher. TESOL Newsletter 16(5):1,5,14-16.

Stevick, Earl. 1980. A way and ways. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

THE EXCOMMUNICATIVE APPROACH
(and how to avoid it)

George Yule

If an ESL student has her learning time largely devoted to the study of linguistic form, taking an essentially passive role and rarely speaking English in any interactive context, she is experiencing the excommunicative approach. If what she actually requires is the communicative approach, then her time should be devoted to using and manipulating whatever English she has, with our support, to get her message across. This paper offers some ideas on how this might be accomplished.

It is a standard principle in semiotics, the general study of signaling systems, that it is impossible not to communicate. In simple terms, this means that if you sneeze, you communicate, if you are wearing a hat, you are communicating, and if an ESL student says this my this this my em yes, she's communicating.[1] Consequently, a methodology which is labeled "the Communicative Approach" could be interpreted as a system designed to get people to do what they're doing already and, in essence, cannot avoid doing. Presumably, ESL teachers have something else in mind when they say they would like to make their classroom teaching more "communicative" in orientation. So, what does "communicative" mean in this context? I doubt if I will be able to provide anything resembling a complete answer to this question, but I may come up with one or two useful ideas on

---

George Yule is Assistant Professor of Linguistics and English as Second Language at the University of Minnesota.

[1] The problem of the appropriate pronoun to be used when referring to a teacher or a student has been resolved in this paper by opting for the feminine forms throughout.

what is and what is not a "communicative" activity.[2]

To do this, I will suggest that the concept of "communicative," as it relates to human behavior, in the context of ESL, has to do very broadly with participation, or training which facilitates participation, of a primarily linguistic nature, in the activities of the wider community of English speakers. The connection proposed has a basis in the etymological connection between "communicate" and "community." By way of contrast, I will use the term "excommunicative," again within the limited world of ESL, to characterize acts or activities which serve to remove the ESL student from participation, or training which does not facilitate participation, in the community of English speakers. The contrast should become clearer in the course of the paper. First, let us try to put some harder edges on the extremely fuzzy notion of "communicative" behavior.

SOME FEATURES OF COMMUNICATIVE BEHAVIOR

It's Intentional

The earlier examples of sneezing, hat-wearing, and word-uttering are clearly not the type of "communicative" behavior an ESL teacher normally wishes to promote. This type of 'signaling' (to use a more neutral expression) can certainly lead the receiver of the signal to have some information about the person from whom the signal orginates, but it is unlikely that the information so received was voluntarily or intentionally sent. So, let us call such signals informative, define them as unintended, and limit the term communicative to signals which are intentionally sent.

---

[2] This paper is full of ideas which were, for the most part, prompted by students in the graduate ESL program at the University of Minnesota, who forced me to make my thoughts on the matter clearer. Credit for whatever seems worthwhile in this paper should consequently be shared with those students. Responsibility for what seems mistaken or badly expressed is all mine.

(For more on this terminological distinction, see Lyons, 1977:33.)

It's Recipient-designed

Yet, intention alone is hardly sufficient as defining communicative behavior. We need a means of disqualifying all intentional communicative behavior which does not take the receiver into account, particularly the receiver's ability to comprehend the message. For example, one of your ESL students can intentionally communicate what she thinks of you (who don't speak the Spanish of northern Mexico) by uttering, "no sirves ni de cacahuate." However, her signal is not designed to facilitate your comprehension of the intended communication. She might even be smiling when she says it, but you probably would not be, if genuine communication had taken place.[3] So, we also need a factor involving "designed for the recipient's comprehension" to be incorporated within our concept of communicative behavior.

There's an Information Gap

Closely connected with the notion of recipient-design is the requirement that communication usually operates with the assumption of an information gap. To be considered communicative, a verbal message must, in some sense, provide information which the speaker believes the hearer does not have. That is, the speaker must operate as if the message she is communicating is not already known to the hearer. This seems a rather obvious point, since we tend not to spend our time telling each other all the things we assume are known, but rather place a premium on telling "what's new."

---

[3] Well, it depends on whether you like to be told that "you don't even do as much as a peanut."

There's a Purpose

However, we do not simply recite random new information to our partners in communication. We usually have some purpose in giving a particular item of information to one person rather than another. In most instances, the purpose is very clear because the hearer needs the information. In fact, one of the ways in which we might identify pathological or mentally-unbalanced behavior would be if an individual started telling you random, purposeless information. So, we would want to exclude such verbal messages from the range of communicative behavior.

It's Appropriate

There are no doubt a number of other factors, but let us consider only one more, concerning "appropriateness". For many theorists, notably Hymes (1972), this factor is crucially important and can be more narrowly defined as "sociolinguistic appropriateness." In simple terms, it has to do with the distinction between using an expression like Please leave me alone and an alternative like Get lost, you creep. Knowing when, where, and to whom these expressions might be appropriate ways of communicating what you mean is an essential facet of what Hymes called the English speaking person's "communicative competence."

INTO THE ESL CLASSROOM: EXCOMMUNICATIVE ACTIVITIES

We have listed some properties which can serve as identifying features of communicative behavior. We are not necessarily aware of such components in our everyday use of language, but we normally have no difficulty recognizing that some element is missing. That is, we know when something is "odd" or "off-key" in someone's interactive behavior. We know what "normal" participation in a verbal interaction (between speakers of English) feels like and we know how communicative behavior fits into that "norm." Yet, we can also pick up our chalk, our books, our handouts, and walk into ESL classrooms, and, in many ways, ignore what counts as "normal" participation in communication via the English language.

I do not pretend that there are not a number of excellent reasons why this comes about. Much of what we do in the classroom stems from the requirements of existing course goals, established syllabus designs, compulsory textbooks, and the nature of standard English language tests. Such requirements have, for a number of years, been a source of frustration and dissatisfaction for many ESL teachers. The constraints created by such requirements have locked us into a number of activities which cannot really be carried over into our so-called "communicative approach."

To return to the issue: we have some idea of what one would expect in communicative language use, yet we also have a suspicion that this is not what's being fostered, at least some of the time, in ESL classrooms. What is being fostered, I will suggest, is some type of "excommunicative" language use, which may be serving as a means of removing ESL learners from participation in the community of English speakers. What are these obvious excommunicative activities which turn up in classrooms ostensibly devoted to the communicative approach?

Let us start with some really clear examples of excommunicative English language behavior. Having an ESL student, comfortably seated among her excommunicated peers, produce sentences like I'm coming to school now, I was coming to school yesterday, I will be coming to school tomorrow is one example. In fact, anything resembling a drill, concentrating on the forms of the English language, is inherently excommunicative. It may be useful for a number of other purposes (for example, passing tests which focus on correctness of form), but it is not communicative.

However, not so obviously to many people, an exercise which asks Maria to disagree with Chang one way, then to use another way, and then to do it another way, is, in fact, another example. This exercise may produce I can't agree with you, I can't accept your argument, I beg to differ. Reciting phrases of this type is the product of a lot of 'functional' course materials which have not really changed the format for student participation, but have changed the types of expressions which can be recited. Essentially, students are given the opportunity to practice, via repetition, not the progressive verb forms, or different tense forms, but ten ways to disagree in English or ten ways to ask for permission. Here is an example from a course called Communicate, by Morrow & Johnson (1979:76).

> You have rented a room in Mrs. Armstrong's house. Here are some things that you want to do. To be polite, you ask Mrs. Armstrong first. You say ...
>
> Could I possibly have a TV in my room?
> Could I possibly put some pictures on the walls?
> Could I possibly ask some friends to call round?
> (plus seven other 'Could I possibly...' sentences)
>
> Now ask her permission in three other ways.
>
> I'd like to ...
> You don't mind if ...
> Do you mind if ...

I suspect that, by this point, Mrs. Armstrong is about to come after you with a carving knife. Exercises of this type may also serve some purpose in the grand ESL scheme, but they are not communicative activities. At best, any exercise on form, whether the form of the present progressive or the form for asking permission, is merely a prerequisite for communicative activities. At worst, and more typically, such exercises are insidiously excommunicative, since they are so dominant in the ESL student's experience with the English language. They are what we give the ESL student to do with the English language, and mostly, we don't move on to have her do anything else. If the English speaking community needed members who can repeat sets of phrases and carry out substitution drills, then we have the trainees. Unfortunately, it doesn't. Such exercises lead students to say what they don't mean, without purpose, in artificial interaction, with no intentions, no recipient, no information gap, and no sense whatsoever of where, when and to whom such expressions would really be appropriate. They are not communicative.

SOURCES OF THE EXCOMMUNICATIVE APPROACH

Teacher-centered Classrooms

Most of the activities which tend to have an excommunicative effect can be identified in the typical formats of strongly teacher-centered classrooms. The student spends most of her time in a receptive role, she is not encouraged to initiate interaction, and, when she is called upon to speak, the expected linguistic production tends to be very brief, phrase- or short sentence-length, and it will inevitably be in the form of a response. In fact, if the student tries to break out of this essentially passive role, it can look like a disruption of the teacher's lesson plan. In a recent paper, Allwright (1984) cites a nice example to illustrate the teacher's desire to get on with what was planned and a student's attempt to interrupt that plan and get what she needs.

> Teacher: Okay, let's get back to this
> Student: Oh, please. At the second line, on second sentence it is, says: "Which word means 'hatred'?" (Pause) What is 'hatred'?

In a sense, this brief exchange contains another clue to the results of the excommunicative approach. The student's production in this example is typical of the type of communicative style a number of students develop by themselves. It is very much a format for classroom communication. The ability to use the English language in this way is not something we ordinarily teach. It illustrates the kind of strategy the students develop by themselves to try to compensate for the perceived gaps in their lessons. Some teachers discourage this type of interruption on the grounds that it plays havoc with the lesson plan.

The Model we Provide

Let us focus on a different aspect of the classroom interactive format which may foster excommunication. Typically, the teacher directs interaction by asking questions to which she already knows the answers. This is not a particularly novel observation - indeed, such behavior may simply be an occupational hazard for all teachers, a kind of classroom silicosis. However, though it may have a traditional place, it surely cannot be part of a 'communicative' approach. The function of questions in the English speaking community at large is surely more often aimed at getting information you do not know. Questions can also be used to make sure that what you thought was, in fact, correct. So, lack of information or doubt about the correctness of information seem to be the general motivating factors, in life. However, in the standard ESL classroom, the teacher's status tends to be that of "knower." When she asks a question, she can tell you whether your answer was correct or not. Now this is the model of interaction involving questions which most ESL students are given. What if they adopt the model? Imagine, in an admittedly exaggerated scenario, a student speaking to a man at the information counter at the Greyhound depot in Minneapolis.

> Student: When the next bus is to Duluth?
> Clerk: Twelve fifteen
> Student: That's correct - very good - now how long this bus it take?
> Clerk: It's about three hours - it's an express
> Student: Yes - that's right - good - so now - how much is it cost?
> Clerk: Listen honey - if you're so smart you tell me

How can there be anything wrong with this student's interactive style? She is taking her teacher's interactive style in the classroom as a model. So, why would the counter clerk get annoyed? Well, he probably feels that he is being "tested" on his knowledge, rather than being genuinely asked to convey information. His reaction is to relinquish his normal role in such interactions and effectively stop taking part. What should be a "communicative" activity for the student becomes "excommunicative." Yet, one can imagine that, in such a situation, the student would not understand why the clerk stopped participating. It would be just another puzzling experience, confirming the student's impression that she will never be successful at using English, even though she carefully follows her teacher's example.

The Corrections We Provide

Another example of how an ostensibly "communicative" activity quickly becomes "excommunicative" involves the way in which student production is treated. In the following fragment of classroom interaction, the teacher and students have been reading some instructions on how to pay bills for utilities. (The students were adult Asian immigrants to Britain receiving a version of ESL "survival skills.") The question and answer format used here is really intended to check that the students have understood the "content" of what they have read. It should, then, be focused on the content, rather than the form of the message.

> Teacher: and where do you have to take this bill?
> Student: is - em - is in the bost office
> Teacher: you mean 'post' - say it "p - p - p - post - post"
> Student: 'post - 'post'
> Teacher: right - say it everyone - 'post'
> All students: 'post' - 'post'
> Teacher: right okay - the post office - good

Useful though it certainly is for the students to have their aberrant pronunciations corrected, we might argue that there are better occasions than in the middle of a discussion about "content." On this particular occasion, the distraction caused by the little pronunciation exercise leads the teacher to accept the wrong 'content' answer. The instructions which the students had been reading involved the post office, but not as the place to take the bills received.

Let us be clear about what seems amiss in the quoted interaction. There is no suggestion that the teaching of accurate pronunciation should be neglected. Quite the contrary - everyone would agree that a certain level of ability in the pronunciation of English is a prerequisite for any communicative ability. However, the teaching of pronunciation, even remedially, should not take place in the middle of a communicative activity. If we wish to teach the correct form of English utterances, whether in pronunciation, grammar, or vocabulary, we really should not be trying to do it in the middle of message-oriented, communicative interaction. Why not have the communicative interaction take place and, if the teacher expects that aspects of "form" in the students' production will need some attention, then tape-record the interaction for later use in a form-oriented lesson. This has the benefit of letting a communicative interaction concentrate on message-content and operate on the level of "getting meaning across," while creating a good set of data for the next lesson which is form-oriented and operates on the level of "becoming formally accurate."

Moreover, if pronunciation and grammar points derive from the students' own tape-recorded production, this is surely an advantage. Our students, like most people, are probably more interested in themselves than in others. They may be more motivated to try to learn the formally accurate version of the English present perfect, for example, if it is apparent from their own tape-recorded speech that they need to learn it.

ON SPOKEN COMMUNICATION

While some attention should be paid to the formal accuracy of our students' speech, we should be careful not to set unrealistic goals for the spoken communicative use of English. The way the English language is used in the spoken mode is not really directly comparable to its use in typical written formats. Many researchers have pointed out that there are fairly substantial differences between spoken and written discourse (cf. Ochs, 1979; Tannen, 1982; Brown & Yule, 1983). Yet, as ESL teachers, we often bring a written language version of precision and accuracy to bear on the spoken language production of our ESL students. It may be because we spend so much time immersed in the written language and our education to become ESL teachers places such a premium on our being highly literate. Whatever the reason, we seem to lose touch with some of the looser and vaguer features which characterize everyone's spoken discourse. Here is an example:[4]

> eh I think it's important that we do this eh I think that for one thing it's always helped me in the past because when I've done that and I've been - been have some - a number of times before ...

So, is this student in need of a grammar lesson, since he says I've been - been have some - ? Whatever you think of Casper Weinberger, the current Secretary of Defense, who produced the speech transcribed above, you would probably not insist that his use of the English language was faulty. I think we should take care not to require that the spoken production of our ESL students be "better" or more "correct" than is normally found among native speakers.

BACK TO THE EXCOMMUNICATIVE APPROACH: IS IT REALLY SO BAD?

I think it should be fairly clear that what I have described as the "excommunicative" approach is really characterized by an overemphasis on accuracy of form, brief contributions by students, usually responding rather than initiating, in passive roles, within a teacher-centered classroom. The effect of such an approach, one might predict, would be that students would not be adequately prepared to participate in the activities of the general English speaking community. One can ask if this is such a terrible outcome.

Let us not misinterpret the effects of a school experience which largely consists of excommunicative activities. Activities of this type may actually have benefits. Removal from one community, particularly one which is stressful for the individual, may have compensations in terms of membership in an alternative community. One community which seems to have a thriving population might be termed "the ESL-classroomees". Members of this community can develop quite remarkable proficiency in producing English language material such as I was tall last night, I'm taller tonight, and I will be the tallest next week, without actually 'using' any English outside the classroom. I'm sure many Americans become "French-classroomees" or "German-classroomees" by a similar process of excommunication, not by choice necessarily, but rather by misdirection. A certain amount of ritual understanding takes place in such communities, since turn-taking formats such as the following can be performed with ease:

---

[4] This example is taken from a speech to the National Press Club during May, 1984, and is part of data collected by John Raiter.

Comment allez-vous?	Je vais bien, merci
Wie geht es Ihnen?	Ganz gut, danke

Yet, membership of the "French-classroomees," for example, seems not to be convertible very readily into membership of the community of French speakers. It is sort of like taking up rollerskating in order to be able to join the rollerskating group of desirable members of the opposite sex in summer parks, and take part in associated pleasures, only to end up becoming proficient at rollerskating. Only. Actually, you can go on to pass rollerskating tests, even get your degree ("B.R."), and lead a contented life. You may be indistinguishable from those who chose rollerskating for its own sake and never thought of alternative pleasures.

The point is, getting back to the ESL students, that the results of excommunication, personally chosen or imposed, are not necessarily bad. They are only bad, as the Catholic will tell the Protestant, if you really didn't set out to be excommunicated. We should also remember that membership in other communities may already be such a powerful influence that there is no real interest in joining the community of English speakers. Some visitors to the community overtly mark their excommunicated status by having interpreters act as go-betweens.

AVOIDING EXCOMMUNICATION

So, what about those ESL students who want to become members of the community of English speakers? Given the constraints of inappropriate environments, such as classrooms, there are nevertheless a number of strategies we can provide them with. Note that it cannot be the aim of these strategies to turn the ESL student into an American nor to enable her to pass as an undercover agent. It cannot be our brief to modify personalities or to change identities. Rather, the aim has to be to provide those skills which enable each student to participate in the community as a Hmong medical technician who speaks English, or a Swedish doctor who speaks English, and so on.

The Communicative Approach

In meeting this goal, I suspect that we should try to be more honest about what the so-called "communicative approach" offers. It does not typically offer, and this is all too often hidden in the small print, any means of providing the student with, for example, basic grammatical knowledge of the English language. If the student needs to be able to produce forms like I went and I have gone, with consistent accuracy and in the correct linguistic contexts, there is unlikely to be any guidance within a communicative syllabus which would prevent her from saying I gone and I have went. Generally, those who promote the "communicative approach" behave as if someone else is responsible for the students having acquired proficiency in the grammar and pronunciation of English.

Others, such as Stephen Krashen in his promotion of acquisition via the "natural approach" (cf. Krashen & Terrell, 1983), seem to believe that English grammar will just "happen" to the student. It's sort of like painting a wall by the "let's-throw-buckets-of-paint-at-it" method. If we throw enough English language at the student, some of it will stick, and acquisition will take place. Unfortunately, some of the painters, metaphorically speaking, are getting a bit frustrated at what is now being discovered to be, in essence, an absence of methodology. The walls remain unpainted and, what's more, everything is in a mess.

Indeed, it may now be becoming clear that the "communicative approach" cannot, in fact, be treated as a teaching methodology in the literal sense. It is not an approach which provides a teacher with a method of "teaching." It has to be treated as a means of determining what kinds of activities take place in classrooms and what kinds of materials are used. In many ways, it requires that the teacher remove herself from the center of activity in the classroom and take a facilitator or stage-manager role, rather than the main character part of the past. It also has to allow, by its format, that I gone and I have went become acceptable within their communicative contexts of use. In simple terms, if those forms work for the students in terms of communication, then they are inherently successful uses of the English language.

This may sound like bad news to someone with an aversion to accepting grammatical error in any English speech, but it would make sense to those who believe that second language acquisition takes place via the development of a student's ability through a series of approximative systems towards eventual competence in the target language. This, of course, is what the term "interlanguage" is designed to describe. At any stage, "mistakes" are to be expected. If "getting the message across" really is the aim, then the only "mistakes" that should worry us are those which interfere with that aim.

Talking about "Mistakes"

To make provision for a more consistent use of accurate forms such as I went and I have gone, when they are required, in the students' speech may in fact demand more than is usually associated with the "communicative approach." It may require "breaks" from communicative activities, during which some attention is devoted to formal accuracy.

We can, of course, take these "breaks" as opportunities to be "heavy" about the inaccuracies we hear. It may be that some student groups will welcome the occasional session on: "Look, folks, you're all doing this wrong and you've got to quit it. Let me show you how English speakers like to do this ...." Unfortunately, this type of approach can, in effect, create a lot of distance between teacher and students. It can have a totally negative effect and may only work with students who are known to be able to cope with rather threatening experiences in the classroom. It's powerful stuff, use sparingly.

Alternatively, we can take some material, as suggested already, from the tape-recorded production of students involved in communicative activities and devote some attention to what's happening at the linguistic level in that production. With some teacher guidance, this type of language lesson can develop from the students' own reactions to what they had said in some previous activity.

Here is an example of some student commentary on the way one of them, who had been in the role of an eyewitness, had described a car-crash scene in a previous lesson. (The elicitation material can be found in Brown & Yule, 1983)

Student 1 (on tape): the car the car is going to go on the up road - and the bus wants to - em a - avance - the lorry - and so the bus when he when it sees the car coming it has to stop
Teacher: So, did you all understand what happened?
Student 1: oh - it wasn't good - I don't remember that word - em - is it "advance"?
Student 2: you mean "take over"
Student 3: it's "pass" - "pass the lorry"
Teacher: right - it wants to "overtake the lorry" or "pass the lorry" - so you did follow that - anything else?
Student 1: I said "he" for the bus - I think
Teacher: did you?
Student 3: yes she said "he sees" for the bus - it means the driver - the driver of the bus he sees the car
Teacher: right - but it didn't sound odd
Student 4: can you say "the car coming" - not "is coming"?
Student 1: I didn't say it "the car coming"

Teacher: oh I don't remember - let's play it again and listen for that ....

This type of activity has the advantage of allowing the teacher to become one of the group discussing the message-form and to be in a position to offer specific lexical and grammatical support precisely when it is needed, in a way that no dictionary or grammar book could ever supply. A clear disadvantage would be that, if students are actually avoiding certain words or structures in their spoken production, then such structures may not come up for discussion at all. If the teacher becomes aware of the fact that a particular structure which could be usefully employed by the students is not being used, then there are options for giving it some exposure.

An interesting exercise developed by Nelson (this volume) creates scenarios in which speakers have to state their choices. One of the natural structures provided by the English language for expressing those choices is the relative clause construction. Without necessarily being aware that they are taking part in a lesson on "forming relative clauses," students can become actively involved in saying things like I'd rather meet the man who won all the money or I'll take the one which you've opened already.

The trick, if that is the appropriate term, in this type of approach is to devise material which will foster skills in using the English language for self-expression, by using the language, rather than developing knowledge of the English language, by treating it as a subject like history or geography.

The Teacher's Skills

It should now be apparent that the "communicative approach" places a premium on different skills, as far as the teacher is concerned, than most traditional approaches. That charismatic twenty-minute presentation on the way relative clauses are formed in English (you know, with the really clear examples, using the whole blackboard efficiently, different colored chalk to highlight the relative pronouns, all that stuff) is, unfortunately, not really appreciated in the communicative approach. Instead, the required skills seem to involve producing material which will stimulate the student to use the English language to actually talk to someone. This can take the form of exercises which lead the student to use relative clause structures, as noted already, rather than to hear about them from the teacher.

The "skill" required of the teacher, then, is a certain amount of ingenuity in coming up with a set of exercise types which give students "roles" and "topics." This doesn't have to be "role-play" and "what I did on the weekend," but such formats are clearly heading in the appropriate direction. The natural classroom setting for such activities is no longer teacher-at-front, class-in-rows, but involves a roving teacher and students in pairs or groups. The "center of attention" in the classroom, then, has to shift and, if considered beneficially, creates the opportunity for the teacher to get among the students while they are trying to produce their messages. The teacher is then available as a resource (for example, for vocabulary) at the precise moment when the student needs such a resource. It's a great idea, but it takes some practice. The problem with the "communicative approach" is not that the skills required of the teacher are particularly novel, since most teachers have, in one form or another, been developing their own exercises and getting among their own students, but that other skills, previously valued, have been pushed aside. A different type of ingenuity in running an ESL class is now required, and for the same low pay, the ESL teacher is expected to have developed it overnight.

From Function to Form

A good example of the ingenuity now required of the ESL teacher within the "communicative approach" involves a substantial mental shift to treat what she knows about the English language in terms of function rather than form. She can appreciate that this makes sense, but most of her training has been concerned with linguistic form rather than communicative function. Indeed, an exercise designed to get students "communicating" via the use of relative clauses, as mentioned earlier, is still motivated by the idea that the English language can be characterized as a set of forms or structures such as the relative clause.

An alternative view might note that we do not "relative-clause" to each other via language, but we certainly try to "identify objects and distinguish them from others" for the benefit of our hearers. This functional view then treats linguistic forms, including the relative clause, as a means of accomplishing that identification. It can be accomplished by other, non-linguistic means, and those, as Tarone (1981) pointed out, must be included in the set of "strategies" of communication.

In performing an "identifying" function via language, we clearly can help ourselves to relative clause structures, as well as other descriptive noun phrase (NP) types. For example, I'm talking about the new professor (NP containing adjective) - the one who wears the weird shirts (NP containing relative clause) - you know - the guy from California (NP containing prepositional phrase), or that function is equally served by proper names, Mike Hammond or job titles, Director of Metrical Phonology Incorporated, and so on. Given such a range of forms which can fulfill a particular function, we have to predict that the more functionally oriented the activity devised, the less predictable will be the actual language elicited from the speaker. Consequently, the ESL teacher following such an approach will have to operate with a much more open view of what can count as "acceptable" responses by her students in the performance of a communicative task.

Probably the greatest ingenuity required, then, is in the actual creation of the types of tasks which will encourage the students' use of a range of communicative functions. Some tasks are easier to envisage than others. Descriptive tasks can be based on photos or pictures, and narrative tasks on strip cartoons or short videotapes. If the teacher keeps in mind the requisite properties of a communicative activity, outlined earlier, then the student speaking should be in a position of intentionally conveying some information to a recipient who needs that information. It follows that the recipient should be another student or students (not the "all-knowing" teacher), who also will have a task to perform, and that there should be an information gap between the two participants involved. For more on such tasks, try Brown & Yule (1983).

Following such an approach, the teacher is in a position to say that what is happening in her ESL classroom is definitely not "excommunicative." Students are being given the opportunity to use the language, they are developing strategies of communication, and can be encouraged to manipulate whatever linguistic resources they have, rather than to search (in grammar book or dictionary) for the precisely correct structure or word. We might note here that, under different circumstances, we might want to teach vocabulary, by whatever method we prefer (see Richards, this volume, for suggestions), but, when involved in a communicative activity, students should be encouraged to manipulate their basic working vocabulary (for example, it's a kind of thing you use to look at very small things you can't see) rather than to stop because they can't remember the precise term (e.g. microscope). Manipulative skills with language, even with a limited repertoire, must lead to greater participation in the activities of the English speaking community than being in possession of a non-manipulative extensive knowledge of grammar and vocabulary. If we can accept this notion, we may then start to make sense of the idea, put forward by writers such as Breen & Candlin (1980) and Tarone (1984), that language learning and development can take place in the very process of trying to communicate and particularly by having to solve communicative problems.

We really do not want to train "ESL-classroomees" and we cannot believe that we should be preparing our students to be dependent on our being there to do all the English language talking. We should be giving them practice in solving communicative problems, with our support certainly, but with an aim to developing those skills which will allow them to participate in the general English speaking community. Our role, after all, is to prepare them to get by without us.

REFERENCES

Allwright, Richard L. 1984. The importance of interaction in classroom language learning. Applied Linguistics 5(2):156-171.

Breen, Michael, and Christopher Candlin. 1980. The essentials of a communicative curriculum in language teaching. Applied Linguistics 1(2):89-112.

Brown, Gillian, and George Yule. 1983. Teaching the spoken language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hymes, Dell. 1972. Models of the interaction of language and social life. In Directions in sociolinguistics, John Gumperz and Dell Hymes (Eds.). New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Krashen, Stephen, and Tracy D. Terrell. 1983. The natural approach. New York: Pergamon Press.

Lyons, John. 1977. Semantics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Morrow, Keith, and Keith Johnson. 1979. Communicate. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ochs, Elinor. 1979. Planned and unplanned discourse. In Syntax and semantics 12: discourse and syntax, Talmy Givon (Ed.). New York: Academic Press.

Tannen, Deborah (Ed.). 1982. Spoken and written language. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex Publishing.

Tarone, Elaine. 1981. Some thoughts on the notion of communication strategy. TESOL Quarterly 15(3):285-295.

Tarone, Elaine. 1984. Teaching strategic competence in the foreign-language classroom. In Initiatives in communicative language teaching, Sandra J. Savignon and Margie S. Berns (Eds.). Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing.

SOME NEGLECTED VOCABULARY NEEDS OF ESL STUDENTS

Tom Richards

Most ESL teachers and students seem to believe that the larger one's vocabulary is the more communicatively competent one is likely to be. An extensive vocabulary is undoubtedly invaluable for effective communication, but it may not be adequate. This paper discusses some important areas of vocabulary which are often neglected in ESL instruction and offers some suggestions for helping students make their vocabularies -- and hence communicative abilities -- more adequate. A bibliography of some useful references is provided for teachers interested in meeting the wide range of students' vocabulary needs.

ON VOCABULARY NEEDS OF ESL STUDENTS

The recent emphasis on the communicative language needs of ESL students (see Yule, this volume) has given rise to much discussion and controversy. While there has been general agreement that a "communicative approach" to language teaching can give us insights into students' language needs, there remains disagreement as to what exactly these needs are and how they may be most effectively met. This is especially the case with vocabulary.

The importance of an extensive and well-developed vocabulary is emphasized by Judd (1978), who stresses that extensive vocabulary development should begin at the beginning levels of instruction. This argument is based on what Baxter (1980) calls the "quantitative" view of vocabulary. According to this view, the more words students know the more likely it is

---

Tom Richards teaches ESL at the University of Minnesota.

that they will be able to successfully comprehend and convey intended messages. This quantitative view seems quite accurate until we make a distinction between the spoken and written modes of language.

As Brown (1978) points out, one important distinction between spoken and written language can be made in terms of time and hearer feedback. Obviously, speakers usually have very little time to search for a particular lexical item when interacting with one another, but can rely on the situational context, including paralinguistic clues, non-verbal communication, cooperation of the listener, and feedback. In contrast, written language lacks the situational context of speaker-hearer interaction, so that lexical explicitness and precision become more important. Because of this distinction, a large vocabulary seems to be more important for communicative competence in the written mode than in the spoken. Moreover, in spoken language the quality of one's vocabulary may be just as important as --if not more important than -- the quantity. This is not to say that in spoken language an extensive vocabulary is not useful, but rather that it might not contain particular words and phrases and related skills necessary for effective and natural communication. So let us focus on these often neglected vocabulary items and skills which can greatly help ESL students to be more communicatively competent.

SOME NEGLECTED VOCABULARY NEEDS OF ESL STUDENTS

Ways of Expressing Meaning Other than through Precise Lexical Items

First of all, ESL students should know that in spoken English meaning is conveyed not only through the use of precise lexical items but in other ways as well. Native speakers use a range of devices to convey meaning when the precise word does not come to mind: near synonynms, more general words, pauses, expressions such as more or less, and phrases such as you know and I dunno, which indicate to hearers that they should increase their involvement in interpreting the message (Baxter 1980). As for "general words," Baxter writes that students should know "defining" vocabulary such as part, way, thing, stuff, kind, and idea, since all speakers -- including native speakers of a language -- cannot always immediately recall precise lexical items for production, even when they know them well. The student who does not know the word for vending machine, for example, can use a defining phrase such as machine that you put money in to get a coke or something. The Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English provides a list of 2,000 defining vocabulary items to which teachers and students can turn for help in identifying common words used in defining. As Baxter argues, ESL teachers should teach students how such devices are employed and devise activities in which they are needed. Such activities can promote the development of "manipulative skills" referred to by Yule (this volume).

There are many different activities which can be devised which teach ESL students to manipulate English to convey meaning in the various ways that native speakers do. One possibility is to present authentic conversations either live or taped (such as those in James 1980) -- and ask students to identify the types of devices mentioned above. Discussion can focus on the purpose various devices can serve (see Nelson, this volume), sociolinguistic appropriateness, etc. Or, students can be asked to desribe an unfamiliar object or narrate an event, recording the speech on tape. It is likely that some meaning will be expressed unnaturally or unsuccessfully; this can lead to discussion of how the students might have performed differently, with special attention to the use of defining vocabulary, the use of near synonyms (perhaps qualified by words like more or less), and so on. Equipped with some new devices for conveying meaning, students can repeat the same tasks or try different ones.

Lexical Patterning

Another aspect of vocabulary which has gone almost completely unnoticed in ESL instruction is the skill of recognizing and being able to exploit lexical patterning (McCarthy 1984). By this McCarthy means that students need to learn how lexical items are related "above sentence level, across conversational turn boundaries and within the broad framework of discourse organization"(1984:14). According to this view, lexical relations such as synonymy, antonymy, and hyponymy above the clause or sentence level play an important part in communication. Thus, ESL students need to learn to anticipate and recognize the many ways in which vocabulary items relate to one another and to make use of lexical relations in producing more natural and effective language. McCarthy offers many useful suggestions for teaching lexical patterning. In a guessing game, students work in pairs with one student trying to guess in as much detail as possible what is in a picture seen only by the other student. The student with the picture can give only two clues. The example is from McCarthy (1984:17):

Clues: piece of furniture, office furniture

A: I've got a picture of a piece of furniture
B: Is it a bed?
A: No, it's office furniture
B: Is it a desk/cupboard? etc.

Another activity is one in which students are asked to respond to utterances in the ways specified in the following example (from McCarthy 1984:19).

a. Agree, with synonym:

A: He was very strange.
B: Yes, very odd

b. Agree, with antonym:

A: Joe didn't stick to the subject.
B: He wandered off too much.

c. Disagree, with antonym:

A: A really gripping film.
B: I thought it was dull.

d. Intensify:

A: It's a hot day.
B: Sweltering.

e. Reduce intensity:

A: Was he furious?
B: He was cross.

f. Agree, with more general word:

A: The cat is great company.
B: All pets are.

g. Agree, with more specific word:

A: Books are badly printed nowadays.
B: Especially paperbacks.

Informing the Speaker about Why You Don't Understand

Finally, another neglected vocabulary need of ESL students is for language they can use to inform their interlocutors when they don't understand a message or a part thereof. Non-native speakers may fail to understand because of particular vocabulary items, confusing grammar, softness or length of utterance, or even their own inattentiveness. Therefore, when students request a second opportunity to comprehend a message, they should inform speakers, insofar as they are able, why they don't understand. That is to say, ESL students should learn words and phrases such as the following (used with appropriate politeness):

repeat the first part
say it again
say it more slowly
rephrase that last part
speak up
say it another way

In addition, students need to practice the skill of forming WH questions in which they repeat what they have understood and replace with a WH word the part of a message they have missed:

Native speaker: Looks like it's going to hail.
Non-native speaker: It's going to what? I don't think
I know that word.

The point is that ESL students need to know that it is their responsiblity to inform native speakers as to the nature of their difficulties in comprehending a message. If they understand this, and if they learn to do it, they will succeed in making repairs of misunderstandings easier.

Related to this is a homework assignment in which students are asked to make phone calls requesting some useful information. For examples, teachers can take advantage of their students' desire to acquire information about subscribing to the newspaper, attending a certain performance, or setting up an appointment. The next day the students can report to the class about the information they received, explain whether they had difficulty understanding the speakers, and discuss the language they used to remedy any communication problems.

CONCLUSION

As should be clear from the above discussion, the quality of one's vocabulary knowledge -- as opposed to simply quantity of vocabulary -- can make a tremendous difference in the extent to which one can successfully participate in a community of native English speakers. Knowing the types of words, phrases, and skills presented above will enable ESL students to interact with native speakers with more confidence and greater ease, more naturally, and ultimately with more success than they could without them. We owe it to our ESL students to help them make their vocabularies -- and hence communicative abilities -- more adequate. Below is a bibliography of some useful references for teachers interested in meeting the wide range of ESL students' vocabulary needs.

A SHORT BIBLIOGRAPHY OF VOCABULARY RESOURCES

Baxter, James. 1980. The dictionary and vocabulary behavior: a single word or a handful? TESOL Quarterly 14(3):325-336.

Brown, Gillian. 1978. Understanding spoken language. TESOL Quarterly 12(3):271-283.

Celce-Murcia, Marianne, and Fred Rosensweig. 1979. Teaching vocabulary in the ESL classroom. In Teaching English as a second language. Mariane Celce-Murcia and Lois McIntosh (Eds.). Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Fredrickson, Terry L. 1983. Current events for ESL students: a course description for the teacher. MinneTESOL Journal 3:6-17.

Fredrickson, Terry L., and Paul Wedel. 1984. English by newspaper. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Hatch, Evelyn. 1978. Discourse analysis and second language acquisition. In Second language acquisition, Evelyn Hatch (Ed.). Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Higa, Masanori. 1965. The psycholinguistic concept of 'difficulty' and the teaching of foreign language vocabulary. Language Learning 15(3):167-179.

James, Gary, Charles G. Whitley, and Sharon Bode. 1980. Listening in and speaking out. New York: Longman.

Judd, Elliot. 1978. Vocabulary teaching and TESOL: a need for reevaluation of existing assumptions. TESOL Quarterly 12(1):71-76.

Krashen, Stephen D., and Tracy D. Terrell. 1983. The natural approach. Hayward, Calif.: The Alemany Press.

Lenier, Minnette, and Janet Maker. 1983. Keys to a powerful vocabulary. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Long, Michael, et.al. 1980. Reading English for academic study. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Martin, Anne V. 1976. Teaching academic vocabulary to graduate students. TESOL Quarterly 10(1):91-97.

McCarthy, M.J. 1984. A new look at vocabulary in EFL. Applied Linguistics 5(1):10-22.

McKay, Sandra. 1982. Verbs for a specific purpose. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Paulston, Christina Bratt, and Mary Newton Bruder. 1976. Teaching English as a second language: techniques and procedures. Cambridge, Mass.: Winthrop Publishers.

Plaister, Ted. 1981. Teaching vocabulary, listening comprehension, and reasoning by means of analogies. Foreign Language Annals 14(1):25-29.

Proctor, Paul (Ed.). 1978. The Longman dictionary of contemporary English. London: Longman.

Richards, Jack C. 1974. Word lists: problems and prospects. RELC Journal 5(2):69-84).

Richards, Jack C. 1976. The role of vocabulary teaching. TESOL Quarterly 10(1):77-89.

Rivers, Wilga. 1968. Teaching foreign language skills. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Rivers, Wilga. 1983. Communicating naturally in a second language. London: Cambridge University Press.

Twadell, W. Freeman. 1973. Vocabulary expansion in the ESOL classroom. TESOL Quarterly 7(1):61-78.

Wilkins, D.A. 1976. Notional syllabuses. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Yorkey, Richard. 1979. Longman dictonary of contemporary English. Review article. TESOL Quarterly 13(3):393-403.

REFERENCES

Baxter, James. 1980. The dictionary and vocabulary behavior: a single word or a handful? TESOL Quarterly 14(3):325-336.

Brown, Gillian. 1978. Understanding spoken language. TESOL Quarterly 12(3):271-283.

Judd, Elliot. 1978. Vocabulary teahcing and TESOL: a need for reevaluation of existing assumptions. TESOL Quarterly 12(1):71-76.

James, Gary, Charles G. Whitley, and Sharon Bode. 1980. Listening in and speaking out. New York: Longman.

McCarthy, M.J. 1984. A new look at vocabulary in EFL. Applied Linguistics 5(1):10-22.

Proctor, Paul (Ed.). 1978. The Longman dictionary of contemporary English. London: Longman.

THE DOUGHNUT THAT FELL INTO THE DISHWATER: THOUGHTS ABOUT TEACHING RELATIVE CLAUSES AND OTHER STRUCTURES

Eric Nelson

One useful thing that relative clauses enable us to do is differentiate clearly between things that are similar: between, for example, a doughnut that fell into the dishwater and some other doughnut with a happier history. Exercises that aim at demonstrating this purpose of relative clauses can provide useful practice in grammar classes. More generally, an approach to teaching grammar that asks what purpose a structure in the language serves can lead us to design exercises that demonstrate function as well as form.

I want to present some ideas for exercises involving relative clauses. In that sense, this is a 'something you can try Monday morning' kind of paper. But at the same time, I want to take you through the line of thinking that led to the exercises, and to make a pitch for using that kind of thinking in the design of grammar exercises generally. With that in mind, I'll ask for a little patience while I lead up to the presentation of the exercises.

WHAT ARE RELATIVE CLAUSES GOOD FOR?

If I were to ask you what the purpose of relative clauses is, you might answer that relative clauses modify nouns. Well, then, what is the purpose of modifying nouns? To give more information about whatever the noun names, you might say. And what is the purpose of giving more information? To make

---

Eric Nelson teaches ESL at the University of Minnesota.

something clear, so that people will know what we're talking about, perhaps. Now we're getting somewhere. Let's think about some situations in which more information is needed to make something clear. And, what's more, let's consider situations that show how a relative clause -- which is, after all, only one way of giving more information --serves a purpose that other ways cannot serve.

Let's imagine three different situations in which you want to refer to something in such a way that I will know exactly what you mean. In the first situation, I've offered you a doughnut and an English muffin. You have to choose. You say, "I'll take the doughnut." In the second situation, you have a three-way choice. You can have an English muffin, or you can have either of two doughnuts, one with frosting and one without. You say, "I'll take the frosted doughnut." In the third situation, you have a three-way choice again. Again, you can have an English muffin, and again you can have either of the two doughnuts. Neither doughnut is frosted this time, but each one has a history. One of them fell into the dishwater last night, but it's dry now and looks tempting. The other one fell into the Kitty Litter, but it too seems no worse for the experience. Maybe by now you're ready to go for that English muffin, but for the sake of discussion, let's say you're not. You say, "I'll take the doughnut that fell into the dishwater."

What can we learn from the language you used to express your choice in each of these situations? In the first situation, you said "I'll take the doughnut." The vocabulary of English offers you a convenient one-word expression, a noun, that allows you to identify what you want. In the second situation, because you were offered 2 things with the same name, you had to use a little more linguistic resourcefulness. You said, "I'll take the frosted doughnut." In this case the vocabulary of English offers no single word to express your choice, but it does provide an adjective, frosted, and the grammar provides rules for using adjectives. Frosted doughnut enables you to make your choice clear. In the third situation, you said, "I'll take the doughnut that fell into the dishwater." In this situation, as in the second one, you were choosing between two things that have the same name, doughnut. But this time the vocabulary of English does not offer any adjective to differentiate between them. You did, of course, have some information you could use to differentiate between the doughnuts -- the information about falling into the dishwater -- but this information is rather specific, and it has so far not been necessary for speakers of English to create a word to express it. The information can, however, be expressed in a sentence: The doughnut fell into the dishwater. And the grammar allows you to encode sentence-like information as a noun modifier -- that fell into the dishwater -- a relative clause.

What I'm trying to establish here is an understanding of what purpose a relative clause can serve.[1] I'm trying to provide an illustration of the usefulness of relative clauses. This notion is an important one, and it's worth saying in another way. Again I ask for a little patience.

One thing we have to be able to do with language is refer to things. Nouns help us do this. When two things have different names (nouns), it is easy for us to refer to one of them without fear that our listener or reader will think we are referring to the other. Of course, there aren't enough nouns to enable us to refer to everything in every circumstance, so we need some lingustic tricks. We need to be able to modify nouns with differentiating information. In some cases, the differentiating information is such that the lexicon includes an adjective for it: frosted, big, gooey, for example. But just as there aren't enough nouns, there aren't enough adjectives. That is, sometimes the differentiating information is such that the English lexicon does not provide an adjective for it (much less a noun). But we can always express information in sentence form, and the grammar includes rules that enable us to put this kind of information into noun phrases in the form of noun modifiers, noun modifiers that we call relative clauses. So the relative clause is a trick of language that allows us to use sentence-like information to modify a noun -- and thereby to refer accurately in cases where adjectives and nouns fail us.

---

[1] I have not examined the use of relative clauses in authentic texts in any systematic way. Therefore I will limit myself to speaking about one purpose that relative clauses can serve. They appear to serve a particular purpose in my constructed examples; I am not claiming that they always serve the same purpose. In addition, what I am saying does not apply to nonrestrictive relatives clauses. See Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman 1983 for a discussion of restrictive and nonrestrictive relative clauses.

A RELATIVE CLAUSE EXERCISE: TEASERS

I think it is worth trying to incorporate this notion of the usefulness of relative clauses into exercises for practicing the structure. That is, I would like to let my intuitions about what relative clauses are used for guide me in the design of exercises. It is possible, in fact, to design an exercise based quite closely on the third situation involving the doughnuts. The student might be presented with situations -- let's call them 'teasers' -- like these:

1. One doughnut fell on the floor. One doughnut fell into the dishwater. Which doughnut do you want?

   (Possible answer: The one that fell on the floor.)

2. One person wants to have two children. One person wants to have ten children. Which person do you think will have a happier life?

   (Possible answer: The person who wants to have ten children.)

3. Two people were interviewed for a teaching job. One talked most of the time during the interview and one of them listened most of the time. Which person should get the job?

   (Possible answer: The one who listened.)

These three teasers are designed to encourage a response that includes a subject relative clause (one in which the relative pronoun is the subject of the following verb). Here are three more that are designed to encourage the use of an object relative clause (one in which the relative pronoun is the object of the verb in the relative clause):

4. I studied two subjects. I studied one in class and I studied one at home in the evening. Which subject do you think I learned more about?

   (Possible answer: The one that you studied in class.)

5. Imagine that you have two drawings. You bought one of them for $200. Your best friend drew the other one. Which drawing is worth more to you?

   (Possible answer: The one that my friend drew.)

6. I kissed one of my professors. I kicked another one. Which professor do you think was more surprised?

   (Possible answer: The one you kicked.)

Here are three more which are designed to encourage the use of an object relative clause in which the object is the object of a preposition:

7. I saw two strangers in the bus station. I talked to one of them for one minute. I didn't talk to the other one, but I looked at him for five minutes. Which one will I remember longer?

   (Possible answer: The one you talked to.)

8. There are two radio stations in town. Most educated older people listen to one of them. Most young and lively people listen to the other one. Which one do you think your

grammar teacher would listen to?

(Possible answer: The one that educated people listen to.)

9. Two beds are for sale. George Washington once slept in one of them. Queen Elizabeth once slept in the other one. Which bed would you buy?

(Possible answer: The one that George Washington slept in.)

Here are three which are designed to encourage the use of a relative clause with whose:

10. One girl's parents are teachers. One girl's parents are police officers. Which girl do you think is more likely to grow up to be liberal?

(Possible answer: The girl whose parents are teachers.)

11. One woman's name begins with K. One woman's name begins with P. Which woman do you think is from Japan?

(Possible answer: The woman whose name begins with K.)

12. One friend's mother died. One friend's father died. Which friend would you visit first?

(Possible answer: The friend whose mother died.)

Here are three which are designed to encourage the use of relative clauses beginning with where:

13. In one country, a small group of businessmen has most of the power. In one country, a small group of generals has most of the power. Which country would you rather live in?

(Possible answer: The country where the businessmen are in power.)

14. I went to two places in the woods. In one spot I took a nap. In one spot I just admired the view. When I got back, I discovered that I had lost my wallet. Which spot should I return to?

    (Possible answer: The spot where you took a nap.)

15. In one room a murder was committed. In one room there is a strong smell of rotten eggs. Which room would you rather spend the night in?

    (Possible answer: The room where a murder was committed.)

You can see, from the way I have grouped the items, that I am very much concerned with form here as well as with function: the exercise provides opportunities for practicing different forms of relative clauses. But the most important feature of the exercise, the feature that sets it apart from, let's say, sentence-combining exercises on relative clauses of the type found in Azar (1981:210), is the attention to the usefulness of the relative clause. The exercise grew out of a desire to reflect the usefulness of relative clauses, and each item is designed to demonstrate that usefulness. The relative clause in the student's response serves the useful purpose of making the student's choice clear.

As you read through the teasers, you probably noted some features in the design of the exercise, and some limitations and objections probably occurred to you. In an effort to deal with some of what you may be thinking, let me make a few more observations about this type of exercise.

- Teasers encourage, but do not require, the use of relative clauses. Although I have conveniently chosen to provide answers that do include relative clauses -- such as the answer for #3, the one who listened -- you might have answered the second one or the listener. But the point is that an answer including a relative clause is at least as good as any other answer and that if a relative clause is used, it is used in a purposeful way.

- There is quite a bit of language in each teaser. It might be expecting too much to ask students to understand all the language and to respond orally. If students are allowed to take the teasers home and make their choices -- simply by underlining one of the sentences -- they will be more capable of responding in class on the next day.

- Since in each case I have called for a choice between two things of the same kind -- two beds, two rooms, two strangers -- it is natural to respond with the substitute word one: the one George Washington slept in, for example, rather than the bed George Washington slept in.

- The most natural response to each problem, to my ear, is a noun phrase, not a sentence. That is, while it is possible to say in response to #3 "the one who listened should get the job," I believe it is much more natural to say "The one who listened."

- Constructing teasers is not as easy as it may look. Assuming that the teacher wants to encourage the use of relative clauses as much as possible, there are certain pitfalls to avoid. Here is a teaser, for example, that would not particularly favor a relative clause response: You can invite either of two men to dinner. One of them is single and one of them is married. Which man will you invite? You might answer "The one who is single," but you might equally well answer "The single one" or even "The bachelor." The fault in the design of the teaser, if it can be called a fault, is that the differentiating information can be 'packaged' as an adjective before a noun or even as a single noun. Avoiding the verb *be* in the differentiating information is a good first stop toward discouraging the adjective + noun response.

Another example of a teaser that would be likely to fail to elicit a relative clause response is this one: You can have either of two cars. One has no safety belts. One has no odometer. Which one would you choose? You might answer "The one that has no odometer," but you might equally well answer "The one with no odometer." What makes it so easy to respond without a relative clause is the use of *have* in the differentiating information (the car *which has* no odometer = the car *with* no odometer). As a rule of thumb, it's best to avoid *have* in the differentiating information.

- In the examples I have given, I have tried to encourage the same type of relative clause response no matter which choice is made. One student's response to #12, for example, might be *the one whose father died*. Another student might say *the one whose mother died*. Both responses, however, include the same type of relative clause -- a relative clause with *whose*. Therefore both responses are, in a sense, equally difficult to attempt. This feature of the design of the exercise is not necessary, of course; I could equally well ask the student to choose between a friend whose mother died (relative clause with *whose*) and a friend who flunked the TOEFL (subject relative clause).

Is this type of exercise communicative? It depends. If the students are encouraged to respond in whatever way they can to express their choices, then the exercise comes close to being communicative. It is, in that case, an exercise in 'referring' or 'identifying' rather than an exercise on relative clauses, and all responses that successfully communicate -- including *The first one*, **The friend that his father died*, **His father dead* -- would have to be regarded as appropriate in some sense. If the teacher demands relative clauses in all responses (as one might do if the teasers are treated as a written exercise), then the exercise is focused more on form and less on function; it is therefore less communicative.

Obviously, the issue of what the focus of the exercise is relates very closely to the design of the items in the exercise. The teacher who wants to make the exercise as communicative as possible, focusing on the function of identifying rather than on the form of relative clauses, need not hesitate to include items that elicit responses with no relative clauses: the one with no odometer and the bachelor, for example. A more communicative approach, furthermore, would likely not limit the student's production to the statement of a choice. It would encourage a justification of that choice and reactions to the choice by others. Maria would not simply state her choice of, say, the bed that Washington slept in; she would justify that choice: it's probably older than the bed Queen Elizabeth slept in, and therefore more valuable. A classmate might point out that it depends on whether we are talking about Queen Elizabeth II or Queen Elizabeth I, and so on. Abdullah would not simply answer that the woman whose name begins with K is likely to be from Japan; he would explain that he knew of Japanese women named Keiko and Kumi and Kazuko but had never heard of a Japanese name beginning with P. A classmate might ask whether the Japanese language even has a p, and so on. Students would be encouraged to choose teasers that interest them and pose them to other students; students would write their own teasers. The activity would be conducted by students in groups, without the leadership of the teacher.

Even in its most communicative form, of course, the exercise remains just that: an exercise. Little depth or realism of communication can be expected in an activity in which students react briefly to a series of short, unrelated bits of language. The activity therefore remains contrived and game-like at best. Still, in the brief exchanges that are stimulated by the teasers, we can hope for purposeful communication of a limited kind.

If we choose the more communicative approach with teasers, we need not, of course, abandon our concern with form. We can, if we wish, follow the suggestion of George Yule (this volume) and record the interaction for later use in a lesson devoted to grammatical correctness.

A SIMPLER EXERCISE

The idea behind teasers can be adapted in many ways. Here is a much simpler exercise, presented as I have presented it on handouts to intermediate level students.

> For each pair of sentences, write one sentence that includes a relative clause, as in the examples.
>
> a) One student always comes late to class. One student always comes early.
>
> Answers: The student who comes late should get an alarm clock.
> or: The student who comes early probably learns more.
> or: The teacher should have a talk with the student who comes late.
> or: The teacher probably appreciates the student who comes early.
>
> etc.
>
> b) One horse runs fast. One horse runs slowly.
>
> Answers: The horse that runs fast will win races.
> or: I feel sorry for the horse that runs slowly.
> or: I would rather ride the horse that runs slowly.
>
> etc.

1. One doctor makes $500,000 a year. One doctor works for free.

2. One story makes people laugh. One story makes people cry.

3. One child always obeys his parents. One child always disobeys.

4. One dog chases cats. One dog chases cars.

5. One teacher gives lots of tests. One teacher gives no tests.

6. One radio station plays fast music. One plays slow music.

etc.

You will have noticed some obvious differences between this and the preceding exercise. For one thing, the 'input' is relatively simple. At the same time, the exercise requires more creativity from the student and results in less predictable language. Another difference is that this exercise seems to focus more on form: the instructions in fact say to include a relative clause. This is not a necessary feature of the exercise; the instructions could be phrased without reference to form. And in fact, we can choose to accept responses which do not include a relative clause (just as we can with the teasers). In response to an item like the one about the horses above, for example, the student might, say, speak of the fast horse rather than the horse that runs fast. If we are concerned mainly with form, this has to be regarded as a weak item. If we are concerned more with function, however, we need not consider it a weak item; we can consider it a successful item and we can consider a response like The fast horse is probably a race horse to be a successful response, even though it does not include a relative clause. With this exercise, as with the teasers, the teacher is free to choose how to focus the exercise.

Some of the comments I made about the teasers (for example, the comment about using the one in responses) apply to this type of exercise too, but a few additional comments might be useful.

- My colleague Judy Fuller has pointed out that students who are used to sentence-combining exercises may be confused by this exercise at first. They may fail to understand that they will use information from only one sentence, doing nothing with the other. The teacher, in going through the instructions, must make it very clear that the student is to choose only one of the people or things to say something about, and that the rest of the answer depends on the student's imagination.

- In this version of the exercise, only subject relative clauses are practiced. This is not a necessary limitation, of course. We can create items for practicing other types of relative clauses by restructuring the differentiating information. (Your parents listen to one radio station. Your friends listen to another radio station.)

- This exercise, unlike the teasers, will encourage sentences as answers, rather than phrases. In order to say something about the doctor who works for free, for example, the student has to attempt to use that phrase in a sentence. Some typical responses might be I prefer the doctor who works for free (the phrase becomes an object in a sentence) and The doctor who works for free will never be rich (the phrase becomes the subject of a sentence).

ONE MORE EXERCISE

The third type of exercise is the most highly structured. Here is how it appears on handouts I have given to intermediate level students:

Follow the example.

One man needs food.
One man needs stamps.
One man needs money.

Where should each man go?

to the Post Office
to a grocery store
to a bank

Answers: The man who needs stamps should go to the post office.

The man who needs food should go to a grocery store.

The man who needs money should go to the bank.

1. One girl likes numbers.
One girl likes grammar.
One girl likes plants.

What should each girl study?

English
mathematics
botany

2. One teacher speaks French.
One teacher speaks Japanese.
One teacher speaks Italian.

Where would each teacher find a job?

in Tokyo
in Paris
in Rome

3. One boy likes boxing.
One boy likes popular music.
One boy likes politics.

Who should each boy meet?

Muhammad Ali
Ronald Reagan
Michael Jackson

etc.

The type of language that will result from this exercise is obviously very limited. The exercise is structured to elicit responses of the same form again and again:

The girl who likes numbers should study math.
The girl who likes grammar should study English.
The girl who likes plants should study botany.
The teacher who speaks French should go to Paris.
The teacher who speaks Japanese should go to Tokyo.
etc.

This begins to look very much like pattern practice, but it differs from pattern practice in important ways. For one thing, the student's attention is focused away from form (the instructions say nothing about relative clauses); it is focused on meaning: matching up pieces of information. Because meaning is important in this exercise, the student's success depends in part on knowledge of the world. The student must know, for example, that Michael Jackson is a music star, that Muhammad Ali was a boxer, and that Ronald Reagan is a politician. (If the student knows only two of these three facts, and arrives at the third by the process of elimination, the exercise actually teaches something about the world, in a small way.)

Once the students understand how this type of exercise works, there is no reason why they cannot handle items in which more creativity is demanded. They might be asked to respond freely to questions, for example, rather than choosing from a set of answers. In this way, the student's output comes to look less like the output in a grammar drill and more like communication.

GETTING BACK TO THE POINT

As a way of getting back to the main point of this paper, let's look at one item of each type of exercise in juxtaposition:

A teaser:

> One couple wants to have two children. One couple wants to have ten chldren. Which couple will have a happier life?
>
> (Possible response: The couple who wants ten children.)

An item from the second type of exercise:

> One couple wants to have two children. One couple wants to have ten children.
>
> (Possible response: I agree with the couple who wants to have ten children.

An item from the third type of exercise:

> One couple wants to have ten children.
> One couple wants to have two chldren.

Where should each couple live?

in an apartment
in a big house

(Possible responses: The couple who wants ten children should live in a big house.

The couple who wants two children should live in an apartment.

It should be clear from this group of examples that the same principle underlies all of the exercises.[2] In every case the student is asked to make a choice. In every case information in sentential form differentiates between things of the same type, and that information is conveniently (most conveniently in the best items) expressed in the form of a relative clause in the student's response. Each item in each type of exercise is intended to demonstrate how the relative clause answers a need we have when we communicate: how it enables us to refer to something in such a way that people know just what we mean.

The approach that led to the creation of these exercises is an approach that I encourage for other activities in the grammar class. It is an approach that asks about a given structure, "What is this structure good for? Under what circumstances do we need this structure?" The exercise then follows from the answers to those questions. If the exercise evolves away from form (and becomes, for example, an exercise in identifying rather than an exercise in structure), that may be all to the good. If different forms (such as nouns, adjectives plus nouns, and nouns plus relative clauses) seem to serve the same purpose under some circumstances, then it is natural to promote practice of these different forms together. In this way, an exercise develops into something closer to real communication.

---

[2] See Wickboldt (1979) for an exercise involving pictures which makes use of the same principle.

REFERENCES

Azar, Betty S. 1981. Understanding and using English grammar. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Celce-Murcia, Marianne, and Diane Larsen-Freeman. 1983. The grammar book: an ESL/EFL teacher's guide. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Wickboldt, June, 1979. A game for practice in using relative clauses. MinneTESOL Newsletter 3(2):8-9.

REVIEW

Understanding Academic Lectures. Abelle Mason. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1983. Pp. xiii + 195. Textbook ($11.95) and 7 cassettes ($129.00).

Susan Gillette

Listening teachers, easily recognized by the ever-present appendage of a tape recorder, are always on the prowl for authentic conversations and lectures to present to their students. In recent years, useful texts for developing conversational listening (see, for example, James et al. 1980) and lecture listening (Young and Fitzgerald 1982) have appeared. No recent text has been as ambitious and thorough as Understanding Academic Lectures (UAL) by Abelle Mason. Mason not only provides students with opportunities to develop their note-taking skills from authentic lectures, but also takes on the complex and fascinating task of lecture analysis, both at the discourse level and at the level of the role lectures play in an educational system.

WHAT DOES UAL INCLUDE?

The book is divided into three parts. Part I presents "A Crosscultural View," Part II is "A Preface to Lectures," and Part III provides "Five Lectures for Study." The book also includes an appendix (completed listening guides and outlines for most of the interviews and lectures) and answer keys to quizzes and exercises. Teachers can write to the publisher for a book of transcripts.

Part I presents features of the education systems --and lectures in particular -- of Latin America, East Asia, East/West Africa, the Middle East, Great Britain, and Europe. Mason recorded interviews with scholars who had been international

---

Susan Gillette teaches ESL at the University of Minnesota.

students in the U.S. and now teach here and American scholars with experience as students in other cultures. Similar topics arise in all of the interviews, including the relationship of students to teachers and advice to students who are of the same cultural background as the scholar being interviewed. The Latin American professor discusses the difficulty of taking a multiple choice exam instead of a lengthy essay exam which allows thorough development of an idea. The West African scholar sheds light on racial prejudice he felt as a student in the U.S. and his way of overcoming it by "walk[ing] with quiet dignity." He also relates specific cultural concepts that interfere with his understanding and use of English. In the interview about East Asia, Edwin Reischauer, the noted American scholar, describes the system of "schools of thought" in Japanese universities. This system contrasts with the diversity of ideas found within a single department at many U.S. universities. The Middle Eastern professor contrasts his country's practice of having students choose and stay with one major to the U.S. system, which encourages dabbling in various fields. The British professor gives an historical perspective on lectures in Great Britain and speaks jokingly of the competition for students: lecturers develop masterful oratorical skills in an effort to draw a good audience. (The excerpt about the British system is from a panel discussion but is in fact a lecture, as revealed by the lack of interruptions or discussion.) The final selection in Part I contrasts the European and American lecture norms. The interviewee reviews the background of lecturers and students in terms of socio-economic status, as well as size of the audience and lecture styles.

All of these selections are on audiotapes which last fifteen to twenty-five minutes. The speakers are all articulate, though a few are a bit monotonous and two speak rather rapidly; but such is the liability involved in using tapes of authentic speech. The procedure for using the tapes remains the same throughout. The students listen to parts of the interviews, then, sometimes, to combinations of parts, and then to the whole. Before they listen to a segment (boundaries are marked in the book and, with tones, on the tapes), they review vocablary and "listening cues." Then they read a series of questions about the content. Finally, as they listen, they answer the questions by filling in a "topic guide." The vocabulary and listening cues include words, idioms, and phrases and their meanings (in the context of the lecture) and some complete sentences from the interview which might cause comprehension difficulties. In some interviews, the topic guide is in outline form. In others, the topics are simply listed and numbered in the order in which they occur.

Lectures differ not only cross-culturally but among disciplines. Part II of the book takes on this area of contrast, looking at the differing roles played by lectures in science and in humanities courses. Two speakers discuss the techniques they use in lecturing and the function of lectures in their courses. One, a biochemistry professor, lists the elements of a good lecture in his field; the other, an English professor, emphasizes the student's role. The biochemistry professor is part of a panel, but here again the information comes across as a lecture. The English professor is interviewed by the author. The third and final tape in this section is a self-proclaimed "canned lecture" by the author herself. Not having found any authentic lecture which could serve as a model with a clear introduction, body, and conclusion, organized in "ideal" form, the author created one. The purpose of the canned lecture is to act as a preface to the long lectures that follow, and, as Mason says to the students, "[to] help you evaluate your progress in listening comprehension." Because of the latter purpose, there is no listening guide or vocabulary help. In this lecture, Mason discusses differences between an interview, an authentic lecture, and a canned lecture. She also gives students advice for listening to academic discourse.

The third part of the book includes five long lectures. Some of the topics are quite unusual for an ESL text and, more important, all of them are truly academic. The speakers cite research, present arguments, and refer to leaders in their fields. The lectures, therefore, have a depth which makes them inherently more interesting than a short tidbit of information on a topic. Three of the lectures were given to ESL students, while the other two were heard by general audiences. All of them are self-contained; that is, they do not originate from a course, they are not dependent on any background reading, and they do not relate to each other or to any other lectures. They are all long -- at least forty minutes -- and are accompanied by detailed listening guides. The guides are thorough enough to compensate for the absence of videotape. Whenever a lecturer illustrated a point visually, a photograph, drawing, chart, or graph appears in the guide.

In the first lecture, "What is Body Language?," the speaker makes several generalizations about communication and describes the elements of sound, space, body boundary, touching, synchrony, rhythm, and movement in communication. The second lecture, "The Roots of Jazz," includes several recorded examples of jazz. The speaker introduces the concepts of swing, tension, surprise, and personality in jazz. He goes on to discuss how jazz probably began as communication between slaves and later evolved when slaves moved to New Orleans and eventually adapted this music form in religious calls and responses in church. In the third lecture, "Roles of Men and Women in Paid and Unpaid Work," the lecturer discusses the present situation of working men and women and also looks at the future of marriage and roles within the American family. The fourth lecture, "The Study of Peasants," includes a definition of peasants and discusses peasants' relationship to the land and to national governments. The speaker describes peasants as a group culturally distinct from the larger society and yet also distinct from a tribe. He looks at the political significance of peasants in the past, the future of peasants, and the pressures on peasants to dissolve their communities. In the final lecture, "Society at the Turning Point," the lecturer examines three time frames which are all coming to an end: the 200 years of the Industrial Revolution, the 500 years since the Renaissance, and 2,000 years of Christianity. He relates five views of the future held by various futurists, describes the concept of a "dual economy," and gives his own model of social transformation.

As is evident from the synopses of the listening selections, a great deal of information is presented in all three parts of the textbook. Beyond the actual content of the interviews and lectures, what can we expect students to learn? The book contains an enormous amount of vocabulary and cue phrases (with their functions in discourse) to be assimilated. There are also thorough presentations and examples of various features of discourse. In Part I, for instance, Mason explores the concepts of dry humor, paradox, and irony. The concept of restatement is also illustrated in detail (in Part II) and then expanded on when it recurs in the five lectures. The uses of questions and comparison in lectures are also described and illustrated. Mason analyzes the structure of lectures throughout Parts II and III. She explains and exemplifies features of introductions such as "breaking the ice," offering credentials, establishing context, and narrowing the focus. Conclusions -- what they can include and why they are often truncated -- are also explained. Mason labels transitions between parts of a lecture as SUMO (summing up and moving on) and brings these to the students' attention when they occur in the lectures. Students will also become familiar with the outline form of notetaking, as well as some attention to note-taking abbreviations.

SOME CRITICISMS

Certainly students who use this book will be sensitized to many facets of lectures, but the book is not without flaws. To begin with a minor criticism, the layout and printing of the text is problematic. There is a great deal of prose to read through. Much of this is explanations of elements of discourse. For example, there are several paragraphs about questions lecturers might use -- their purposes and classifications. There is also a discussion of the differences between written and spoken language. While these descriptions are useful, they are not displayed in a visually appealing or salient manner. The student would benefit more from them if they were singled out with a box around them or placed on a page of their own. The prose is particularly weighty in the presentation of content questions that precedes the lecture listening. These are printed in paragraph form and also lack visual salience. Thus, the text looks more formidable (and dull) than it actually is.

A second weakness is that the knowledge of lectures and of discourse that students are likely to have even before they enter an American university -- the knowledge that they bring to the task of understanding academic discourse -- is not fully utilized. In fact, it is sometimes ignored. For instance, the author goes on at length about why speakers make comparisons, a concept that is surely familiar to most students from their previous experience.

A more serious criticism, perhaps, is that the students are simply not required to do enough on their own as they listen. They do not have to determine the functions of cue phrases, for example, since that information is always provided. If the functions were not provided with the cue phrases (and if the cue phrases themselves were not always provided), the students would be more actively engaged in using their own analytical skills. The primary task throughout, as mentioned, is to fill in outlines. These are presented with major parts and even illustrations clearly labeled. The students do not have to listen to discern the divisions or to separate examples from main points. This much support seems inconsistent with Mason's stated goal, "to enable students to reconstruct the plan, the purpose, the supporting data and illustrations in a given lecture." The students don't have to do this work for themselves; they are apparently expected to learn how to do it from Mason's guides. Beyond that, the task of filling in outlines is too mechanical and too repetitive in itself.

Perhaps the most serious criticism of the outline task is that it seems to emphasize the "total comprehension" model of listening, an unrealistic view of listening (held by many students) that every word must be understood. In reality, of course, listeners do not hear every word even when listening to their native language; yet they construct an understanding based on what they do hear and what they already know about the subject. Mason's outlines structure the listening experience so that the student is preoccupied with trying to figure out what piece of information goes under what heading. The focus is taken away from constructing an interpretation of the message as they listen. In addition, the outline form doesn't allow for experience and information students may already have about a topic. Some information will be familiar to some students, and, realistically, would not be written in their notes.

There are other tasks, but these appear only here and there. They include true/false and multiple choice quizzes on content, vocabulary matching exercises, and questions for discussion and writing. Most of them seem to be more of an afterthought than an integral part of the text.

A final criticism relates to the absence of background reading. Mason takes the trouble to establish how lectures are related to assigned readings (and tests) in academic classes, yet she fails to provide readings to go with the five lectures.

SUGGESTIONS FOR USING UAL

Criticisms aside, Mason's material contains a wealth of interesting natural discourse which teachers and teacher trainers can use in their own way. How can the text best be used so that students learn various skills? Some suggestions follow.

Because Part I includes six speakers from different areas of the world, different groups of students could be assigned different areas. Each group would listen to one interview and then share the information on various topics with others. If students worked on tapes dealing with parts of the world they were unfamiliar with, they could then check their comprehension with classmates who were from those areas. Using the tapes for Part I in this way would eliminate the tedium of listening to six fairly long interviews. The teacher could present information on discourse that seems important for all groups, using excerpts from the tapes as examples.

Part II is probably most relevant to students who are teaching assistants in the U.S. The perspective of respected members of their field could be useful in helping TAs set goals for their own teaching. The information in both Parts I and II could be used in training teachers --both native speakers and non-native speakers -- to be more sensitive to cultural differences in education.

As mentioned earlier, the lectures in Part III are independent both of each other and of written material (other than the guides that the author provides). Auxiliary readings to go with the five topics in Part III could give students useful background information, help them develop core vocabulary for the topics, better prepare them for discussions or writing, and give them a more realistic lecture-listening experience. Tests that are similar to those used in academic courses could also be developed. Because these lectures are all so long, listening in segments over a period of a few days might be advisable. Changing the student's task from outline completion for various segments would also be useful. Styles of note-taking other than the outline form could be presented and tried.

A REMARKABLE RESOURCE

Mason's achievement in producing this text is, despite criticisms, considerable. Mason has successfully gathered extensive authentic speech and analyzed it for important discourse structures, an enormous task that has discouraged other authors. The student who uses this book to best advantage will become aware of major features of lectures --such as the organization of arguments, the nature of introductions and conclusions, and the uses of examples -- as well as subtler features of style and tone. The abundance of taped material in itself is of great value and will help lighten a listening teacher's load.

It is interesting to note that one of the lectures, the lecture on jazz, was recorded in 1967. This was long before most ESL professionals recognized the value of authentic discourse. Mason's insights and knowledge of lecture discourse stem from many years of study and of listening. Though UAL is not a book to be used "as is" (does such a book exist?), it is a remarkable resource.

REFERENCES

James, Gary, Charles G. Whitley, and Sharon Bode. 1980. Listening in and speaking out. New York: Longman.

Young, Lynette, and Brigid Fitzgerald. 1982. Listening and learning: lectures. Rowely, Mass.: Newbury House.