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CHAPTER I
APPLIED LINGUISTICS FOR TEACHERS: STRUCTURALISM

Introduction

The teaching of language has been going on for at least two thousand five hundred years, according to one contemporary scholar. Yet the concept of a "language teaching profession" (complementing, but not identical to a "literary profession," which implies a body of knowledge to be controlled by the members of the profession, is a relatively new one. It is so new in fact that over the past three decades, a recurrent theme in the literature has been an attempt to define it and to justify its legitimacy. Presently, in the United States, some knowledge of linguistics is officially designated as essential to the formation of an adequate teacher of language.

This situation has not existed for much more than a decade. Fifteen years ago, a mood of mutual antagonism prevailed between descriptive linguists and professional language teachers and teacher trainers. And previous to that, although the educational establishment was paying increasing heed to the professional training
of language teachers,\textsuperscript{5} little mention was made of linguistic study other than that of traditional grammar and, occasionally, etymology.

The report of the Committee of Twelve stated that

...to be decently prepared...(the teacher of language) should know thoroughly the grammar of the language in its present form. If he has some knowledge of the historical development of the forms, such knowledge will help him in his teaching, especially the teaching of French to pupils who have studied Latin.\textsuperscript{6}

A 1927 survey of universities, colleges, and teacher's colleges preparing foreign language teachers mentioned a course in etymology. In a series of rank-ordered topics discussed in the methods course, a topic labelled "devices for teaching and drilling special grammar topics (e.g. adjective endings, use of subjunctive, etc.)" appears seventh out of 24 topics listed.\textsuperscript{7}

In a volume appearing in 1929, C.M. Purin emphasized the role of diachronic linguistics in second language acquisition:

After the study of earlier forms of the languages, most of the irregularities featured by the grammars are seen to exemplify well-defined rules of phonological development and many of the difficulties in form and syntax disappear. Also, the habit formed in linguistic study of thinking of words in terms of etymology and of families of words is of great aid in the acquisition of vocabulary.\textsuperscript{8}
The "Coleman Report" mentioned language comparison, with increased awareness of English structure and semantic organization as the fifth immediate objective in a two-year program. In keeping with the overall goals of the program suggested by Coleman, the comparison is primarily of the written languages, and the grammar is "traditional:"

Progressive development of an increased knowledge of the derivations and meanings of English words, of the principles and leading facts of English grammar and the relationships between the foreign language and English.9

Stephen Freeman, writing in 1941 about the preparation of foreign language teachers, recommended that teachers acquire knowledge about the foreign language that today would be classified as linguistics. Freeman recommended that good language teachers watch

...our habit of using the English stress accent to emphasize a word in a sentence, even though we know that the French don't do it that way. These are not really the "fine points" of the language, as we tell our pupils -- they are the fundamental point of view of the language.10

Freeman recommended also that the language teacher take up the study of etymology, if he had not received training in it during his professional preparation.

In a 1945 survey intended to bring up to date statistics about the formation of foreign language
teachers, C.C.D. Vail discussed language requirements and requirements in the area of professional preparation in education. The primary point of emphasis of this survey was to see whether teachers were more competent in the language they were teaching than they had been reported to be in 1929 by Purin. No mention was made of areas other than language competence.  

Freeman, speaking again about the formation of language teachers in 1949, emphasized the habitual nature of language and the resultant length of sequence which was required to attain language mastery. In addition to a reformulation of his remarks of 1941, he recommended

...a thorough training in the pronunciation of the foreign language. This is best done by a scientific study of phonetics, carried to a fairly advanced stage. The intonation of whole sentences, voice inflection and expressive diction should receive attention, instead of limiting the analysis to sounds and single words. American patterns of accent and intonation should be completely eradicated.  

Freeman clearly intended this training for the improvement of the language competence of the teacher; there was no explicit reference suggesting that knowledge of phonetics could make a teacher more effective in teaching pronunciation.
A 1954 survey reporting on the training of modern foreign language teachers made no mention of coursework in linguistics or phonetics which would aid the teacher's performance in the classroom. J.B. Tharp, director of the survey, mentioned that training in such areas might be obtained at the masters level. "The present poverty of advanced coursework in grammar review, phonetics, language history and civilization may not be too depressing since teachers are likely to get such coursework in taking the M.A. degree."

The MLA "Qualifications for Secondary School Teachers of Modern Foreign Languages" appeared in September, 1955. Section five, dealing with desired teacher competence in "language analysis", made no reference to a branch of linguistics which is directly relevant to foreign language teaching. The "minimal" level emphasized language competence of the teacher, while the ability to apply notions of linguistics to language pedagogy was mentioned only at the "superior" level.

In 1962, W.H. Starr called the area of competence "applied linguistics", and in this later formulation, emphasis was on application of contrastive data even at the "minimal" level: "Ability to apply to language
teaching an understanding of the differences in the sound systems, forms, and structures of the foreign language and English." ¹⁵

A survey of modern foreign language teacher education curricula in 1960 showed that, on the graduate (M.A.) level, courses in linguistics for teachers were beginning to appear.¹⁶ By 1964, a survey of undergraduate teacher-training programs in liberal arts colleges indicated that courses in linguistics were appearing in the formation of teachers. The percent of institutions including training in linguistics was very small, however. Out of a population of 335 departments responding to the questionnaire, only 30 (9%) required a course in phonetics, and 8 (2.4%) recommended it. Twenty-six (7.8%) departments required a course in linguistics, while 29 (8.6%) recommended it. ¹⁷

A study of foreign language teacher preparation in schools and colleges of education showed similar results. Out of 203 departments training modern foreign language teachers, 14 (6%) required a course in phonetics, while 3 (1.5%) recommended it. Sixteen (8%) departments required a course in linguistics, and 12 (6%) recommended it. ¹⁸
During the past decade, virtually all models for the education of modern foreign language teachers have included some training in linguistics. Those provided by Axelrod, Folitzer, and Brooks are typical in this respect. Though the survey results of the preceding paragraphs indicate that only a small percent of teachers trained in 1964-1965 were receiving instruction in applied linguistics, the literature shows that the profession is more than ever committed to the idea of linguistics for teachers of language.

A recent issue of Foreign Language Annals contained two important articles reaffirming the place of linguistics in the formation of language teachers. Hanseli, while disclaiming any role which linguistics might have in directly determining pedagogy, stated that language teachers

...must cultivate linguistics sincerely and seriously. After all, linguistics is the only field of study which is capable of offering them a theory and a body of knowledge on the nature of what they propose to teach—language—as well as analyses of individual languages. 21

Bolinger, writing about the implications of generative grammarians' criticism of the descriptivist influence on language teaching practice, advised against a too hasty rejection of certain aspects of this influence.
He implied that linguistics should be studied, but not in a one-sided manner; the language teacher could find justification for different classroom procedures in the theory of different linguistic schools. Quoting Shipley et al., he stated:

From the teaching standpoint both positions have advantages: the first (the behaviorist one), in viewing language as basically stimulus and response, turns out to be highly useful for making oral exercises; the mentalist position, on the other hand, is enormously helpful for the explanations that students may need to be given. 22

Articles such as those just cited have been appearing in the journals devoted to language teaching in the United States for almost three decades: since the wartime experience which employed linguists to describe and sometimes to teach languages for oral competence, first in the ACIS Intensive Language Program and subsequently in the Army Specialized Training Program. The literature to come out of this "Army experience" is voluminous, and has been well summarized (through 1960) by Moulton. 23

Much of this literature has centered around the role linguists should play in constructing materials of instruction, or in the analysis of a language prior to such materials construction. Although language analysis and subsequent text construction is obviously an important contribution of linguistics to language teach-
ing, it will not be treated in this study. The area of concern here is to survey the literature which deals directly with the recommendation of linguistic study to language teachers. Most literature discussed in this chapter will be general in nature, dealing with all languages. When information dealing with specific analysis is called for, French will be the language usually referred to.

The literature concerning "applied linguistics for language teachers" may be divided into the following four categories. First, statements by linguists about the nature of language and language learning; their statements are presented to language teachers as representing the only sensible way to look at language. These "linguistic truths" represent what Bolinger has termed the "unlearning or therapeutic stage" of linguistic instruction, where the teacher is taught to recognize popular misconceptions about the nature of language. Each linguistic school has its own set of such precepts: those of the descriptive school will be presented in this chapter. Chapter IV will elaborate on those of the transformational school. These statements about the nature of language may or may not be interpreted
as directly applicable to the methodology of language instruction.

The second category includes methodological proclamations, which attempt to justify the validity of their techniques by claiming that they correspond to linguistic reality or that they are supported by linguistic principle.

Although there exists a large literature of articles which recommend in vague terms that "teachers should study linguistics," and which perhaps cite several examples of linguistic concepts applied to the language teaching situation, there have been few outlines detailing what might be a reasonable program for this study. The fourth section of this chapter will discuss these.

Finally, there exist examples of actual linguistic analysis which present pedagogical material in a language-specific framework. Chapter III will contain a critical analysis of the only works which fit into this category in French.

**Structuralism: the nature of language**

Descriptive linguists saw in "traditional" language teaching, both of native language and foreign language, a complete ignorance of the real characteristics of
language, characteristics which could only be realized through insight gained by descriptive linguistic study.

Leonard Bloomfield asserted as early as 1914 that failure is inevitable when language instruction does not take into account the "fundamental process of language learning and...of speech in general. Almost every feature of our instruction runs counter to the universal conditions under which language exists." Bloomfield held the schools responsible in large part for the misinformation about the nature of language:

Our schools and colleges teach us very little about language, and what little they teach us is largely in error. The student of an entirely new language will have to throw off all his prepossessions about language and start with a clean slate.

A set of "slogans," as Coulton (1961) calls them, evolved, which describe the attitude of descriptive linguistics toward language and language acquisition. Linguists have offered these statements to the language teaching profession with the implication, sometimes overtly expressed, that language teaching was bound to improve if instruction were based on a more accurate knowledge of the nature of language.

According to Bloomfield, the most serious mistake made by language teachers was to regard language teaching as the imparting of a set of facts. The true nature
of language was associative rather than cognitive, so language teaching should concentrate on building up associative processes through language use, rather than on applying a set of axiomatic grammatical rules to vocabulary items. The conception of language as a "set of habit patterns" came to be widely accepted by the leaders of the audio-lingual school of language teaching methodology. Such statements as the one by Hoult (A language is a set of habits...the ordinary speaker is quite unaware of the mechanisms of speech.") were adapted by audio-lingual theorists and applied linguists Iaco, Politzer, and Brooks:

The single paramount fact about language learning is that it concerns, not problem solving, but the formation and performance of habits. For Brooks, the fact that a native speaker rarely can analyze his language in grammatical terms means that languages must be learned without conscious analysis on the part of the learner:

...(the language learner) is to analyze— if he does so at all— only what he has heard, spoken, read, written, and learned.

First, one wonders what meaning Brooks attaches to the phrase and learned. Secondly, the decision about method described in this statement derives not from the above affirmation of the habitual nature of language, but
from a belief on the part of "rooks that one arrives at habitual behavior by analogy or non-analysis.

Notice that linguists and audio-lingual methodologists do not seem to have differentiated between language acquisition and native-language usage. It was reasoned that, since there had been no experimental evidence to indicate analysis, conscious or subconscious, in first-language learning, that second-language learning would proceed in a similar manner. Exponents of audio-lingual teaching methodology maintained that a behavioristic, stimulus-response paradigm was the best avenue to achieve habitual behavior. Rivers and Ausubel have more recently challenged this notion on psychological and pedagogical grounds. Their arguments are essentially that stimulus-response learning is perhaps not the only way to achieve habitual behavior, and that this kind of justification for language learning procedures was confusing the means and the end of language learning. That is, perhaps for "linguistic adults", a cognitive, conscious approach to language structure and vocabulary will yield better results than one which attempts to build up from the very beginning "automatic responses."

Others have attacked the behavioristic views of language learning on linguistic grounds; these arguments will be discussed in Chapter IV.
A second fact which descriptive linguists pointed out to language teachers is the predominately oral nature of language. Spoken language is not a poor manifestation or a degenerate form of a "more correct" written language, stated Hall and others. In reality, the situation was just the reverse: the spoken language has preceded written in both the ontogenetic and the phylogenetic development of man.

An orthographic system is a poor approximation of spoken language, said some structuralists, since it cannot express the prosodic elements of the latter. Bloomfield insisted, for instance, that reading, even silent reading, involves a process whereby printed signals are converted to auditory ones before meaning can be perceived, so a student who is not familiar with the sounds of a language will have difficulty in learning to read it.

More recently, Valdman has expressed the view that the real question is not one of precedence of oral over written language. Rather the problem is to describe oral and written language as different manifestations of one language. Oral and written language are taught simultaneously, and the two aspects are mutually reinforcing.
A third observation about language which was seen to be relevant to the language classroom was the fact that "correctness" in speech is a sociologically determined, not a linguistically determined, phenomenon. Teachers and textbook writers had been looking to classical grammar books and to the academies for information concerning language usage. Hall maintained, with others, that these sources were not accurate ones for information about contemporary usage:

The dicta of grammarians and academies are frequently quite out of harmony with the facts of normal speech...the language to be taught should always be that of normal everyday speech...39

Even the average, educated "informant" could not be trusted to give his judgement about "appropriateness of usage," since he has usually been prejudiced by a normative grammatical training. Hida, in a book intended for missionaries who were contemplating learning a foreign language, advised them against doing so with a native tutor, who frequently has the impression that "learning a language" means learning the niceties of the written language, since this is how they "learned" their mother tongue. "This seems particularly true of tutors in French, where spelling is complicated and many educated people take considerable cultural pride in orthographic correctness." 40
A corollary to the linguists' underlining of the oral nature of language and of the gap between what is considered "correct" and what is actually said, was the recognition that oral language is separable into several distinct levels or registers of speech, which speakers of a community will use depending upon the social situation they face. Linguists have defined these, and have recommended that language teachers be aware of the various levels. It has been recognized also that individual languages present differences in social and regional dialects which necessitate choices by text writers and teachers. A dialect and a level of language which are appropriate must be chosen and adhered to.

A fourth descriptive "truth" about language which was proposed to teachers was that languages differ categorically in the ways they split up reality. These differences exist on all linguistic levels: phonetic, phonemic, morphemic, syntactic and semantic. Thus, any attempt to describe a foreign language in terms of the grammar of the mother tongue or of another language was bound to be inaccurate. Of course these differences were most graphic when languages of two unrelated families were compared. Even for languages as closely related as French and English, however, differences manifested themselves under descriptive analysis which
had not been noted previously. An example of this may be found in the classes "noun- and verb-satellites" in French; this analysis will be discussed at greater length below, Chapter III.

No logical scheme of the parts of speech— their number, nature, and necessary confines—is of the slightest interest to the linguist. Each language has its own scheme. Everything depends on the formal demarcations which it recognizes. 44

On the semantic level, Whorf stated that a language imposes a world-view on the speaker:

...our linguistically determined thought world not only collaborates with our cultural idols and ideals, but engages even our unconscious personal reactions in its patterns and gives them certain typical characters. 45

Carroll, though he does not believe in the strong formulation of the Whorf hypothesis, states that "...language users tend to sort out and distinguish experiences differently according to the categories provided by their respective languages. These cognitions will have certain effects on their behavior." 46

A fifth reason which descriptivists gave in support of the application of their discipline to language teaching was that their analyses were more accurate than those of classical grammar. The classical grammatical tradition, they contended, had ignored the structure of the utterance and had concentrated uniquely on the word.
Descriptive linguists maintained that a view of language which focused on the lexical item, and which treated the meaning of a sentence as "the sum of the meanings of the individual words," was missing the most important aspect of linguistic study. The emphasis in structuralist study was shifted from the lexical items of a language to the system by which they combined to form utterances. Fries has stated:

...items...have no linguistic significance by themselves. Only as such items contrast with other items in the patterns of an arbitrary system do they have linguistic significance. In other words, all the significant matters of language are linguistic features in contrast.

The conception of opposition as the fundamental mechanism of language, originated by Saussure, was applied by descriptive linguists to all levels of linguistic analysis. Fries has outlined linguistic analysis as the attempt to discover and describe

(a) the basic contrastive bundles of sound features that constitute the units that identify and separate the lexical items;
(b) the basic contrastive markers that identify and separate the units that constitute the patterns of grammatical structure;
(c) the basic contrastive arrangements of the patterns of grammatical structure that regularly elicit recognition responses of grammatical or structural meanings.

Descriptive linguistic analysis attempted to make a clear distinction between "semantic meaning" and
"grammatical meaning." Thus, any "traditional" grammatical classification, which attempted to differentiate between the functioning of two categories on the basis of semantic difference, (e.g. *adjectifs qualificatifs* vs. *adjectifs déterminatifs*) was in violation of this division between form and meaning. In the structural descriptions of French adjectives to be discussed later, grammatical function is classified according to purely formal terms: pre- and post-nominal adjectives, determiners.

In the presentation of the notion of grammatical versus semantic meaning, Lewis Carroll's "Jabberwocky" was inevitably cited (and examples in other languages were invented: "Les galâts narpeux mourtaient statieusement les flênes" 50) to demonstrate that lexical meaning could be entirely absent, yet the relationships between these unknown objects, actions and attributes could be at the same time perfectly clear through the use of the syntactic and morphological signalling system.

This distinction led to the separation of the lexicon into two basic classes of words: function words and content words. It was claimed that the former set was closed, comprising only 7% of the vocabulary of a language, 51 and that these words acted as the "grammatical glue" in the formation of morphologic and syntactic
patterns while contributing little "lexical meaning."
The rest of the lexicon of a language was divisible into
a small number of form-classes (constituent classes,
tagmemes) which corresponded basically to traditional
syntactic categories. Membership in these classes was
determined by substitutability in a sentence frame
(hypertagmeme). 52

Gleason is less sanguine than Fries about the
solidity of the theoretical basis for this analysis:

This is hardly a satisfactory definition. Both
constituent class and constructional pattern
are basic concepts not definable, and not oper­
ationally discoverable. But they seem to have
enough intuitional reality that another person
can readily learn to identify them. 53

The most powerful tool which linguistics could
give to language teachers was contrastive linguistics,
according to Lado and other disciples of Fries:

Of special interest to the language teacher is
contrastive linguistics, which compares the struc­
tures of two languages to determine the points
where they differ. These differences are the
chief source of difficulty in learning a second
language. 54

Lado asserts simplistically elsewhere that the student's
trouble in learning a foreign language stems from the
elements of that language which are different from his
native tongue. Elements which parallel the native
language will present no learning problems. 55
Fries himself has written:

...only with sound materials based upon an adequate descriptive analysis of both the language to be studied and the native language of the student (or with the continued expert guidance of a trained linguist) can an adult make the maximum progress toward the satisfactory mastery of a foreign language. 56

Recently, more modest claims have been made for the utility of contrastive studies. Bolinger, in a review of Stockwell and Bowen, whose contrastive study of Spanish and English 57 is generally recognized to be the most complete, makes two basic criticisms. First he states that the work should have followed "monographic treatment of each topic that is described here in generative terms. A guide for teachers is no suitable proving-ground." 58 What Bolinger seems to be arguing here is that contrastive analysis must be performed in such a way as to have the theoretical linguistic bases as neutral (i.e. generally acceptable to linguists and teachers) and as accessible as possible. The Stockwell and Bowen work as it stands is not accessible to the teacher who has not had considerable experience with linguistics.

Bolinger's second criticism is related to the first: in the section of the study which deals with phonology, he accuses Stockwell and Bowen of basing their hierarchy
of difficulty too much on phonological theory alone
and not enough on the experience of classroom teachers. 59

Eric Hamp expresses similar conclusions in a recent paper:

...if we want to teach languages better...why not
start with a careful and searching consideration
of the learning mistakes that are made, and pro-
cceed to a body of increasingly predictive state-
ments. Such bodies of statements might, of course,
look nothing like a formally derived contrastive
statement...A contrastive statement formally arrived
at on the basis of grammars may have only an
indirect bearing on what goes on in and out of
the classroom, and what we need to know about
this process...Let us take the pedagogical situ-
ation as we find it, learn as many lessons as we
can, and from that derive a theory that will be
maximally explanatory and predictive for that
total body of information. 60

Many descriptive linguists speaking about the
relevance of their discipline to language teaching
practice have been cautious. Moulton has disclaimed
the existence of any "linguistic method" of language
teaching. 61 Hill has made clear the fact that des-
criptivist pedagogical recommendations were the result
of teaching experience rather than theoretical insight:
The linguists scientists' recommendations are
not new or revolutionary doctrine, but simply
recommendations of what those linguists who are
also practical language teachers have found to
be effective. 62

Bolinger and others have traced language pedagogy
used by linguists during the Intensive Language Program
and the Army Specialized Training Program to its source in the work of Jespersen, Sweet, and H. E. Palmer:

...structuralism did not invent the principles that have become practically the trademark of the current audiolingual approach in language teaching. One has only to consult the writers on language pedagogy who were on the scene before structural linguistics began to be used as a source of pedagogical argument. 63

Haugen has claimed that these ideas were familiar to language teachers in early twentieth century America, but that they had not become common practice

...due to the attitude of the American public, which did not really want languages to be taught effectively, and therefore did not provide the time and the money needed. But when the changing international situation and the wartime crisis brought a new interest in language learning, there were many who were interested in contributing to the new program and equipped to teach by the new method, which by this time was really old. 64

Other applied linguists have been less cautious in statements about the direct relevance of linguistic principle to language teaching practice. Cárdenas states:

...we would say that application of linguistics implies conscious adherence to and application of the following principles: 1) oral-aural approach; 2) systematization of presented material on all levels; 3) emphasis on pattern practice drill by means of substitution and memorization to the point of over-learning; 4) postponement of grammatical analysis until after memorization; 5) presentation of vocabulary in meaningful context; 6) translation from the target language to the native language reduced to a minimum. 65
Folitzer speaks of a "linguistic method" in his *Teaching French*. Elsewhere he states that methods of linguistic analysis may be converted into teaching methods, "since linguistic analysis is basically a way of learning a language." 66

Finally, there is a considerable number of journal articles which equate linguistics with recent developments in language teaching in vague and frequently misleading ways. Some amount to no more than a vote of confidence in audio-lingual methodology. 67 Others, which include such statements as "linguistic science is a progression from comprehension and speaking into reading and writing," 68 certainly are a misrepresentation of linguistics and are of no benefit to the teacher.

**Structuralism: pedagogy**

The following discussion treats five points of language pedagogy which have been supported as "linguistically sound". These areas are: separation of oral and written language, the dialog, mimicry-memorization, structure drill, and the role of grammar rules.

Most basic among teaching procedures suggested by linguists is the separate treatment of oral and written language. Texts inspired by descriptive linguistic thought have presented language in two parallel
sections, oral analysis and written analysis. 69

Separate treatment of oral and written language implies some sort of notation by which to represent the spoken language. Sweet and Jespersen 70,71 along with other proponents of the International Phonetic Alphabet, had argued for a phonetic representation. The innovation of descriptive linguists was the application of phonemic principle to the representation of oral language to be taught. They reasoned that since, according to descriptive theory, native speakers of a language "listen selectively," that is, they recognize as distinctive certain (phonemic) differences in sound and ignore other (allophonic) differences, since this was the case, language could be learned most effectively if students were introduced to the sound system of a language through a phonemic, rather than a phonetic, transcription. 72

In practice, however, linguists have emphasized that the goal of phonemic presentation is a practical one, and that in some cases the difficulties of learning an alphabet outweigh its merits:

If the phonemic alphabet will cause more trouble than the imperfections of ordinary spelling, one may decide to use normal spelling with a few special marks at the trouble spots. This might be the case in teaching Spanish. In teaching Chinese there is really no choice but to teach a special alphabet. 73
Gleason has made very conservative claims for the utility of the phonemic concept in language teaching:

...phonemic analysis, however thorough, and competent it may be, can neither assure— nor, even with good fortune, produce — an adequate command of the phonology of a language (by itself). ... It can only provide a basis for planning the work and illuminating the problems which arise. This is, however, an essential service. Together with training in phonetics, close attention to phonemics may enable a student to make an excellent first approximation quickly and easily. 74

Practical experience has shown, moreover, that a phonemic presentation alone is unsatisfactory. Stockwell has documented the fact that language learners need phonetic information, particularly where foreign language sounds resemble those of the native language. He also adds that any suprasegmental information must be graphically represented in the most simple way possible, even to the point of being approximate rather than exact descriptively. 75

The argument against a phonemic presentation is further supported by experimental evidence reported by Brière. He concludes that phonemic comparison of target and native languages does not lead to any useful formulation of the difficulties that a language learner will encounter, and that comparison "must be based on description of these categories in terms of exhaustive information at the phonetic level, rather than on description solely in terms of distinctive features or
A second pedagogical device which has been supported by descriptive linguists is the dialog or narration, to be learned by students orally, using the mimicry-memorization technique. Iado expresses a common descriptive view when he states that the rote learning of dialog material should be oral before written:

From linguistics we know that language is most completely expressed in speech. Writing does not represent intonation, rhythm, stress, and junctures... (This) implies that deciphering written material without knowing the language patterns as speech is incomplete, imperfect, or inefficient.

Haugen (cited above, p. 23) and Desberg are no doubt closer to the truth when they state that this device came into use not for any theoretical linguistic reason, but for the excellent pedagogical one that during the ILP and ASTP experiences, the primary goal was one of oral competence, which had not been the case previously in most American foreign language instruction.

Hall states that colloquial dialogs should contain full-sentence utterances, since humans normally talk in complete sentences, not in isolated words, and our basic use of language
is to converse with each other. Formal expository prose is not our customary way of communicating... 79

Hall goes on to state that in more advanced classes, prose and poetry may be used for this basic corpus of language to be memorized by the student, but that the bulk of memorized material should be "everyday speech."

For Politzer, the primary purpose of the dialog is to provide basic frames for pattern practice, which he considers to be the central learning activity. He criticizes dialog presentation, stating that the variety and complexity of constructions found in most dialogs tend to cancel out advantages gained by presenting syntax and morphology in an orderly sequence of drills. 30

In sum, "linguistic justification" for use of oral dialogs in language instruction is limited to the facts that 1) memorized material provides vocabulary and structures in a "natural environment" i.e. the spoken language, 2) the structures contained in these memorized passages can be used for pattern practice in order to provide the language learner with the ability to use them in making new sentences on his own, and 3) the student is given practice at pronouncing the sounds of the language in context.

Pattern practice, or structure drill, is the fourth pedagogical device which linguists have attempted
to justify. In addition to pattern practice, the role of grammar rules in language teaching was discussed by structuralists. Since these two points are closely related, they will be treated together here.

Lado defines a pattern as "an arrangement of parts having linguistic significance beyond the sum of its parts." He elaborates by stating that a pattern is neither a conjugation or a declension nor a sentence. Lado makes no mention of how many patterns there might be in a language, or what one might look like. He does say that the sentences John telephoned, The boy studied, I understood are examples of the same "statement pattern." in English, which do not parallel the Spanish statement pattern Llamó, Estudió, Entendimos.

Politzer's definition of pattern is more explicit than Lado's. He gives the following drill and explanation:

Je voudrais que vous répondiez à ces lettres.
J'exige obéissiez mes questions.
J'insiste pensiez mes enquêtes.

...there is a certain identity of meaning that (is)...kept constant during the exercise, namely, "I, would like, want, expect, you to do something." This part of the meaning of the sentence is not identical with the sum of the lexical meanings of the vocabulary items involved, but it is the meaning of the structure, of the pattern itself. A structure or pattern may therefore be identified as the common element of different sentences or phrases which have the same structural meaning. Strictly speaking, a single French sentence can thus be only an example of a pattern: by itself
it can neither be a pattern nor can it teach one. The pattern is the grammatical relationship itself and the structural meaning expressed by the sentence. 82

Like Bedo, however, Politzer makes no statement about how many such patterns might exist in English or French.

Felasco 83 bases his development of pattern drill on the three basic "free utterance test frames" of Fries:

Frame A: The concert was good (always)
Frame B: The clerk remembered the tax (suddenly)
Frame C: The team went there 84

Valdman's analysis of French verb syntax 85 shows that these three patterns are not enough to account for double-object verbs like acheter, donner, etc.

Roberts, speaking of the basic patterns of English, does not attempt to state how many exist. He does affirm that "certain common patterns stand out prominently," and lists seven. 86

Fries' statement notwithstanding, the list of "patterns" for any language must be considered to be very large; the fact that Valdman's analysis of French syntax must resort to traditional categorization procedures to account for French and English verbs and their complement structures demonstrates this fact.

The only definition possible then for the concept of "pattern", as it is used in the literature of language
The pedagogy is: "the structural description of a model sentence which has been selected for pattern drill." This is in essence the way Brooks uses the term when he states that a pattern practice "starts with an utterance that is or could be a part of interpersonal exchange." 87

In Politzer's view, the structure drill is intended to replace the "traditional" method of learning structure: construction of sentences using vocabulary and rules which govern order, agreement, and inflection of these words. He rejects this practice for one basic reason, which stems from descriptive linguistic theory about language difference: construction of utterances in the foreign languages forces the student to "arrive at French constructions by learning sets of correspondences between French and English." 88 This is dangerous, says Politzer, since structural parallels are unpredictable and the student will over-generalize. In addition, those places where structure is not similar must be treated as "special problems or exceptions or idioms."

To avoid these pitfalls, "constructions in the foreign language must be learned as a whole rather than assembled." 89 But Politzer does not make specific the way in which a pattern is learned. He implies
in one statement that the simple fact of substitution in a "slot" gives the student some implicit knowledge of a pattern's structure:

"The student learns how the construction is made up by exercises in which building stones are replaced by others. This shows him how the construction fits together and what the value of each building stone is." 90

The pattern drill is thus intended to build up in a language learner the same unconscious control of language which is evident in native speakers. Thus, when the "generalization" is reached at the end of pattern practice, it plays the same function as a "grammar rule" taught to a native speaker: it is a statement of something already known, a "summary of behavior."

At the same time, however, Politzer makes the seemingly contradictory statement that "a linguistic teaching approach does in no way endorse or sanction the idea that a student should be ignorant of the grammatical structure of the patterns which he is learning." 91 Politzer seems to be saying that it is possible to be "learning the constructions as a whole rather than assembled" and thinking about their structure simultaneously.

In spite of the theoretical vagueness of Politzer's formulation of the acquisition process and the influence
this should have on pedagogy, he has in the following passage described well the reasoning behind the development of structurally based language instruction.

Suppose we give the student a lesson about the present subjunctive, explain its formation, then tell him that the present subjunctive is used after verbs of emotion, verbs of thinking in the negative, verbs expressing doubt, verbs expressing volition and impersonal expressions...and so on. Each one of these rules may be illustrated by one or more examples. Then we ask the student to translate sentences like:

- Do you think that he is right?
- We doubt that he will arrive tomorrow.
- Let's not be afraid.
- It is not necessary for you to read these papers.
- I expect all of you to do your duty.

The above sentences translated into French are examples of many different patterns. Practically the only feature they have in common is that in each of these patterns, one of the building stones used is an ending which we can identify as the present subjunctive. But this is not enough to establish any identity or even great similarity between the patterns themselves. Actually, this exercise does not teach the pattern. It tests whether or not the student has already been able to recognize the underlying patterns from the rules and the few examples alone.

This argument is basically a pedagogical one, however; the only role that linguistics has in its elaboration is the fact that it recognizes the difference between various sentence types which require the subjunctive in French.

Lado's conception of the function of pattern practice differs from that just discussed:
Pattern practice is rapid oral drill on problem patterns with attention on something other than the pattern itself... "What is needed is practice that will gradually force the students' attention away from the linguistic problem while forcing them to use language examples that contain the problem. This will engage the habit mechanism and more quickly establish the new habits." 93

This description of how patterns are learned is even vaguer than Politzer's, since Lado makes no attempt to describe what the "habit mechanism" for a human language learner might be.

Brooks attributes the value of pattern practice to the ability of a human language learner to detect "hidden saneness" in structure by using powers of analogy which

...function liberally in the acquiring of the mother tongue. Pattern practice attempts to exploit the potentialities of analogy in the learning of the second language. For analogy to function to its fullest capacity, the new patterns to be learned must faithfully follow a logic of consistent change. 94

Politzer and Brooks represent the "strict audio-lingual" school of thought, which advocates overt discussion of structure only after the learner has practiced the structure to the point where he "controls" it, i.e., is able to perform the prescribed pattern practice satisfactorily. Many others have echoed this view, among them Feldman and Kline:

It is important to note... that discussion always follows the exercises, and students are not expected to generalize until after they have mastered the pattern. 95
Other descriptive linguists have not been convinced of the efficacy of this method of teaching language structure. Bolinger mentions that his experience has led him to believe that humans are not very good at solving language problems inductively, and states that "there is no question that the feasibility of induction has been exaggerated out of all proportion to students' ability." 96

Hall has recommended that language analysis should precede pattern drill, so that the latter is seen as practice of known grammatical principle. He sees two purposes in overt structural discussion of grammar:

1) to help the learner see the structural patterns that are inherent in what he has memorized so far, and the similarities and differences when they are compared with his point-of-departure language;
2) to tell him how far he can go in making new combinations with the already learned material or with any new material he may learn. 97

Linguistics curriculum for language teachers

In spite of descriptivist proclamations about language and the implications which these ideas hold for language teaching, formulation of exactly how teachers were to approach linguistic study were slow to come.

Cornelius, in a methods text written in the early 1950's posited the following areas of linguistic study:

1) A statement of the basic sounds of the language, and the distribution and variation of these sounds in a system.
2) An analytical statement of features such as stress contrasts, intonation, and the distribution and variation of these features in the language system.

3) A statement of the structural points in the language system, including the sequence of forms.

5) An understanding of the system used within the speech community for recording the language, that is, the written representation of the language, the orthography.

How this knowledge was to be acquired by the teacher was not detailed, however.

Stockwell, writing several years later, stated that teachers should become acquainted with the jargon of linguistics so as to be able to understand descriptive grammars. He also advocated that teachers acquire a "scientific orientation toward the study of this aspect of human behavior, (so that teachers would be) propagating no unsound views about the nature of language." Stockwell made no suggestion about what material teachers should study to best achieve these attitudes.

Poulton expressed sympathy for the frustration of the teacher who attempted to interpret such works as Bloomfield's *Language* in the light of practical classroom teaching. He said, however, that "there has emerged a large body of principles, attitudes, and techniques which are by now firmly established and show no signs whatever of going out of date." He listed a bibliography which included Carroll (1953), Fries (1945), Gleason (1955), and Mida (1949).
Pulgram spoke eloquently about the value of linguistic training for teachers:

With proper linguistic training an instructor can speak intelligently and competently about language as a field of study and knowledge, thereby combining training in a skill with a worthwhile type and amount of education in a subject, acquaintance with which is not only helpful in the mastery of the native and the foreign language, but surely appropriate to a curriculum of liberal arts and humanities. 101

Discussing what should comprise linguistic training in a Ph.D. program in French, he included courses in general linguistics, phonetics and phonemics of French, French and English structure compared, history of the French language, Old French, and the application of linguistics to language teaching. 102

Asked to specify the minimum training he would recommend for a secondary teacher, Pulgram stated:

...all anyone can do is to state what a subject contains, what it has to offer the non-specialist, and why it might be useful to him in pursuing his own work. Every least little bit helps. But how many least little bits constitute an irreducible minimum it would be difficult to say. Moreover, minimum knowledge makes a minimum teacher. And who wants him? 103

Working Committee I of the 1962 Northeast Conference, chaired by Hall, outlined the reasons why a teacher should have some knowledge of "the results of linguistic analysis" in order to teach effectively. The arguments parallel those discussed in the first two sections of this Chapter. 104
Bolinger has presented the most interesting and
substantive outline of how a teacher might be intro-
duced to linguistics. He divides linguistic study into
"general linguistics" and "structural comparison" of
native and target languages, the latter maintaining
"as practical and untheoretical an orientation as possible."

Broad training in linguistics should contain an
"unlearning" and a "learning" stage, in Bolinger's view.
He lists as general topics for the unlearning stage:
relative positions of precept and description, notions
about the structure of language, language kinship, and
finally language and logic. The learning stage treats:
dialect geography, structural hierarchy in language,
physiological and physical bases of speech, linguistic
change, language and writing, meaning, and finally,
schools and doctrines of linguistics. 105

This outline contains what Bolinger has charac-
terized elsewhere 106 as the first requisite for a course
in applied linguistics for teachers: enough information
about general linguistics so that the teacher has the
resources to pursue linguistic study if he so desires,
and so that he avoids a perfunctory "application" of
a formalism he does not understand. The other three
requisites for a course in applied linguistics include:
1) the setting of passable knowledge of the structures
of native and target languages, i.e. an entrance requirement for the course, which stipulates certain competencies on the part of the incoming student; 2) the course describes language differences in a systematic way, language-specific and uni-directional, e.g. "problems of English-speakers learning French"; and 3) the contrasts should be specifically related to the activities which go on in the classroom.

This survey of curriculum in linguistics for language teachers concludes with a short discussion of three books which have been prepared expressly to present linguistics to language teachers. All three books attempt to acquaint the teacher with several linguistic schools, with a certain amount of linguistic formalism from one or more of these schools, and with pedagogy which is claimed to stem directly or indirectly from what linguistics has had to say about language. 107

Linguistic theory. Discussion of differing linguistic schools is of necessity brief and simplified in books of the kind under discussion. This leads to omissions, ill-defined generalities, and sometimes to errors in detail. Calimag, writing in Kehoe, states that for transformational grammarians

...the question is not which groups of words in the sentence are more closely related to each
other but rather what utterance is another utterance related to. 108

This is certainly a misrepresentation of the central concern of generative linguists, who are just as concerned as any grammarians about the relationships between the constituent members of sentences.

Kadler is guilty of loose formulation of the preoccupation of American structuralist linguists when he states:

The structural approach, which is typical on the American linguistic scene, is characterized by regarding language as structure. 109

First of all, this statement implies that structuralism is predominant in the "American linguistic scene." This is not true, as a glance at any of the current linguistic journals will indicate; the predominance of transformationally oriented articles is impressive. Secondly, any linguistic scheme of analysis regards language as structure axiomatically. Analysis implies the imposition of some sort of structure to a body of data. Finally, the phrase "language as structure" probably does not characterize the American structuralist school as well as the term "empiricist." The structural linguists have been notable for their desire to be governed in their analyses only by overtly observable data.
Hughes, in describing transformational theory, states:

Chomsky considers a language to be a finite or infinite set of sentences, each finite in length, and each constructed from a finite set of elements. Chomsky's statement was made about all languages, both natural and otherwise. Chomsky states later in the same paragraph that natural languages contain "infinitely many sentences." Hughes does not make it clear that he understands this distinction, which is crucial to the generative explanation of natural language. There exist of course constructed languages which contain a finite number of sentences.

**Pedagogy.** Hughes presents his book as primarily a methods text. He states in his introduction that better training in methods requires better textbooks for methods courses. In the present volume the author has endeavored to provide such a textbook covering methods derived from his own special field, linguistics.

Hughes has some good comments to make about certain aspects of language teaching, most notably about the teaching of vocabulary, which he terms "the most neglected branch of foreign-language learning." He also gives a good, short summary of the history of the ASTP during the Second World War. Certainly the book could not be considered a "methods text"; the extent of coverage of classroom practices is not what one finds in any of the standard methodology books.
Kadler has assembled an impressive amount of minimal pair exercise material in four languages, and has grouped it in an easily accessible way. He has kept theoretical discourse on audio-lingual methodology to a minimum.

Most of the material in Kehoe dealing with pedagogy has the teaching of English as a foreign language as its focal point. In addition, the articles are about British and Canadian experience with the subject. This makes interesting reading for general information, but there is not much information which an American teacher of foreign language can make relevant to his own classroom.

In conclusion, these books are not impressive in their attempts to make linguistics relevant to the needs of a classroom teacher. Most of the essays in Kehoe are interesting but uninformative with regard to the professional concerns of the American teacher. Hughes has some insights, but they must be found. Kadler, a disciple of Fries, Lado, and Politzer linguistic school, has compiled a large number of minimal pairs just at the time when the prevailing wind in language teaching is shifting away from the emphasis on audio-lingual skills which has been characteristic of the past decade.
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CHAPTER II

NDEA EXPERIENCE WITH
APPLIED LINGUISTICS COURSES

The Development of an Institute Model

Introduction: The MLA and NDEA

Public Law 85-864, the National Defense Education Act of 1958, Title VI, Section B, states that "the Commissioner (is to) arrange, through contracts with institutions of higher education ... institutes for advanced training, particularly in the use of new teaching methods and instructional materials for individuals who are engaged in, or who are preparing to engage in the teaching, or supervising or training of teachers, of any modern foreign language in elementary or secondary schools." How did applied linguistics come to play an important part in these NDEA institutes? This introduction will try to outline how the concerted efforts of the leadership of one organization gave form to the NDEA institute, and how this form happened to include an area "language
analysis" or "applied linguistics."

The Modern Language Association of America played an important part in the congressional decision to include foreign languages in the Act, as well as in the initial implementation of the institute program. William Riley Parker, Secretary of the Association and Director of the Foreign Language Program, supplied "the legislator's Bible" in the form of his National Interest and Foreign Languages because of its concise exposition and cogent justification of an increased emphasis on foreign language instruction at all levels of American education. Members of the MLA as well as officers acted as witnesses in congressional hearings. After passage of the bill, foreign language teachers and linguists contributed to the elaboration of a beginning institute program in September and October of 1958. 2

The MLA was well-prepared in the late 1950's to oversee the establishment of NDEA institute practices. Parker, who in 1952 had formed the Foreign Language Program of the MLA, had provided a forum in the "F L Program Notes" in Publications of the Modern Language Association of America (FMLA) for matters concerning foreign language instruction. He had suggested, in a "Conference on the Role of Foreign Languages in American
Schools" in January, 1953, the appointment of a foreign language specialist in the United States Office of Education. This position was filled on 16 July 1956 by Marjorie C. Johnston, thus providing a point in the federal bureaucracy where professional advice would be heard and heeded.3

The MLA had demonstrated that it recognized the importance of good teacher preparation programs in the overall improvement of language instruction in the United States. "The General Meeting of the Foreign Language Program (had) heard professional preparation discussed by Stephen Freeman and Theodore Andersson in 1953, by Nelson Brooks and Theodore Andersson in 1955... there (had) been conferences on audio visual aids in teacher training at the MLA Annual Meetings in 1953, 1954..."4 One of the three official pronouncements of the Steering Committee of the FLP was the 1955 statement, "Qualifications for Secondary School Teachers of Foreign Languages."

Section 5 of the Qualifications, "Language Analysis," represents the first appearance in public policy of a major professional organization that contrastive linguistic analysis should be an important component in the education of a competent foreign language teacher. This statement was endorsed not only by the MLA Execu-
tive council, but also by the Committee on the Language Program of the American Council of Learned Societies, and by fourteen separate regional and language-specific organizations.  

When, in 1957, the FLP proposed an action plan for improving foreign language instruction in the United States, "language analysis" (which became later "applied linguistics") was an integral part of the proposal, one of the seven areas of teacher competence which were to be developed. One aspect of the "Five-Year Program" comprised the development of proficiency tests of teacher competence; "language analysis" was one of the seven tests to be devised for each language.

The place of linguistic training in teacher preparation was virtually assured in the MLA program, since it was specified that linguistics have some representation on the directing committee. "The program was to be administered by a professional staff of five full-time high caliber persons, respected in the language profession and of proven ability in one or more of the following: administration, teaching, linguistics, or research."  

Upon the passage of NDEA, William R. Parker was chosen to be Chief of the Language Development Section
of the NDEA program, to be replaced by Kenneth W. Mildenberger some nine months later. Thus, the thinking which had given birth to FLP policies was imported to give shape to the NDEA program. "I can recall now no policy decision," Parker told a conference of English professors in 1961, "made by either of us that did not reflect, conscientiously and confidently, the findings of the FL Program's Steering Committee or of some conference of experts that were called and later reported on." 8

The Initial Experience, Summer 1959

Several summer institutes in 1959 provided considerable contact with linguistics; institutes at the University of Washington and the University of Michigan both provided two courses, each meeting three times a week. One course was intended as an introduction to descriptive linguistics, with English as the language to be analyzed. The other course provided practical application of this analysis to the target language in question. Participants included teachers of four target language: French, German, Russian, and Spanish. Howard Nostrand, the director of the institute at Washington, justified the linguistics component of the institute:

The planners of the Institute believed that in order to suffuse language teaching with an exciting
freshness of vision, the curriculum should induce a new look at language... that teachers accustomed to thinking in terms of the old prescriptive grammar of the written language need first of all a good grounding in the newer linguistic concepts. It was decided lastly that general linguistic theory should be taught as well as its application to teaching, so that teachers would be able to judge proposed applications and invent new ones of their own, rather than simply learn derivatives of insights they did not understand.

Reaction to the work in linguistics was mixed, as it was to be during the whole NDEA experience. Some directors expressed contentment with the way the course was received by participants. Joseph Axelrod at San Francisco State College was so pleased with the course at his institute that it has been adopted by the curriculum at the regular session of the College.

Theodore Andersson at the University of Texas admitted to having overestimated the capacity of participants. Albert Marckwardt, in describing the negative participant reaction to linguistics courses, cites both Michigan and Washington as concluding that the reaction was not so much against linguistics per se as against "all subjects not immediately relevant to the improvement of language proficiency."

A team of investigators headed by Stephen Freeman, under contract with the United States Office of Education (USOE) to evaluate institute practices, was somewhat more severe in its criticism of the courses in
"descriptive and general linguistics," though no mention is made of the applied courses:

With a few conspicuous exceptions, the courses in descriptive or general linguistics were not very successful. Only a few of the professional technical linguists who gave courses this summer had had teacher-training experience and were able to make the practical applications to the foreign language at the participants' level, and to the procedures of the secondary school class. In the few cases where such practical applications were made, the participants gradually dropped their hostility to the new ideas and recognized the contribution which linguistics can make to language teaching.

The general trend in light of the 1959 experience was away from theory in the direction of more practical application to the target language in question. One of the keys to the success of later Institute linguistics courses, close coordination between them and courses in methodology and courses in language practice, was mentioned in several reports. Some directors felt that it was unrealistic, particularly in view of the lack of time available to participants to do reading on their own, to attempt to furnish participants with a rigorous introduction to descriptive linguistics.

No adequate materials existed to use as basic texts for institute courses in linguistics in these first institutes. Several texts were pressed into service, notably Robert Lado's *Linguistics Across Cultures* and
Harold B. Allen's *Applied English Linguistics*. But these texts had been intended for teachers of English as a foreign language and teachers of English as a mother tongue, respectively, and lacked systematic contrastive data essential to a practical institute course. The Office of Education contracted with Simon Belasco to act as editor of an anthology to be prepared by a team of linguists. These materials were to be constructed with institute linguistics courses in mind, to be used in the summer of 1960.

Subsequent evaluations and attempts to improve instruction

Taken as a whole, the linguistics courses of the summer 1960 institutes met with better participant approval than had those of the preceding summer. "Better definition, more limited objectives, and a more careful selection of teachers resulted in less resistance and more positive accomplishment than in 1959." The linguistics course continued nonetheless to be "one of the most thorny" problems.

In these first institute linguistics courses, participant reaction did not necessarily correlate positively with the professional competence of the linguist giving the course. The Freeman Report of 1960 mentions
the efforts of several highly qualified linguists
who, despite sincere efforts to make their discipline
relevant to teachers, met with considerable participant
hostility. Marckwardt had observed similarly:

There is no observable correlation, either posi­
tive or negative, between the seniority or repu­
tation of the instructor and the apparent success
of the course. This does suggest, however, that
the personnel resources for the 1960 institutes
may not be quite as meager as we are likely to
think, but on the other hand, there certainly
will not be enough big names to staff all thirty­
six. 13

The Freeman Report of 1960 suggested that "big
names" were not necessarily what institute linguistics
courses needed. Following the line of thought of the
1959 Freeman Committee, it stated that there was a
real shortage of teachers of linguistics who could
present their subject in such a way as to achieve the
objective of an institute linguistics course. The
conclusion of the Committee:

It is our general feeling that such a course can
best be taught by a trained language teacher who
has also made a careful study of linguistics. We
do not consider it wise to spend several weeks
of an institute in a detailed analysis of American
English. 14

The second Freeman Report was more explicit than
the first in describing how this course might be organ­
ized:

It is therefore our recommendation that, except
for those institutes where the course has been
completely successful, the linguistics course be reduced to a series of lectures, which might be entitled "Topics in Linguistics for Modern Language Teachers" or "The Linguistic Rationale of the New Key" or something similar. These lectures should cover the basic theory and major principles through which linguistics can contribute significantly to modern language teaching. The objectives of the course should be very carefully defined and limited, in terms of the needs of the language teachers. 

Linguists consider this "watered-down" introduction to be at best a misrepresentation of facts, at worst, a betrayal of the integrity of their discipline. These apprehensions would be no doubt merited if the course had been designed to teach linguistics as a discipline. Consideration of the institute situation, however, demanded the configuration suggested by the Freeman Committee for several reasons.

The primary reason was one of priority. Most institute participants had come to improve their proficiency in the language they taught. The first order of business in their minds was therefore to concentrate on courses offered in language, particularly those dealing with oral competence. In order to afford maximum contact with the language to be taught by participants, institute directors established highly structured programs, with activities extending into the late afternoon, and frequently including lectures and film showings in the evenings. This situation left little
time for completing reading assignments, which of course are to be expected in a beginning linguistics course.

The second reason for participant resistance to the early linguistics courses was the fact that the course demanded a complete change of attitude toward the subject that the participant was teaching. Where many participants had been trained to regard language primarily as a written phenomenon whose oral forms were best explained in terms of the written language, descriptive linguists insisted that not only was spoken language more important than written, but that it had its own grammar, and that this grammar was different from and "truer than" the grammar they had been accustomed to. These statements were bitter pills to swallow for language teachers who were well into their professional careers, and who were suddenly informed, at least by implication, that their beliefs about language implicit and explicit, were either questionable or simply wrong.

Lack of appropriate curricular materials posed a continuing problem. The special institute materials under the editorship of Simon Belasco were not ready in time to be used in all 1960 summer institutes. They would not become widely available until the summer institutes of 1961. In 1959, the Louisiana State
University Institute had used the films produced by Henry L. Smith, Jr. at Indiana University to good end. The use of these films was to continue in institutes. The MLA films, "Principles and Methods of Teaching a Foreign Language," became a regular component of the curriculum after their completion in 1961, although some evidence will be presented later in this chapter which questions the frequency of use of the MLA films, at least as a component of the linguistics course.

In 1963, Donald D. Walsh suggested:

> For participants who are severely limited in skills (Code 3-4), it may be wise to replace the linguistics course by a series of talks (one or two a week) centered around the film series...16

This suggestion seems rarely to have been implemented, though some evidence presented below would indicate that it could have been a viable alternative.

It is clear from the preceding discussion that although the 1960 linguistics courses were better received than had been those of the previous year, they needed further improvement. It was arranged to convolve the linguistics instructors for the summer 1961 institutes in an attempt to standardize procedure to some degree and to reach a consensus about what was possible in an NDEA linguistics course. This meeting was held in Washington under the auspices of the Foreign Service
Institute (FSI) of the Department of State on 4-5 May, 1961.

Several speakers described the role of linguistics in the language instruction at FSI and attempted to draw parallels between the FSI experience and what they envisaged as the institute situation. D. Lee Hamilton saw in the construction of systematic pattern drills a valuable contribution to the linguistic formation of the teacher. Speaking of the training of FSI instructors, he said:

In our experience the instructor gains more by far in the preparation of drills, in general, and especially in construction of systematic structural drills, than he gets from his work on any other part of our manuals. Nothing gives the instructor so direct an insight into the true nature of student progress as to attempt three versions of a structural drill on a seemingly simple feature of his own language and to have all three versions rejected. 17

Hamilton saw the following application of his own experience to that of linguistic training of teachers in NDEA institutes:

Many of your students, insecure as they are in the language they teach, may react negatively to the prickly terms and rigorous discipline of linguistics. It is too easy for them to rationalize that such long-hair stuff really has no relevance to the secondary classroom. But they don't react so violently to drills. After all, every commercial text has drills; through their own experience they can be shown how much drills can improve their own fluency, and they have begun to recognize that they need something to put on their tape
recorders. In this context it is easy to ask them to construct drills on assigned features, then to point out the linguistic and pedagogical objections and ask them to try again. After a few such attempts they begin to acquire a new respect for this thing called descriptive linguistics and are much more receptive to a presentation of some of the techniques of linguistics.

This advice was followed in many subsequent institutes. It was found, however, that the construction of drills was most effective when it constituted a segment of the course in applied linguistics, not its entirety. Teachers felt the need for an introduction to the linguistic point of a drill before they could profitably construct drills on it. Furthermore, many participants in Code 3-4 institutes were incapable of constructing correct drills, due to insufficient knowledge of the target language.

Dan Desberg, Head of the French Section of FSI, gave a presentation which outlined the basic duties of the FSI linguists. One aspect of their work, as explained by Desberg, is to lecture to language students at FSI about the nature of language, and about the theory of language learning which underlies the method used at the Language School. The second aspect of the classroom linguist's task is to monitor the performance of the classes he is responsible for and to diagnose student difficulty, providing guidance for the regular
native instructor or grammatical explanation of troublesome constructions for the students. 19

The outline of Desberg's talk does not make explicit any interpretation of the role of the FSI linguist in relation to the situation that was to face the NDEA linguists during the summer of 1961. It would seem logical to assume that the ability to talk sensibly about the nature of language and the nature of language learning, and the ability to diagnose student errors and to remedy them in a maximally economical way, might be set up as the goal for all language teachers. The job of the institute linguist would then be to attempt to impart knowledge about linguistics which would make their participants come as close as possible to this goal.

Elton Hocking, in an evaluation of institutes he visited during the summer of 1962, argued for a reexamination of the importance of the linguistics course in the institute curriculum:

...most participants need primarily to practice speaking and hearing. We know this and they know it too. If audiolingual teaching is to succeed, the institutes must impart good audiolingual skills and techniques. If audiolingual teaching does not succeed, its failure may be charged in part to our insistence on what is essentially peripheral to the primary purpose of the institutes. 20

Hocking could see little good in linguistics for any
but the teachers with excellent control over their target language. His final recommendation was to make linguistics a

...half-course, meeting only two or three times a week, taught by one of our own colleagues as defined by Freeman. This will enable institutes to avoid engaging an outsider who doesn't speak the foreign language, doesn't appreciate our problems and purposes..." 21

This view of the linguistics course, similar to the one of Walsh cited earlier, did not prevail. The course remained a major one in the institute structure, usually three to five hours weekly plus the viewing of selected MLA or Smith films, done frequently in the evening.

Linguistics in the Axelrod Report

The Axelrod Report of 1966, which was the result of extensive observation of the summer institutes of 1965, attempted to arrive at the definition of an optimal teacher-training curriculum, basing itself on the institute structure. The Report represents a knowledge of linguistics as an important part of the teacher's stock in trade. His specific competencies are that he:

understands enough about linguistic science to know how it is related to his work and what the language teaching profession may learn from it... Secondly, he knows about the nature of language
in general and he is able to use with some ease the major tools that have been developed for analyzing and describing language. In particular, he has had some training in applying these tools to the language he is teaching and therefore has some understanding of its elements and structure—from the totality of an entire speech utterance down to its individual sounds...successful foreign language teachers should have a knowledge of contrastive linguistics. 22

Several paragraphs in the rather short section dealing with what the successful foreign language teacher should know about linguistic science deal with frustrations which ensue because of the state of flux of the science of linguistics. Allusion is made to the despair of a teacher who had become a believer of the phonemic principle, only to find it attacked by the latest linguistic theory. The lesson to be learned here, according to Axelrod, is that the language teacher need not feel obligated to espouse any particular linguistic doctrine. The teacher should have enough background in linguistics to be able to follow the arguments of both sides of a quarrel, and to borrow eclectically from each those elements which can best aid him in the teaching situation.

Section III of the book, "Recommendations for Curricular Development," indicates what might comprise a linguistics course for teachers. Axelrod proposes a theoretical phase, in which teachers would become
acquainted with one or more "frameworks for linguistic analysis...together with the analytic tools which have been developed for (those) framework(s)." In addition to this theoretical and applied work, certain attitudes about language are to be acquired in the linguistics course. Teachers should become aware of the systemic nature of language, and of the necessity of mastering special intellectual tools to analyze this system. None of these analytical tools has been able to describe completely any language, however. One product of linguistic analysis has been a very useful technique for language teaching: pattern drill. Finally, teachers must understand

...the reasons why a practical command of a language cannot result merely from knowledge about the language, even the most accurate knowledge... At the same time, students are able to see, as a result of their work in linguistics, that anyone teaching language must have knowledge about the language in order to be able to make decisions affecting the planning and actual teaching of his classes. 24

Mention is made of the early difficulties encountered with institute courses in linguistics, difficulties which were avoided when the courses were more closely coordinated with the courses in methods:

...as the work in linguistics and methodology became more coordinated, drill sessions were scheduled in which linguistic principles were applied
consistently to the solution of problems in phonetics, vocabulary, and syntax that institute students were facing themselves and which they would probably also be facing in the classes they would be teaching. 25

The report suggests finally that the model provided by the institute linguistics course is worthy of imitation by teacher preparation institutions.

With the Axelrod Report, we come to the end of the available documentation evaluating the applied linguistics courses in NDEA institutes. It has been seen that a model was worked out over the first several years of institute experience which, ideally, could provide teachers with a knowledge of linguistics that they could see as being relevant to what was going on in their classrooms.

The next section of this Chapter will include a detailed examination of some concrete examples of teacher experience in NDEA institute linguistics courses in order to determine to what extent this practical experience vindicates the model whose evolution has just been described.
National Defense Language Institute  
Linguistics Courses  

Introduction: Sample of Final Reports

The National Defense Foreign Language Institute experience is impressive in its size. Over the ten-year period of its history, there were 638 institutes in all, including first, second, and third levels, institutes abroad, and those for supervisory personnel.

It was obvious at the outset that this dissertation could not pretend to deal individually with the final report of each institute. Some sort of sampling procedure was indicated. A random sampling technique or a stratified random technique was the first alternative considered. This possibility was rejected for several reasons. First, it was found that a rather clear idea of what had transpired in early institute linguistics courses could be gotten from the evaluative studies done by the Freeman Committees and by others. The material in the previous section of this Chapter is based on these studies. Second, limitations of time and the disposition of the records in the archives of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare made the random technique impractical. It seemed that very little real information could be gained through orthodox
sampling techniques, since the reports revealed themselves to be not as useful as had been the above-mentioned evaluations. It was decided then to concentrate upon reports which were at hand.

The sample of final reports upon which this section is based comes from the years 1964 and 1966. A total of 78 final reports from these two years were closely scrutinized to obtain information about the course in applied linguistics. This includes all 58 reports for the institutes conducted during summer 1966 and academic year 1966-67, and 20 of the total of 87 reports from 1964.

The final reports proved to be an unsatisfactory source of objective data about what transpired in institute linguistics courses. Unfortunately, since the evaluations of institutes were never filed methodically, and do not seem to have been kept after 1964, the reports are the only source of data which exists in any realistically obtainable form.

The amount of information about course content and participant reaction varies from very sketchy descriptions by the institute director to rather full accounts written by the staff members and compiled by the director. Some indication is usually given about the text materials used in the course, though frequently
this information is minimal. Occasionally the holdings of an "institute library" are detailed, but these are not usually extensive. Institute libraries were primarily assembled for overseas institutes, where participants could not count on the resources of institutional libraries, as they could in the United States. A later section will describe the texts which were used in the institutes whose final reports were examined. It was sometimes possible to gain an idea of the orientation of the course toward language practice or pedagogical considerations from a syllabus, included in the final report. But the most interesting aspects of individual linguistics courses, both positive and negative, showed up in the professors' descriptions of the courses.

Some special cases

Not all institutes whose final reports were studied offered a course in applied linguistics. There were several reasons for this. Institutes in the oriental languages were frequently uniquely concerned with developing competence in the target language and could thus not spare time to ancillary concerns such as linguistics and methodology. An examination of the reports of the 1966 institutes of Seton Hall University (Chinese
and Japanese) and San Francisco State College in Taiwan (Chinese) revealed nothing resembling the linguistics courses taught in most institutes. The institute held at the University of Hawaii in 1966, however, which combined programs of Japanese and Spanish, provided a course in linguistics in each language. Since contrastive materials for English-Japanese were not available, the Japanese linguistics course centered around a study of: Lado, Language Teaching, Carroll, The Study of Language, and Fries, Teaching and Learning English as a Foreign Language. 27

Institutes designed primarily for supervisory personnel offered varying amounts of work in applied linguistics. At the 1966 institute for college and university trainers of teachers held at the University of Minnesota, there was a course in linguistics in each of three languages: French, Spanish, and German. 28 The 1966 institute at Central Washington State College in Ellensburg, designed for foreign language supervisors of French and Spanish, offered no formal course in applied linguistics. 29 At the institute for state supervisors of foreign languages held at the Indiana University in 1966, work with linguistics was done in an intensive, workshop manner. Albert Valdman and William Moulton spent one week at the institute working
individually with the participants. 30

Most institutes which involved participants from two different languages arranged to have language-specific scheduling for the courses in linguistics. A rare occurrence was the course offered by James F. McArthur at the 1966 institute at St. Lawrence University. McArthur, a high school teacher with competence in both Spanish and French, taught combined Spanish-French linguistics. The brief account in the final report describes the course as a very practical one in which there was much classroom participation. 31 Although time spent in the analysis of each language must have suffered, the better participants had the possibility of gaining additional insight by the comparison of three linguistic systems.

Results were somewhat less satisfactory at other institutes where participants teaching different languages were given a common linguistics course. At the 1964 Institute for Secondary School Teachers of German and Spanish, held at the University of Wisconsin, the eminent linguist Martin P. Joos conducted a series of lectures on linguistics with the intent of changing teacher attitudes about language. As the following quotation shows, Joos was not satisfied that he had significantly changed these attitudes in a large number
of teachers by the end of his course:

The lecturer had long suspected that foreign language teachers were to some extent dominated by the same folklore notion that hampers their pupils, the notion that grammar is cosmetic; even so he was horrified to find that nine out of ten participants had absolutely no other theory of grammar than just that—that they could hardly believe that grammar had any function at all—and distressed to find at the end that only about two out of ten changed their minds at all in the course of the summer... Still, the hope remains that the momentum aimed at did develop within a few, so that they will be wiser a year or two later: eight weeks is a short time for making any great headway against the habits of half a lifetime.

The participants themselves were impressed by the knowledge displayed by Professor Joos, but the applied linguistics course came in for considerable criticism, as has been the case in every institute on which the associate director has read a final report. Most participants had never been exposed to this field, and some stated that it was simply overwhelming. There were recommendations that fewer hours per week be given over to work in applied linguistics.

One institute director described a course given by a group of eminent linguists to his Code 2-3 language teachers thusly:

...Dr. Velma Pickett gave the initial lecture, introducing the hierarchical approach to language as developed in Dr. Pike's *Language in Relation to a Unified Theory of the Structure of Human Behavior*. The remaining introductory lectures, by Dr. (Kenneth L.) Pike, related language learning and teaching problems to linguistic theory within the hierarchical approach, including the concept of nucleation in language learning. Special attention was given to linguistic units larger than the sentence and their relation to the
study of composition and rhetoric. These latter are the subject of current research and recent developments... The remaining units of the course included emphasis on sensitizing to phonology, phonetics, literacy, morphology, and syntax. Except for the first two initial lectures, which were given by Dr. Pike, each of the other lectures given as a part of the linguistics course was given by a different member of the staff of the Summer Institute of Linguistics. Each lecturer presented linguistic material in an area in which he has specialized or had special experience...

From this description, the discussion in the first section of this Chapter would lead one to think that participants would find this presentation extremely difficult. This was in fact the reaction of most:

...participants expressed clearly the opinion that the class in linguistics was the one from which they derived the least benefit... The participants were almost unanimous in their suggestion that the number of hours in phonetics be increased, and that the work in linguistics be reduced to lectures slanting toward both French and Spanish.

Finally, there were two institutes which did not include any course in applied linguistics. At least no mention was made of such a course in the final reports.

Having dispensed with the "anomalous" linguistics courses in the preceding discussion, we are now prepared to speak in general terms about the nature of "the applied linguistics course in an NDEA institute." The population from which the observations of the following
sections are drawn contains the final reports of about 30 French institutes, 20 Spanish, 8 German, and 7 French and Spanish (where separate courses were given).

Structure of the course

The final reports of institute directors show that within the general outline of curriculum for an institute, considerable latitude was left for planning the detailed structure of the coursework. Thus, in spite of the fact that institutes almost universally included a course entitled "applied linguistics" in the curriculum, content and emphasis of this course varied greatly.

The most basic reason for the disparate nature of the institute linguistics courses stems from the philosophy which seems to have motivated most institute staffs. The idea was less one of establishing high standards which all participants would feel pressured to attain than one of meeting each participant on his own intellectual level, and helping him to achieve as best he could.

A good example of the thought which prompted institute flexibility appears in the 1966 proposal of Professor Sanford Newell of Converse College:

...it would be unwise and not exactly true to state categorically this far ahead of time that we will
or will not do a given thing in the linguistics courses. How far we shall be able to go, and how much we shall be able to accomplish, will depend in very large measure on the participants' previous linguistic acquisitions. Whatever might be stated with feigned assurance some months ahead of the fact would have to be subject to change once we find out what our participants know.

The applied linguistics course in this second-level institute was in principle to build upon a sound basis in linguistics acquired by the participants at the first-level institutes. The Newell proposal states elsewhere that in fact the preparation in linguistics varied from very little to knowledge adequate to do a supervised study of the regional dialect of Toulouse.

Professor Edgar N. Mayer experienced similar articulation problems. He attempted to section the total of eighty participants into two groups on the basis of a questionnaire which he constructed. The large groups were given four lecture-demonstrations per week; they were in turn split in half to form recitation sections, which met once a week.

The questionnaire was found to be inadequate as a placement device, as roughly one quarter of the participants in each large section were misplaced. Thus the sectioning was not as effective as it could have been, and procedures in each group ended up being quite simi-
lar. Professor Mayer had the following recommendation based on his experience with second-level linguistics courses:

The teaching of linguistics at first level institutes needs further improvement. Many institutes, even in 1965, gave courses in theory without application to the structure of French, others merely offered courses in phonetics and called them linguistics. As long as this is so, we shall continue to lose a golden opportunity.

Let us examine now some of the reasons for the non-homogeneity of linguistics courses in first-level institutes. First, there is the matter of language competence of participants. As mentioned above, improvement of language proficiency was the principal goal of the institute program. Where this competence was below the minimum for effective performance in the classroom, i.e. Code 3-4 institutes, every element of the institute instructional program was designed with language improvement in mind. The course given by Professor Paulette Collet at Kansas State Teachers College in 1964 demonstrates the remedial work in language which was typical (emphasis mine):

It was decided to start with the teaching of phonology so that the participants' pronunciation might receive immediate benefit. All phonemes were taught in great detail with numerous examples of minimal pairs and exercises. There was little time for individual practice in this course because of the large number of participants, but some
chorus work was done, and individual practice was given in the lab and in the small sections for pronunciation. The rest of the time was spent on the teaching of syntax, with emphasis on pronouns and use of tenses, particularly the imperfect and the passé composé. Every effort was made to make the linguistics course practical and useful to participants at a minimal level. The pattern drills made up by the participants showed that they need even more practice and more examples on this type of exercise.

Some instructors thought, with Hocking and Walsh, that teachers with minimal language competency should be allowed to work uniquely on improvement of language skills for the major portion of the institute, and be given a brief introduction to linguistic concepts during the last several weeks:

...the minimal people cannot hope to understand the linguistics of French until they have a better command of the language. As one participant phrased it, "How can I understand the linguistics of the formation of the imperfect if I don't know the endings of the imperfect myself?" ... Minimal groups should be released from linguistics for the first six weeks (of the institute), during which time they would do additional intensive language drill. For the last two weeks they would have an intensive series in elementary applied linguistics in French.

Certainly the knowledge of linguistics gained during an institute such as the ones just cited does not provide an adequate base for substantive progress in a second-level institute. Both Mayer and Delakas, the instructor in linguistics at the 1966 Converse
College institute, found that, for a segment of their students, no prior experience with linguistics could be assumed.

It has been seen above that one of the "contaminating factors" in institute linguistics courses, particularly at the Code 3-4 level, was the work which was done in language practice. Another factor which influenced the linguistic content of the course was the amount of language pedagogy included. Instructors generally realized the importance of a practical approach to the subject, i.e. one which made the application of linguistic principles explicitly clear.

Sometimes, however, the course in linguistics became a methodology course using the terminology of linguistics. On institute director outlined the course in the following way:

...the participants should grasp the meaning and importance of linguistics, how it can aid the teacher in understanding how languages operate, the contrasts in structure between the native and target languages, the interference of the native language, etc. They should be made to see how a knowledge of linguistics will enable them to predict the areas of difficulty their students will face, how to overcome these difficulties, and how to construct valid tests to determine whether these difficulties have been mastered. Then the participants should learn the terminology and concepts of linguistics, for example "morphemes" and "phonemes" should be more than just words, they should be thoroughly
understood. I should like for the participants to know exactly what pattern drills are, the rationale behind them, how they should, and should not be used, and how to construct their own, if need be... What I am actually proposing for you is a course in methodology taught from a linguistic point of view. 41

The final variable contributing to the uneven preparation in linguistics mentioned by Mayer above is purely logistic: the number of class hours devoted to the subject during the institute. Directors were at liberty to design their courses within certain liberal guidelines. In linguistics, the number of class hours per week varied from three to five in most cases, in configurations ranging from all-lecture to lecture-tutorial setups. The institutes themselves ran from six weeks to nine weeks, the average for a domestic institute being seven weeks. The class contact with linguistics could thus total as little as 18 hours (three hours per week for six weeks), or as much as 45 hours (five hours per week for nine weeks).

It is easy to see how the heterogeneous conditions just described for first-level institutes would lead to considerable placement problems at second-level ones. Participants from two different institutes could have very different ideas indeed about what ling-
uistics was, and the role it had to play in the teaching of languages. This diversity will manifest itself again in the discussion of text materials for the course, below.

**Participant reaction to linguistics courses**

Participant reaction to the course in applied linguistics is a difficult quantity to document in retrospect. The evaluators of early institutes found much discontent with the courses; they were able to visit the institutes in situ, as were the members of the Axelrod committee in 1965. Unfortunately, none of the final reports looked at for this study contained a systematic profile of participant reaction to the institute programs in question. Participant reaction was summed up in very general terms by most institute directors, using such terminology as "mostly favorable" and "very enthusiastic." Infrequently, final reports included anecdotal information from participants' comments about the institute. The solitary questionnaire found in the corpus of reports will be described here. Some information comes from incidental comments by instructors and directors in their narrative reports.

The overwhelming majority of directors seemed
reasonably satisfied with the applied linguistics course. Several of them mentioned that it had traditionally been a problem, that they expected problems, and that they were pleasantly surprised when the participants reacted favorably to the course. The most widespread participant discontent came from those courses which departed from the "institute model," the course discussed in the first section of this Chapter.

Mayer,\textsuperscript{42} in his discussion of sectioning attempts, mentions "neutral and hostile participants" which were grouped together in one of two sections of his linguistics course. This concentration of negative attitude

...was enough to affect the atmosphere. Group B was hence decidedly less receptive than Group A. Since the less-well-prepared participants tend naturally to be neutral or even hostile, this phenomenon is likely to continue.

Mayer goes on to mention, however, that the resistance of participants in Section B decreased as the institute progressed.

Although the neutral and hostile elements in applied linguistics classes are not frequently mentioned when in the minority, there seems to have been a segment of most institute populations which was unhappy with the course. The following questionnaire supports this view: \textsuperscript{43}
3.1 Were the Applied Linguistics classes, in your opinion

   Very satisfactory  3
   Satisfactory      16
   Fairly satisfactory 13
   Unsatisfactory    4

3.2 Do you feel that the study of linguistics is of value to the classroom teacher of foreign languages?

   YES  29
   NO   7

3.3 Do you feel that the applied linguistics sessions have benefited you in terms of increased language proficiency?

   YES  16
   NO   20

3.4 Did you gain new insights into the nature of language which you feel will be applicable in your teaching?

   YES  31
   NO   5

3.5 Do you consider that the amount of time scheduled for applied linguistics sessions was

   Too great  7
   About right 22
   Too little  7

It may be seen that the participant reaction to this particular course in linguistics, though not clearly negative, was not overly favorable: eighty per cent of the participants considered the course either "satisfactory" or "fairly satisfactory," which shows that about one fifth of the participants did not demonstrate great enthusiasm for the course.

Items 3.2 and 3.4 are really two instances of the
same question, the first generic and the second specific and personal. Though the majority of participants responded favorably, roughly twenty per cent of them failed to see any relevance of the course to language teaching. There is no reason to generalize from this very small sample to the entire population of language teachers. Nonetheless it would seem safe to conclude that a sizeable minority of language teachers remained unconvinced, in spite of institute courses, that a knowledge of linguistics could have a positive effect on their performance as language teachers. It is unfortunate that there is no way to reach members of this population now. It would be interesting to discover whether their performance today differs in any noticeable way from that of participants who reacted positively to the institute linguistics work.

The resistance to work in linguistics probably comes from participants whose language competence is low. It should be noted that the above-cited questionnaire applies to a Code-4 institute. Reaction from participants with better language background is likely to be much more favorable, as the following comment from the director of a 1968 Code 1-2 institute
shows: "Thirty-three of forty-four participants... stated that linguistics had been 'most helpful' to them in preparing to be a better Spanish teacher, ten judged the component 'moderately helpful' and a single holdout as 'not very helpful'." 44

It is no doubt accurate to say that the course in linguistics caused more participant unrest, over the ten-year NDEA experience, than did any other segment of the institute curriculum. The fears of Vincenzo Cioffari, expressed in the Modern Language Journal in 1962, did not turn out to be well-founded, however. 45 Overall evaluations of the linguistics course became considerably more favorable as linguistics became not only acceptable to most, but faddish, and as a group of instructors emerged who through experience had learned what was possible in an institute linguistics course. Nevertheless, a significant though small segment of the participant population showed itself to be dubious about the worth of the applied linguistics course in particular, and about the applicability of linguistics to language teaching in general. This feeling was most prominent in Code 3-4 institutes, where language difficulties predominated.

The first year's experience with NDEA institute courses in applied linguistics made it apparent that there were no suitable materials available for conducting courses in linguistics for teachers. By the middle of the institute experience, the years covered in this survey, several manuals had been created expressly for use in institutes, and other materials had been pressed into service.

The purpose of this small survey is to determine whether definite patterns had been established regarding the use of these materials in various institute situations. For instance, it is reasonable to assume that institutes dealing with participants of minimal language facility would use more accessible materials, such as the Politzer series (Staubach and Politzer in Spanish), while the more advanced Code 1 institutes would use the more difficult materials edited by Belasco, or the Contrastive Structure Series sponsored by the Center for Applied Linguistics. All three of these texts series had been published in order to supply teachers with information about contrastive linguistics, information which, it was claimed, could
help the teacher perform more effectively in the classroom. Interesting differences in text usage were hopefully to be found between the institutes of summer 1964 and those of summer 1966, which might indicate that some texts were more effective than others.

Mention of a book in the final report, even specification of it as a basic text, gives no clear idea of how it is implemented in the course. Making interpretation even more difficult, the reporting procedure for institutes showed little uniformity. Some directors specified clearly a basic text with related outside readings to be done at the discretion of the participant. Others showed little more than a list of books, with no indication of how they were to have been used. Of course, these reports were useless in this survey, and the population used is consequently smaller than the number of reports initially consulted.

Tables 1 through 4 show usage of books on applied linguistics expressly written for teachers. In many instances, several texts were ordered for a single course; in these cases, all texts were included in the tabulation, hence totals in books used are higher than those in number of courses.

Not all institutes limited themselves to par-
TEXT USAGE IN APPLIED LINGUISTICS COURSES:

FRENCH AND SPANISH, SUMMERS 1964, 1966

### TABLE 1: French, 1964

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Uncoded</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Politzer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valdman</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total no. courses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 2: French, 1966

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Uncoded</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Politzer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valdman</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total no. courses</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 3: Spanish, 1964

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Uncoded</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cárdenas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staubach</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total no. courses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 4: Spanish, 1966

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Uncoded</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bull</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cárdenas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staubach</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockwell, Bowen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockwell, Bowen, Martin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total no. courses</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
participants of one code. For example, institutes designed for participants whose language skills were minimal were sometimes designated Code 3-4, whereas some overseas institutes, designed for participants with good to excellent language skills, were designated Code 1-2. This code-mixing presented a problem in the establishment of categories for Tables 1-4. Three categories for institutes were set up: High, which includes Codes 1 and 1-2; Middle, which includes Code 2, 3, and 2-3; and Low, which includes Codes 4 and 3-4. The last category includes "uncoded" institutes, which selected participants on criteria other than language competence, e.g. institutes for supervisory personnel.

Data from applied linguistics courses in German did not warrant the establishment of a table for several reasons. First, the number of German applied linguistics courses in the sample is small: eight. Further, out of the eight, five are High level courses, which in the German institutes tended to be courses in advanced grammar. Nonetheless, as may be seen from Table 7 (Appendix A), seven of the eight courses included listed the Moulton book, and roughly half listed both the Marchand work and the Kufner study.
In French, where the choice in both years was limited to two texts, an overwhelming majority used Politzer in preference to the Valdman text, probably because the former is the more accessible of the two. In 1966, roughly 80% of courses included the Politzer book, while in 1964 the percentage had been close to 70%. In both years slightly over 30% ordered the Valdman book. In the sample of reports examined, one director of a 1964 Code 3 institute mentioned that he felt the success of that year's linguistics course (as opposed to the one held in 1963) to be at least partly due to the use of the Politzer book. 46 No significant preference is shown for Politzer in the lower level institutes; no preference for Valdman evidenced itself in the higher ones. Politzer seems to have been unanimously preferred.

In the 1964 Spanish institutes, instructors were faced with the choice between Politzer-Staubach and Belasco-Cárdenas. Here each book was chosen for about 70% of institutes. Forty per cent of the courses were thus using both books.

In 1966, however, several new texts were available, including Bull's Spanish for Teachers: Applied Linguistics, and the Contrastive Structure Series volumes.
The Contrastive Structure books were ordered by about 50% of instructors, though more were ordered for low-level institutes than for high. This surprising fact would lead one to believe that the instructors in the low-level institutes were too sanguine about what could be attained in an institute linguistics course. These same instructors, however, showed a distinct preference for the less difficult Staubach book over Cárdenas.

In sum, it is impossible to identify any trends or patterns of text selection with the data that is available, except that Politzer was the favorite in French institutes at all levels, and that no such clear favorite could be established in the Spanish institutes.

Tables 5, 6, and 7 (Appendix A) list all books mentioned in the applied linguistics section of the final reports examined, with an indication of how many times the books were selected. The multiple listings under "language and phonetics" indicate the extent to which institute courses emphasized language practice and remedial phonetics. Although many final reports made no specific mention of the fact, drill material from both the A-LM materials and the Foreign Service Institute materials were frequently used for
language study and for analysis in applied linguistics courses, particularly at the lower levels.

From the sections "Methodology" and "Linguistics and other", one may see that a limited number of institutes did some work both in methodology and in structural linguistics. Most institutes using the Buchanan text indicated that participants were to have read the book before coming to the institute. The hope was that the programmed nature of the work would enable teachers to progress alone, and that they would have been able to acquire some knowledge of elementary linguistic concepts before arriving at the institute. Unfortunately no attempt seems to have been made to ascertain how effective this practice was.

The writer had thought that the film series "Principles and Methods of Teaching a Second Language" would naturally comprise part of the work in most applied linguistics courses, particularly in the Code 3-4 institutes. This was not found to be true, according to final reports. Of the twenty reports consulted for 1964 (six of which were Code 3-4 or 4), seven indicated showing the films in conjunction with the applied linguistics course. Of the 58 reports consulted for 1966 institutes (fourteen of which were Code 3-4
or 4), only five indicated using the films in the linguistics class. It is possible that use of the films was shifted to the methodology course to free applied linguistics for more practical language work. Some reports mentioned that the films were shown in the evenings.

**Conclusion**

It has been seen in this Chapter that, in spite of the establishment of certain global objectives for what has been called here an "institute model," practice in NDEA linguistics courses remained quite heterogeneous. Differences have been discussed in the areas of curriculum and of participant preparation which caused the emphasis of the course to shift from pedagogy to language practice, from contrastive linguistics to theoretical descriptive linguistics, depending on the philosophy of the individual instructor, the director of the institute, and on the preparation and outlook of the participants.
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CHAPTER III
A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF PEDAGOGICAL TREATMENTS OF FRENCH

Introduction

Two books published in the early 1960's represent the only attempts to construct a general course in applied linguistics for teachers of French. They are Politzer, Teaching French and Valdman, Applied Linguistics: French (ed. Simon Belasco). Both books are based on descriptive linguistic theory, though a more recent edition of the Valdman-Belasco book has included some transformational material.

Although both books purport to make available certain linguistic concepts which will benefit the classroom teacher, they differ considerably in emphasis. The first section of the Valdman-Belasco text, by Belasco, concentrates uniquely on an analysis of English syntax, and attempts to provide a systematic rationale for the development of pattern drill. Belasco bases his analysis on the slot-class techniques of Fries and Pike. The second half of the volume, by Valdman, attempts
a brief treatment of the principle features of French at the sentence, phrase, word, and single sound levels; emphasis has been placed on those features which present particular difficulties to speakers of American English and which should therefore be especially stressed in the teaching situation.

Politzer considers pedagogy the focal point of his book:

The first part of the book is devoted entirely to methodological considerations. In the second part, linguistic concepts are introduced, but emphasis remains on the teaching of French rather than its scientific analysis.

Both Politzer and Valdman maintain that a systematic comparison of two languages may be useful in arriving at a pedagogical sequence.

By comparing the linguistic analysis of the native language of the learner...with that of the language to be studied...we highlight the major difficulties encountered by the learner.

Unless the teacher fully understands how a linguistic feature functions in French, and has a clear view of its relation to the students' native language, he will not be aware of the students' real problems.

Although neither author claims to have analyzed more than small segments of the structure of each level, "points of interference" are seen to exist at each one.

The following analysis will cover the treatments of Politzer and Valdman at the levels of phonology, morphology and syntax, emphasizing the pedagogical implications of their treatments.
Both authors claim that the phonemic principle can be very useful in teaching the phonology of a language:

The concept that a language is composed of a very limited set of phonemes is primary for the successful and efficient teaching of pronunciation.

The important contribution of phonemics to language teaching...lies in the fact that it has simplified the task and systematized it... Phonemic analysis of French and English shows us quite clearly which of the French phonemes will be difficult to learn for speakers of English and must therefore be emphasized in our teaching.

An explanation of the phonemic principle must be built upon a knowledge of the phonetic realities of language; it is difficult to attempt a discussion of the phonemes of French or English before the student knows some elementary facts about articulatory phonetics. Certainly the statement that "in English, aspiration is a secondary or contextually determined feature" will hold little meaning unless the student has prior knowledge of the phonetic reality involved.

Politzer includes a short introduction to articulatory phonetics before his discussion of the phonemic principle. In the nine pages of this treatment, he explains such basic concepts as point and manner of articulation of English consonants, and secondary articulatory features. Politzer's treatment also touches on phonetic notation and the cardinal vowel triangle.
A serious lack of the Valdman (1961) treatment is the absence of such a section giving articulatory information and explanation of terminology. The symbols used by Valdman are introduced at the beginning of the Morphology section, which precedes the one on Phonology, and articulatory descriptions of consonants and vowels are not provided until fifty pages later. This lack of explanation of articulatory terminology and phonetic notation means that the student must get this information from supplementary sources, in class, or not at all.

Sometimes Valdman provides information explaining terms, but it is not easily accessible to the student. For instance, Valdman describes the "basis of articulation" as "secondary though obligatory features of articulation that characterize...speech." The reader whose prior knowledge of linguistic terminology does not permit him to guess what is meant here does not learn until 14 pages later that Valdman is referring to the general phonetic features characteristic of French articulation, which Delattre has called "les modes phonétiques du français." 8

The way in which the two authors define the phoneme
is typical of the difference between the books. Politzer, in keeping with his aim to restrict technical jargon, defines the phoneme as "the smallest building stone available to the speaker of a language." Politzer would thus have the student believe that the phoneme is a unit of sound which is differentiated, as he explains later, from all other phonemes by the fact that it is substitutable in a frame to form "minimal pairs."

Valdman bases his treatment of the phoneme on the theory that the phoneme is actually an abstract entity which includes a class of sounds ("phones") differentiated from other phonemes by differences of one or more "significant features." But the only overt explanation of this concept is the following:

> Phonology is concerned with the listing of the sound contrasts of a language and the discussion of the various relationships among the phonemes (phonemics). The description of the phonemes (sound classes) can be made in terms of acoustic energy...or the physiology of speech production...

Clearly, a more complete discussion of this rather abstract formulation of the phoneme is needed to avoid confusion. Reference is made to "significant or obligatory features" and to "secondary or optional features", in addition to the "secondary though obligatory features (basis of articulation) mentioned above. Any definition of these terms must be gotten elsewhere. Moreover,
when Valdman discusses French vowels, he uses the term "distinctive articulatory feature" to refer to rounding, position and height, rather than using the terms he had previously introduced: "significant or obligatory feature." Valdman has explained the phonemic concept much more lucidly in his Drillbook of French Pronunciation.

Both books introduce an alphabet to represent more accurately French sound. Politzer uses the International Phonetic Alphabet. Valdman uses an alphabet which he claims to represent better the phonemic reality of French. The chief advantage of Valdman's representation is that it enables the easy notation of mid-vowel opposition and non-opposition in utterance-final and medial positions, respectively.

Vowel analysis

Politzer's comparison begins with a juxtaposition of the French and English vowel triangles. In order to make comparison easier, Politzer has interpreted the tense-lax oppositions in English front vowels as being represented by separate phonemes: /e/ - /ɛ/ and /i/ - /ɪ/. Except for his discussion of vowel length and "certain other slight modifications" which the French vowel system undergoes (i.e. mid-vowel alternation), Politzer's entire analysis derives from this comparison.
Valdman organizes his treatment of the vowels by "distinctive feature," though as mentioned above he never justifies his use of the term. Oral vowels are treated first, then nasals. In a separate section, he discusses certain limitations on the mid-vowel alternation. Finally, he includes a very short section on phonetic characteristics of French vowels as compared to English ones.

Politzer and Valdman both conclude that the front rounded vowels and the nasal vowels provide the American student with the most serious learning problems, since he former series does not exist in English and nasalization is not a distinctive feature in English, but rather what Valdman calls a secondary feature.

Valdman makes the point that some contrasts are not as important as others: "the contrast /ë/ versus /ê/ is not of the same order as the contrast /i/ versus /y/." However, in his treatment of the oral vowels, he seems to accord equal importance to the analysis of French front unrounded, front rounded, and low vowels, in spite of the fact that he states that the front rounded series is sure to cause the most difficulty to the speaker of English. The front rounded vowels could have been discussed at greater length to give a clearer
picture of why they present difficulties to American students. The fact that they are differentiated from the front unrounded vowels only by the feature of roundness should be discussed, and it should be mentioned that students may be expected to have trouble differentiating them from one another as well as from back vowels. Finally, the principal English substitutes for them might have been contrasted, for example the English /ə/. Instead, the author has stated only that English does not have these vowels, and has proceeded straight to articulatory descriptions of how to form them.

In the same section, Valdman discusses the "paradoxical" fact that American students of French sometimes interpret French /ê/ in free syllable to be English /iː/, sometimes to be English /eɪ/. He explains this by the fact that "English has only two contrasts (i.e. contrasting vowels) in free syllable; American speakers have difficulty identifying French /ê/ in that position and will usually hear it as /iː/. If they are corrected they will then choose the other possible alternative in their native language system, namely /eɪ/. This does not explain why students choose /iː/ in the first place as an interpretation of the French /ê/.
It would seem that this mistake could be more accurately diagnosed in phonetic terms: French /e/ includes phones which are more closed than those of the fairly open American /ej/. It is therefore interpreted as the next higher phoneme in free position, /ij/, the lax American /i/ being permitted only in closed syllables. In any event, this problem, which is certainly not of the magnitude of that presented by front rounded vowels, should be subordinated to the latter in any analysis which takes pedagogy into account.

Valdman and Politzer both treat the French nasal vowels as major pronunciation hurdles for Americans. Both refer to these vowels as "nasalized", a term more appropriate to English vowels, since they show nasalization as a secondary feature only. The term "nasal" could then be reserved for "true" nasal vowels, in which the feature of nasality is distinctive.

Although Politzer recognizes that the American's learning problem stems from the feature "nasality" of English, his treatment of the problem is quite cursory:

...nasality also exists in English. Vowels following or preceding a nasal consonant...are nasalized, but since this nasality in English is only the result of the consonant and has no phonemic significance, speakers of English are not used to paying attention to the nasal pronunciation of the vowel. 15
Valdman's explanation of nasal opposition in French and nasal assimilation in English explains more fully the problem, though he makes no mention of progressive assimilation. Valdman describes the two tendencies of English speakers in French which have been generally recognized in manuals of phonetics: diffusion of nasalization and intercalation of nasalized consonantal elements. 16 A serious omission from the Valdman discussion is the fact that from the point of view of comprehension, the tendency of Americans to be unable to distinguish between nasals is probably a more serious problem than articulatory difficulties of production. Although Valdman includes a sample drill 17 which demonstrates how to give practice in nasal discrimination and production, an explanation of the problem here seems indispensable.

Politzer, after discussing all segmental vowels, states:

In rapid colloquial speech the French vowel system undergoes certain other modifications... 18

He proceeds to discuss the lack of opposition between front and back open vowels (as in tache, tâche) and mid-vowel phoneme pairs ( /æ/-/œ/, /e/-/ɛ/, /o/-/ɔ/) in certain environments in colloquial speech. It would
see that these are not "modifications" at all, but rather basic facts about the structure of the French sound system, and should be described as such. In fact, Hall, Delattre, and Léon, as well as Valdman, treat the mid-vowels in such a way as to show how their alternation is a rather important characteristic of the French sound system.

Mid-vowel alternation causes considerable embarrassment to the phonemic framework of Politzer, which would have all mid-vowels be phonemes. But in the face of alternation, Politzer must say:

...in colloquial French /ə/ as opposed to /œ/, and /e/ as opposed to /ɛ/, also disappear as distinct phonemes of the language. This does not mean that the sounds as such disappear, but whether one says /œ/ or /æ/ or /e/ or /ɛ/ becomes clearly predictable according to the environment in which the sounds are used.

Politzer formulates a "loi de position" which states that open vowels are used in closed syllables, while the closed vowels appear in open syllables, in most instances. He does not state, however, that this rule holds true primarily in stressed syllables, but that in unstressed (non-final) syllables, the value of mid-vowels tends to vary between /e/ - /ɛ/, /œ/ - /œ/, and /o/ - /ɔ/, depending on the dialect, the speaker, and the occasion.

Valdman's treatment of this point is superior to Politzer's. Valdman notes the limitations in occurrence
of the mid-vowels in accented syllables, and discusses their unstable character in unaccented ones. 24

Politzer's treatment of /ə/ seems questionable:

The French /ə/ sound of le, me, se...offers several problems. Some students will confuse it with the French /œ/ or /ø/. It is then necessary to contrast it with these sounds and to develop auditory comprehension between...je and jeu, je dis and jeudi. 25

Phonicians generally agree that /ə/ may vary in height from /œ/ to /ø/; 26 therefore it is not a useful exercise to attempt to differentiate it from these sounds.

Politzer includes a discussion of phonetic difference between French vowels /i/, /e/, /o/, /u/ and their English counterparts; he does not mention the fact that this is a less important point than the previously discussed phonemic problems. Rather, he states that the substitution of English sounds represents a "rather serious and noticeable mistake." Valdman treats this diphthong problem in a separate section labelled "phonetic features".

Consonant analysis

Valdman and Politzer agree that the French consonant system presents the English speaker with less serious problems than do the French vowels.

Politzer's method of analysis is similar to the one he uses for vowels: juxtaposition of two charts
showing the articulatory features involved. This method shows only two phonemes existing in French which do not exist in English: /i/ and /j/. Politzer points out that Americans frequently substitute the cluster /nj/, as in "onion", for the French sound /ŋ/. He also mentions the fact that the /i/ - /w/ opposition, which is confusing to many Americans, is related to the purely vocalic /y/ - /u/ opposition, and will present no problem if the former is mastered properly. What Politzer does not note is the relative lack of importance of both of these phonemes, which comprise less than one per cent of all usages of all phonemes in a recent study. 27

The rest of Politzer's discussion deals with phonetic differences between the languages: aspiration in initial unvoiced English stops; lack of release in final stops and lateral; difference in place of articulation of English and French /t,d,l,n/; American /l/ and /r/ pronunciation, extremely diverse in the United States, conflicts in all its forms with French articulation.

Valdman discusses only three problem areas which he considers to be phonemic. First, the American retroflex /r/ is seen as comprehensible to a Frenchman, hence presenting no phonemic problem. Its influence
on surrounding vowels, however, can be such that it obscures the oppositions between rounded vowels, e.g., /mɔr/ vs. /nɔr/. Secondly, Valdman notes free variation between /s/ and /z/ in some instances; he cites "greasy, citizen", to which one could add "Vietnamese (as well as all other words ending in the derivational morpheme "-ese") and please". French always distinguishes between these consonants. Valdman contends that this phenomenon is responsible for the confusion which occurs between French words such as "désert -dessert" and "poisson -poison". Thirdly, Valdman notes the articulatory characteristic of English which causes /s/ and /z/ followed by /j/ to become palatalized, forming the consonants /ʃ/ and /ʒ/. This articulatory phenomenon does not exist in French.

Valdman does not mention the fact that palatalization occurs also in English /t/ and /d/ followed by /j/ to form /ʃ/ and /ʒ/, as in "hit you" /hiʃa/ and "did you" /diʃə/. Since the clusters /tj/ and /dj/ do not occur in French, this potential problem does not manifest itself.

These three phonemic points of interference, although interesting and plausible, do not account for a significant number of the mistakes which an American student
makes in pronouncing French consonants. Valdman describes briefly four articulatory problems under the heading "phonetic features": non-aspiration of voiceless stops, final consonant release, dental consonants, velar fricative /r/. These are discussed by Politzer also, as mentioned above, though Politzer makes no distinction between phonemic and phonetic errors in his discussion.

Politzer treats semivowels with consonants, and has little to say about /w/ and /j/, while discussing /l/ at length. He classes English /r/ as a semi-vowel, in spite of the facts that 1) /r/ does not constrict the vocal passage as do /j/ and /w/, and 2) /r/ is syllabic in English, whereas other semivowels have been defined as non-syllabic alternates of the high vowels.

Valdman's treatment of the semivowels is more thorough than Politzer's; he describes the fact that semi-vowels /w/ and /l/ alternate with high vowels /u/ and /i/. It is noted also that both /w/ and /l/ have quite limited distribution, occurring primarily before /a/ and /i/, respectively. There is no mention made, however, of any interference that English speech habits might provide.
Prosodic analysis

The prosodic features of stress, juncture and pitch are treated by both Valdman and Politzer. In general, Politzer's treatment, the longer of the two, is more complete, though its organization makes it less accessible than Valdman. For instance, Politzer makes a short presentation of the features of English prosody, which he follows with the explanations of French. His presentation might be clearer if the two descriptions were juxtaposed for each of the three basic features discussed.

Intonation. Although Politzer seems to use this word to mean all features of prosody, it is used here to refer only to treatment of pitch contours. Politzer has included a section on English intonation, which shows how English can change the emphasis of a sentence by stressing different parts of it. He mentions also that 1) strongest stress (i.e. intensity of sound) correlates with highest pitch in English and 2) the transition between two levels is usually made within the vowel sound. Valdman does not make these points.

Both Politzer and Valdman sketch the main types
of intonation curves for French: descending and rising. Politzer makes no attempt to establish levels of pitch as he did for English, stating that "linguists have (not) been able so far to state with any reasonable argument or proof that in French there is only a limited number of pitch levels."  

Valdman uses three levels, a system adapted from the Armstrong and Coustenoble scheme. It would seem that a more effective system than either of these is the four-level one used by both Delattre and Léon. Although Valdman claims to be merging the middle two pitch levels of Armstrong and Coustenoble, he is in effect stating that the pitch levels of these two sentences (underlined syllables) are the same:

\[
\text{Quelle âge avez-vous?} \\
\text{Il va à Paris.}
\]

Certainly Delattre and Léon would disagree with him here. Valdman himself seems to have changed his mind about the levels of intonation in his more recent work, which differentiates four levels of pitch.  

Stress. Politzer describes the four significant levels of English stress that are described by Smith and Trager. Valdman states only that there are
several significant levels of English stress. Both authors underline the essential stressless nature of French prosody at the word level, and the fact that rhythmic groups usually have a length-accent on the last syllable.

Both Politzer and Valdman recognize the "accent d'intensité," "emphatic stress" in Valdman's terminology. Politzer notes that it usually appears on the first or second syllable of the noun or adjective and is produced by an emphatic lengthening of the consonant rather than the vowel. He gives the examples: C'est impossible! and Quelle impertinence! 38 But there is no further explanation and no marks indicate where the accent occurs in the examples given. Certainly this brief description is not sufficient to provide the teacher with enough information either to use or to teach effectively the accent d'intensité if he does not already know what it is.

Valdman's treatment is similar to Politzer's in its brevity. The phonetic description of the accent is more complete, however: "...it is composed of an increase in intensity, length of segments, especially consonants, and rise in pitch..." 39
Valdman does not define the technical term "intensity"; neither he nor Politzer makes clear the phonetic reality of increased intensity and length in consonant articulation in French.

**Juncture.** Although Valdman does not devote a section to this aspect of prosody, he does discuss junctural phenomena under the rubric Stress (8.1). He states: "In English the transition between successive syllables is lax, and intervocalic consonants cannot be clearly assigned to the preceding or following vowel."^40^  

In a succeeding paragraph, however, he cites the pairs an aim and a name, showing that indeed junctural phenomena are phonemic in English. It is possible that in the above citation, Valdman was referring to within-word juncture only.

Politzer, in discussing English juncture, states that in English there are "...two basic kinds of syllable boundaries: one usually between syllables of the same word, the other between syllables of different words."^41^ The examples which he himself cites (White House - white house) would seem to indicate that the situation is more complicated than this, at least with regard to between-word juncture in English.
Valdman and Politzer agree about the lack of marked word-boundaries in French and both state that English habits of word-marking will cause the English speaker learning French to make divisions between words which are highly unnatural to the French ear though not necessarily inhibitive of communication.

**Pedagogy**

Phonemic theory states that the speakers of a language split up "phonetic space" in such a way as to obliterate certain phonetic distinctions, placing classes of phones into opposition with each other to form phonemically recognizable contrasts. Students learning this language may not distinguish between its phonemes in their native language, and therefore would not even hear the distinctions, to say nothing of their ability to perform the articulatory movements necessary to produce the sounds in question. Thus descriptive phonemic theory predicts that students should be led first to discriminate between new sounds, second to articulate them, once they have been perceived as being different. Both Valdman and Politzer subscribe to this point of view.

A second pedagogical idea which follows from
phonemic theory explicitly in Valdman and implicitly in Politzer is that a differentiation may be made between phonemic pronunciation problems and phonetic ones, the former ones being more serious. Thus Valdman states that correct pronunciation is best attained by 1) preliminary training in discrimination between the phonemes of the foreign language and 2) subsequent practice with the "secondary features" that differentiate the phonemes of the native language from those of the target language. Valdman proposes that the first of these objectives be carried out by drills entirely in the target language, and that the second "cannot be acquired by contrasting French phonemes with each other but by contrasting French phonemes with their nearest English equivalents and underscoring phonetic differences between near-equivalent pairs." 42

Valdman further recommends that French vowels which are "near equivalents" to English be the first ones practiced by the student, i.e. contrasts between French /i/, /u/; /e/, /u/; /u/, /o/. 43 However, one would conclude that the only thing the student could practice with drills on these oppositions would be differences which Valdman classifies as phonetic
(articulatory tension and lack of vowel glide), since English phonology contains similar phonemes. In fact, Valdman's Drillbook of French Pronunciation begins with consideration of just these phonetic characteristics of /i/. In the first chapter of Drillbook, phonetic /i/ and /u/ are treated individually, including contrast with English and articulatory information, before they are opposed. It would seem therefore, that in spite of the theoretical utility of separating phonetic and phonemic information, the two must be treated concurrently in a pedagogical situation.

A teacher in search of practical exercise material will not find satisfaction in either book. Politzer and Valdman both divide their exercises according to the distinctions made above. But adequate drill examples of each type, together with information about how to implement them in the classroom, is lacking, particularly in the Politzer book. For example, his advice to the teacher for discrimination drillwork on French front rounded vowels:

The auditory discrimination problem can be tackled by the method of training discrimination between minimal pairs. The vowels /y/, /œ/, /œ/ should be contrasted among themselves: /y/ vs. /œ/: pur-peur, sur-soeur, mur meurt; /y/ vs. /œ/: pu-peu, du-deux, fut-feu; /y/, /œ/ and /œ/ should
also be contrasted with the corresponding back vowels: /ɛ/ vs. /o/: deux-dos, peut-veau, veut-vaut; /œ/ vs. /ɔ/: leur-l'or, meur-mort, soeur-sort. Especially the contrast /y/ vs. /u/ must be drilled very carefully, since for many Americans the sound /u/ is the favorite substitute for /y/. The instructor must emphasize contrasts like roue-rue, doux-du, loup-lu, sou-su. 45

This passage takes for granted the fact that the teacher knows how to construct a drill or a set of drills on these discrimination problems, to say nothing of how to conduct the drill in the classroom.

Valdman includes a sample exercise for most sections of his treatment of phonology. The following drill is found after the discussion of front unrounded vowels: 46

Front unrounded vowels. Contrast drills, /i/-/é/

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>fit</th>
<th>fée</th>
<th>mari</th>
<th>marée</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nid</td>
<td>nez</td>
<td>précis</td>
<td>pressé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prix</td>
<td>pré</td>
<td>sali</td>
<td>salé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>riz</td>
<td>ré</td>
<td>parti</td>
<td>partez</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This drill is typical of the ones given by Valdman to illustrate "contrast". The minimal pairs are given, but there is no indication about how the columns of contrasting words or phrases are to be used. Valdman does not specify how the drill might be used for either recognition or articulation practice, depending upon classroom implementation. If the drill is intended as a production drill, one assumes that the
teacher is to model and that students are to repeat each contrasting pair of words. This is only one way to work with these pairs; others should be discussed as well. Some suggestions regarding pedagogical treatment of this point will be made in Chapter V.

Morphology

Descriptivist viewpoint

Both Valdman and Politzer include in their chapters on morphology several passages intended to influence the attitude of the language teacher toward his subject. These arguments are designed to rid the teacher of "traditional" attitudes about the supremacy of the written language, and to persuade him that a "descriptive" attitude is more accurate.

Politzer mentions at least four times the fact that morphological variants are the grammar, not just irregularities in the pronunciation of written matter. For example:

It is important to realize that these variants should be drilled as different forms rather than as different pronunciations of the same form. 47

Approached from the viewpoint of speech alone, all of the important cases of liaison and /ə/ involve, basically, the use of alternate grammatical forms in specific position. Thus,
liaison and /ɔ/ are really part of the grammar of spoken French rather than a matter of pronunciation. The best way of teaching liaison and /ɔ/ is, therefore, to present them as part of the grammar (especially morphology) of the French language.

In reality, the writing system of French is an effective indicator of morphological relationships, both derivational and inflectional, which would seem to be helpful in learning language. For example, given the word /kɔba/, a student who has seen the "latent t" in the orthographic representation combat is more likely to be able to use the verb combattre correctly than one who does not realize the "t" exists.

Moreover, it would seem that the central question in attempting to teach the elements of French morphology is not one of attitude, i.e. "Is this a morphological or a 'pronunciation' problem?" It is rather a question, first of all, of realization on the teacher's part of what the various forms are and in what contexts they appear; this information may be expressed in any way which is clear and consistent. This is the point where descriptive emphasis has been felicitous: it has helped bring to the classroom an awareness of what the oral forms are. To appreciate
this one has only to note the number of texts which now differentiate between oral and written language in their language analysis.

Secondly, the central question in learning a language is one of practice of the relevant forms until students are able to handle them without faltering. Thus it is the practice and not the description which achieves the ultimate goal of language learning. It does not matter whether the students' initial conception of the plural definite article liaison in French is "'s' of 'les' is pronounced before a vowel" or "the pre-vocalic form of /lez/ is /lez/"; if he understands the description and is forced to practice the distinction between /lez/ and /le/, learning should take place.

Descriptive linguistic terminology is a second way in which Valdman and Politzer attempt to show how "traditional" grammar can be misleading. Politzer takes a cautious view of this practice:

New nomenclature seems justified only when the traditional nomenclature is downright misleading or when the new terminology makes a positive contribution to the student's understanding of the grammatical pattern. 49

He mentions as an example Hall's "Timeless subjunctive" in the place of "Present subjunctive." Valdman refers
to this tense alternately as "timeless" and "sub-

junctive." It would seem to be a moot point, however, whether the most typical aspect of this tense is

1) the fact that it can refer to past, present, or future time, or 2) the fact that its use is semantically restricted to certain clauses, i.e. dependent subjunctive clauses.

The most useful of the descriptive terminology pertains to the noun phrase and the verb phrase constituents, though below an example will be given where Valdman's use of the terminology seems to be more misleading than productive. Both Valdman and Politzer identify "determiners" as a small class of words which signal noun occurrence. They are bound forms which signal number and gender in nouns, thus encompassing sub-classes: definite and indefinite article, possessive and demonstrative adjectives. Verb "satellites" constitute a class of words which do not occur except in close link with a verb phrase. Members of this class include: direct and indirect object pronouns, y, en, ne...pas and some other negative particles. Valdman refers to the pronouns of this group as "conjunctive substitutes."
Politzer likens the language student's position to that of the anthropological linguist learning a new language:

What the student must learn are the formal features that enable him to recognize and to use word classes. 50

Of course neither Valdman nor Politzer can adhere strictly to this over-formalistic approach. For instance, formal criteria alone are certainly insufficient to distinguish the use of the definite article and the third person object pronouns of French. The student must learn something about the syntactic privileges of occurrence of these two homophonous classes before being able to interpret correctly French sentences. A student who has been told that "le determines a following noun" will be confused by the sentences On le voit, On la voit, On les a vus, unless he knows also that there exists another class of words whose morphology is nearly identical to the article's but which plays a different syntactic role.

Although we have seen that descriptive terminology and classification have provided an interesting analysis of some systems, its effect has been to confuse matters in others. One of these is Valdman's analysis of the possessive pronouns. He states:
(possessive pronouns)...are inflected for gender and number and are preceded by the appropriate form of the definite article. Because they are marked by a definite article, possessive pronouns are in reality "noun phrases." 51

In spite of this phrasal characteristic of the possessive pronoun, it cannot be considered a true noun phrase, if one is to follow the definition of the NP which Valdman himself has given:

French nominal phrases contain at least a noun (or adjective) as head and optionally, prenominal, i.e. pre-head, and post-nominal modifiers. 52

The possessive pronoun cannot be preceded by any other determiner besides the definite article and its combinations with "de" and "à". In addition, the only modification it accepts pre-nominally is the cardinal numeral, and post-nominally, the relative clause, as the following examples show:

Les deux nôtres vivaient perchées sur l'épaule... 53
On s'est servie des miens, qui étaient là.

The remainder of this section is organized in the following manner. First, general morphonemic problems of liaison, elision, "mute e", predictable morphonemic alternation, and morphonemic representation. Next will appear treatment of word classes included in the Politzer and Valdman works. Finally there will be a discussion of relevant pedagogical questions.
General morphonemic problems

Although Politzer states (fns. 47 and 48 above) that he believes liaison and "mute e" phenomena are morphological in nature, he nevertheless places his discussion of these points in his chapter entitled "Teaching Pronunciation" rather than in the one entitled "Teaching Morphology." Valdman treats these questions, as well as other general problems, in the first paragraphs of his morphology chapter.

Politzer makes no strong claims about his treatment of liaison, giving only what he calls "simplified general rules." This amounts to a definition of the phenomenon of liaison, and the description of the categories liaison facultative, obligatoire, and interdite. He gives an abbreviated list of each type, and devotes a paragraph to the special case of liaison with words ending in a nasal. In essence, then, Politzer has distilled the work of phoneticians such as Delattre, and has presented the possible liaisons in the form of lists, without attempting to provide a more theoretically oriented presentation.

Valdman's treatment attempts to supply the descriptive framework which is lacking in Politzer's
exposition. Valdman uses technical jargon liberally: sandhi variation, close vs. open syntactic link, phonemic environment, phonological environment. He states that French liaison is a function of syntactic conditions and phonological environment, i.e. initial sound of succeeding word. Valdman concludes that the pre-consonant form of a morphological alternation should be considered the general form, since it occurs optionally before a vowel and open syntactic link, and obligatorily elsewhere. While Politzer and phoneticians have simply listed constructions where different types of liaison phenomena existed, Valdman has introduced the concept of open vs. close syntactic link to account for these same phenomena. Valdman does not indicate how one arrives at the "closeness" of syntactic link between two or more words. One suspects, however, that the only way to do this is empirically, viz. to define the class "close syntactic link construction" as just that set of constructions which manifest liaison obligatoire. In fact, Valdman's list of these constructions exactly matches Delattre's Tableau détaillé de liaisons obligatoires. 55 Valdman does not mention the liaison facultative; Politzer mentions it briefly, and notes that it varies
in distribution with the level of discourse.

Mute-e

Politzer sketches the "essential rules," noting that a complete description would be "rather complicated." In essence, Politzer's treatment involves an explanation of the loi des trois consonnes, plus a short list of exceptions to the general rule.

Valdman treats mute-e first as a case of elision. After discussing the two minor cases of elision in French: si ("if") → s' before /i/, and la → l' before /V/ (except for the case of a post-posed pronoun), Valdman turns his attention to words whose final vowel is mute-e. He splits these words into two groups: a) words which appear in close syntactic link and never before # (phrase boundary or pause), and b) words which occur in all three positions in a phrase: before vowel, before consonant, and before pause. Several errors exist in Valdman's treatment of these categories, most of which have been corrected in the newer edition. Valdman's original chart of words in the first group has this form:
Elision: mute-e

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before V</th>
<th>Before C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>j'/je</td>
<td>/z/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qu'/que</td>
<td>/k/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l'/le</td>
<td>/l/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two words are omitted from this list: ne and ce; they have been included in the newer edition. Notice also that Valdman does not account for occurrence of these words in # position. The newer edition accounts for the existence of le#, as in Regarde-le, but fails to account for que# and ce#, as in parce que and sur ce. It may be argued, however, that these are special cases which violate the general rule of occurrence for these words. The newer edition does not account for the special case of the post-imperative le, which does not elide in front of a succeeding word starting with V, e.g. Emmène-le avec toi. Whether Valdman intends to account for this case by stating that constructions including pronominal le are in "close syntactic link" is not clear.

The following chart describes words of class b):
Before C  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Pronunciation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>quatre</td>
<td>/katr/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>autre</td>
<td>/otr/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>notre</td>
<td>/notr/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>table</td>
<td>/tabl/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>montre</td>
<td>/montr/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ours</td>
<td>/urs/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>film</td>
<td>/film/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before V, before #

* This class of words is of course not limited to those listed here; the class includes all those which end in a double consonant cluster.

Valdman contradicts the conclusions of some phoneticians by noting no difference between _V and _# forms of words such as quatre. In _V position, the form is of course obligatorily /katr/. However, in the _# position, the phenomenon of "détente" accounts for shapes which vary from fully voiced /œ/: /katr/, to an unvoiced trace vowel sound: [katr]. Delattre states that détente is always present, which means that the form [katr] does not exist in the environment _.  

A second questionable interpretation of Valdman's is his noting the forms /ursœ/ and /filmœ/ as the _C alternates of these words. This case also seems best accounted for by the phenomenon of détente, which explains the existence of /œ/ without having to hypothesize a mute-e in words such as ours and film.

In the newer edition, Valdman has added in a footnote: "To be avoided in careful style."
More subtle rules are needed to explain the alternations of the mute-e than those which explain elision, however. Valdman furnishes a list of five rules in addition to the elision rule, which describe the occurrence of /ə/ quite accurately. He adds at the conclusion of his discussion a warning, however:

"The above statements must not be construed as infallible laws but as useful rules of thumb which must never be dogmatically applied." 61

Valdman's fifth rule reads:

When two or more /E/ (i.e. underlying form, manifesting itself as either /ə/ or /∅/, depending on the phonological context) occur in successive syllables within the same phrase, the first /E/ is realized as /œ/ and the second is zero in successive alternation, unless the first /E/ is preceded by a sibilant consonant and the second /E/ by a voiceless stop; in which case the second /E/ is /œ/ and the first is zero... 62

It would seem that the exception to the general rule could be much more clearly handled by merely referring to the two exceptions: je te and ce que ( /ʃtœ/ and /skœ/), as groupes figés. Rule five is the least strictly applicable of the phonological rules cited by Valdman. His example: je le ferai could just as easily be said: jœ le fœrai. Valdman's "warning" would perhaps have been more effective had he shown how different alternating configurations are allowed.
One feature of Valdman's treatment of morphology which makes it more interesting and perhaps more valuable than Politzer's is the fact that he outlines typical alternations which are characteristic of all French inflectional and derivational morphology, regardless of syntactic class. His schema includes the mid-vowel alternations, \( \tilde{V} \sim \hat{V} \) alternations, and alternations between /E/ \( \sim /\tilde{E}/ \), /e/ \( \sim /\tilde{e}/ \). Politzer discusses the nasal alternations twice, for instance, once for adjectives and once for verb inflection, without mentioning the similarities involved. 63

**Word classes**

**Determiners, numerals, adjectives.** Both Valdman and Politzer separate their discussion of noun modifiers into two classes, determiners and adjectives. Valdman gives a more detailed justification for this separation: 1) Determiners do not appear in the frame: \( N + \text{être} + \) _____; 2) they occur in second position of the expanded noun phrase; 3) all have overtly realized plural forms; and 4) they are never nominalized and can never occur independently of nouns. 64 This definition limits determiners to articles plus possessive and demonstrative pronouns. Although quel
functions similarly to these words, Valdman excludes it because in the environment C, quel does not satisfy condition (3) above, e.g. quel garçon - quels garçons, but le garçon - les garçons. Politzer considers quel a determiner.

Valdman's analysis of the determiners consists essentially in the above definition and an enumeration of the forms in chart form. Politzer engages in a lengthy discussion of which forms of the various determiners make gender distinctions in differing environments. He suggest considering votre and notre as separate group of determiners, since they never express masculine-feminine contrast. 65

Politzer makes no mention of the morphology of the cardinal numeral system; Valdman provides a chart and extended notes on the cardinals one through ten. These will be discussed in the pedagogy section, below.

In his treatment of adjectives, Politzer attempts to provide descriptive criteria which will separate the syntactic classes Noun and Adjective, since there are some conditions under which they behave similarly, e.g. the frame: NP +être + . In reality, however, the restrictions of occurrence for nouns in this frame
are quite limiting. Most nouns fitting the slot as Politzer describes it are those dealing with "job description," e.g. Samuel est balayeur.

Politzer's treatment of French adjectives consists of the definition of two classes: 1) those adjectives which make no contrast between masculine and feminine (spoken) forms, and 2) those adjectives whose masculine form may be derived by deleting the final consonant sound of the feminine (oral) form. He classes as irregular all adjectives whose masculine and feminine forms (1) end in different consonants, (2) demonstrate the opposition: /V1/ /o/, and (3) the single case vieille-vieux.

Politzer recognizes the distinction between pre- and post-nominal adjectives only to note that the masculine-feminine distinction is frequently obliterated before V-initial singular nouns, since many pre-nominal adjectives have special forms for masculine singular. He notes that these adjectives "use only the feminine form in that position," but does not note the special case of aspirated "h", which shows that a difference does indeed exist between the two forms, e.g. petit ami, /petitami/ vs. "petite amie" /petitami/, but petite hutte /petitute/ vs. petit heaume /petitome/. 66
Valdman, like Politzer, analyzes French adjectives with the intent of showing how many (oral) forms they demonstrate in varying environments. He bases his rather elaborate classification system on 1) the difference between pre-nominal and post-nominal adjectives, and 2) whether masculine form is homophonous with the feminine form (Class I) or masculine form equals feminine form minus final consonant (Class II). All other adjective types are considered irregular.

Since post-nominal adjectives are rarely in close syntactic link (i.e. rarely demonstrate liaison) with following words, the number of alternate forms is quite limited. Post-nominal adjectives generally do not mark singular-plural differences. Pre-nominal adjectives, however, because of their close syntactic link with following noun, demonstrate much sandhi-variation. Valdman's classification determines six different types of pre-nominal adjectives, based on the number of sandhi-forms which may occur.

Substitutes. Politzer discusses substitutes only briefly. He does not attempt a systematic analysis of pronominal forms, either bound or disjunctive. He mentions the difficulty which students have in recognizing the singular-plural contrast in verb forms, especially when the /z/ (as in *il arrive* vs. *ils arrivent*)
is the sole signal of plurality, and recommends that these points be drilled intensively. He justifies his brief treatment with the statement: "For the student, the most difficult problem connected with the use of personal pronouns is their sequence and position -- a syntactical rather than a morphological problem." 68

Valdman includes in this category subject, object and disjunctive pronouns, as well as possessive, demonstrative, interrogative and relative pronouns. He limits his discussion to an enumeration of the form variations.

In his discussion of pronouns, Valdman criticizes the traditional person-number designations, and proposes a different labelling system, which substitutes the numbers 1 through 6 for the person-number labels first-singular through third plural, respectively. Valdman's only expressed motivation for this is the fact that "the traditional labels are misleading in the so-called second person plural." 69 Notice, however, that by calling this "5" rather than second-plural, one does not clear up the number ambiguity of the form "vous". Moreover, the efficacy of this system seems dubious, since it obliterates the two basic variables in any paradigm: person and number.
Anyone learning the new system of notation would have to learn also that 4 was the plural of 1, 5 was the plural of 2, and 6 the plural of 3. This relationship is made explicit in the traditional nomenclature.

Demonstrative pronouns are placed in two classes by Valdman: 1) inflected demonstrative, celui, and 2) indeterminate demonstratives: ce, ça, ceci and cela. Valdman calls ça "disjunctive", since it may occur in all positions and alone. However, both ceci and cela share these same privileges of occurrence. In addition, the fact that ça is derived from cela is not mentioned by Valdman. 70

Finally, in his presentation of the inflected demonstratives, Valdman does not make it clear that these words may substitute for nouns in a third environment besides ___ -ci (or -là) and ___ Prep. phrase, namely, ___ Rel. clause. At the end of his discussion, Valdman states that -ci and -là are replacives for both Prep. phrases and for Rel. clauses. This statement does not stand in lieu of the description which should stipulate all possible modifications of celui: particle, phrase, and clause. 71
The verb

Verb analysis constitutes a large portion of the discussion of morphology in both Valdman and Politzer. Both authors reject the classical method of pedagogical derivation of tenses, stating that more economical schemas may be elaborated. Valdman simply asserts the fact; Politzer states that the infinitive should not be the "basic form" from which other forms are derived, since "it does not serve as basis for as many forms as do the plurals of the present indicative and it is functionally less useful." 72

Politzer and Valdman both give much attention to the present tense, where most morphological variation in verb root forms takes place. Politzer evolves a sequence of fifteen "transformations" designed to teach the oral forms of verbs, of which five deal with derivation of present tense forms. Valdman distinguishes five different schemas to account for morphological alternation in the present tense of verbs.

Both authors attempt to break verb forms into a base and several affixes: Politzer recognizes a root, a tense sign, and a personal ending. But he states immediately that, pedagogically, it is advisable
to have no more than two segments for the teaching of tenses: a root form of the verb and affixes. Reference to tense, actor and mood may not be traceable to any one morpheme in the verb form, but learning is facilitated by this presentation, states Politzer. Valdman reaches similar conclusions, although his derivations are more elaborate than those of Politzer.

It has been noted that both Valdman and Politzer claim greater economy in their descriptions of the verb system. New categories, differing from those established in traditional grammars based upon infinitives, and other "principle parts", are claimed to account in part for this increased economy.

For example, Politzer separates verbs into only two groups: 1) verbs whose third singular forms have the same shape as their third plural ones, e.g. il lève - ils lèvent, and 2) those verbs whose singular form equals the plural form minus the final consonant, e.g. il veut - ils veulent. There are of course many phonological alternations which take place when a stem is truncated. Politzer must describe these individually. Other stem alternations occur in Step IV (first plural, present). Here Politzer must enumerate several different types of alternation. Aside from
these two steps in the derivation where many exceptions must be accounted for, Politzer's schema works well for deriving the forms of most common verbs.

However, in spite of its ability to explain, for example, the future forms of verbs such as appeler and acheter, Politzer's schema presents other problems. In order for the system to work in a learning situation, every verb must be presented individually, as each inflectional form must be derived according to the sequence of rules. Thus, there is no provision in Politzer's schema for a statement such as: "Verb X functions in a like manner to verb Y." This lack of generalizability appears to be a drawback of this suggested analysis.

Valdman's schema, though much more rigorous in appearance seems less able to account for such basic irregular verbs as voir and boire. Valdman has established four "stem modification classes", which correspond to the three traditional conjugations plus a category for verbs like partir, i.e. "-ir verbs" which do not exhibit the infix -iss-. (See next page) An attempt to classify the verb boire shows it to be no less irregular than it is in traditional grammar. Valdman assigns verbs to categories according to their future stem modification type; present stem
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>BASE Present Stem</th>
<th>Stem Modification</th>
<th>FUTURE</th>
<th>Present Stem</th>
<th>Stem Modification</th>
<th>PAST</th>
<th>Part.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>don- donn-</td>
<td>-m/-é-</td>
<td>donEr- donner-</td>
<td>-e- done</td>
<td>donné</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>part- part-</td>
<td>-i-</td>
<td>partir- partir-</td>
<td>-i- parti</td>
<td>parti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>vad- vend-</td>
<td>-Ø-</td>
<td>vadrE- vendr-</td>
<td>-y- vady</td>
<td>vendu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>finis-finiss-</td>
<td>-↓-</td>
<td>finir- finir-</td>
<td>-↓- fini</td>
<td>fini</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Symbols:
- -↓- means loss of final consonant
- -Ø- means zero affix
- - at the end of a form means that it is a stem

Notes: 1) Oral forms appear between slashes.
2) The future stem suffix -r- is added to all forms to form the future stem.
Valdman defines as the third plural. Thus, we find that *boire* is a class IV verb, since the present stem /bwav/ minus last consonant /v/ plus future "stem suffix" /r/ gives the correct future stem /bwar/. However, applying the stem modification rule for the past participle, we obtain an incorrect form */bwa/ rather than the correct /by/. The schema thus fails to classify the verb *boire* successfully.

Similar difficulty is experienced in attempting to classify the verb *voir*, since the Base column does not allow for verbs whose stems end in a vowel. This means that Valdman's system is unable to classify such important verbs as: *employer*, *créer*, *payer*, *envoyer*, *ennuyer*, unless one happens to know that they function similarly to Class I words whose stem ends in a consonant. In addition, verbs like *croire* will be classified as Class III (if one ignores the above problem of vowel stem endings). But the present forms of *croire* do not fit those of the verb *vendre*, the example verb. Finally, verbs like *croître* cannot be assigned to any class at all, since the base resembles that of Class IV, yet the future stem modification is closest to Class III. Valdman does not include a discussion which treats any of these exceptions to his classification schema.
An exhaustive treatment of the adequacy of Politzer's and Valdman's French verb system descriptions is beyond the scope of this study. It has been shown, however, that both analyses have weaknesses which may handicap their usefulness in a pedagogical situation, making them questionable alternatives to "traditional" presentation of verb morphology.

**Pedagogy**

The entire pedagogy of Politzer and Valdman derives from the attitude that the primary organizational criterion for learning the morphology of a language should be a formal one. An example where this pedagogy based on formal reality of language conflicts with a better pedagogy, one which takes into consideration the use of these forms in the classroom, may be found in Valdman's presentation of the numerals.76

Valdman recommends that numerals be taught in the order: sept, neuf; quatre, huit, cinq, deux, trois; six, dix. His motivation for this suggestion is that the first group has only one sandhi variant (except for the "formes figées" neuf heures and neuf ans), the second group has two forms, and the third has three forms; therefore, he implies that the groups are organized in an ascending level of difficulty.
It would seem more realistic pedagogy to control presentation of these sandhi forms by introducing all the numerals in a specific context on one occasion, and in other contexts on succeeding occasions. For instance, all numbers could be introduced in their "pre-pause" form by "learning to count" in French. After mastery of these forms, the frame Il est _ heures. could be introduced, thus giving practice with pre-vocalic forms of six, dix, deux, trois. Finally, pre-consonantal forms of cinq, huit and quatre could be introduced in the frame Il y a _ personnes.

The important contribution of Valdman's analysis is the fact that it brings to the teacher's attention the various morphological variations which exist. As has just been shown, this analysis does not indicate a single "best" pedagogical presentation; in fact, a presentation which is overly formal frequently loses sight of the essential communicative aspect of which cannot be neglected, even in (or perhaps particularly in) elementary language instruction.
Syntax

In the sections dealing with morphology and phonology, Politzer's and Valdman's formulations have been treated simultaneously. Their discussions of syntax do not lend themselves to this type of treatment, however, because of their very different character.

First, Politzer has organized his treatment of syntax about "pattern correspondence" between French and English. His examples are taken from differing aspects of French and English syntax, but their organization depends upon the breaking or following of syntactic parallelism as he defines the process. Valdman's organization of material is more traditional, in the sense that he attempts first to define syntactic entities, starting at the sentence level, and proceeds to analyze the various component parts of the larger entity, starting with predicate structure, then verb complementing structures, verb phrase structure, noun phrase structure, and finally, assorted grammatical topics.

Politzer and Valdman differ radically in the amount of formal notation which they employ. Politzer's treatment is quite remarkable in the simplicity of its terminology. All grammatical terminology is standard
"traditional" vocabulary of grammatical analysis, except for such words as "pattern," "function word," "determinative," and a few others which he has ade­
quately explained. Valdman's treatment is character­ized by the development of a whole new set of symbol­ism and some new terminology. For instance, Valdman differentiates the structures of the sentences

Il est convaincu and Il est à Paris by assigning
the structures: S + P: (Vl) + 3C (Adj) (i.e. Subject Predicate, which includes a linking verb and an adjec­tival subject complement) and S + P: (Vl) + A(Loc)
(i.e. Subject Predicate, which includes a linking verb plus an adverbial of location) to the two sen­tences, respectively.

A third reason why the two treatments of syntax do not lend themselves to comparison involves the amount of overt contrastive data they contain. Pol­itzer's entire presentation involves the juxtaposition of French and English structure to reveal "points of interference" (except in those cases where French or English "breaks the consistency of its own pattern.") Valdman, in contrast, makes sparing use of language contrast, centering rather on an organized treatment of French structure.
The following sub-sections of this Chapter will thus contain a treatment of Politzer's chapter on teaching syntax, Valdman's syntax chapter, and a final section which deals with the pedagogical aspect of these syntactic presentations.

Politzer begins his treatment of syntax by stating that "the typical basic structure of the French utterance is...very much like English." By this he means that in both languages, the major syntactic groups are noun phrases and verb phrases, which are arranged in similar manner in strings. He gives as an example the French sentence: *Notre ancien ami ne comprend pas les nouvelles idées de votre professeur*, which has the structure NP + VP + NP + NP. This sentence has the same structural description, says Politzer, as the English sentence "Our old friend doesn't understand the new ideas of your professor". The conclusion Politzer reaches from this analysis is

> With comparatively few exceptions, the main difficulties in French facing the speaker of English do not lie in the arrangement of the Noun and Verb clusters themselves, but rather within the formation of these clusters.

One way which Politzer suggests to analyze the differences which exist between the phrases of English and French is the utilization of the concept of media, mentioned also by Lado. Politzer defines the
word to mean "different ways in which structural relations and meanings are expressed". He gives as examples of media: word order, intonation (i.e. prosodic features), inflection, agreement, and function words. When native language and target language use different media to express an idea, states Politzer, one may expect the learner to have difficulty. Politzer gives seven sets of examples which demonstrate differences in media between French expressions and their English translations.

But differences in media do not present the learner with the majority of his learning problems:

The most persistent problems faced by the student are not those created by radical differences but by those due to a partial similarity or overlap between the two languages, which the student extends by analogy into an area in which the overlap does not exist. 82

One concept which must be made clear, before attempting to analyze several examples of interference, is Politzer's conception of a parallel construction. He states:

We may define as parallel constructions all those in which each French element corresponds to an element in the English construction; in both the French and English construction the corresponding elements make the identical contribution to the total structural and lexical meaning of the utterance. 83

Naturally, the parallelism between two structures,
one French, one English, will rest on the analysis which defines the structures in question. Politzer does not elaborate any descriptive system; rather, he relies almost exclusively on the reader's knowledge of French and English structure to provide the necessary analysis. He provides the parallel and contrasting structures in a series of juxtapositions, with indication made where the "interference points" are located.

Politzer's first category of interference involves verbs with differing object structures; the first section of the chart has this form:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>English</strong></th>
<th><strong>French</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I work for John.</td>
<td>Je travaille pour Jean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I speak for Charles.</td>
<td>Je parle pour Charles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ask for Mary.</td>
<td>Je demande Marie.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notice that the third English sentence is ambiguous, meaning either 1) "I ask (the question) for Mary" or 2) "I ask for Mary (every time I go, she's the best waitress there)". For the first meaning, the French *Je demande *(ça)* pour Marie* is acceptable, as a response to the question *Pour qui est-ce que tu demandes ça?* Thus for meaning 1) above, there is no change in
parallelism of structure, and no interference.

Obviously, Politzer did not have this meaning in mind when he gave the example; he was thinking of the demander pour ("ask for") mistake which is a persistent problem for many French students.

Classifying data according to overt features only, Politzer has assigned "I ask for Mary" the same structure as the preceding sentences. However, any native speaker of English will recognize upon reflection that this sentence, given the meaning intended by Politzer, does not have a structure identical to the others. In the sentences "I work for John" and "I speak for Charles," "for John" and "for Charles" have an adverbial quality which is not present in the clearly direct object sense of "Mary" in "I ask for Mary". Thus, one cannot say that there is a break in parallelism between the pair "I ask for Mary" and Je demande Marie. In fact, these two sentences both have the structure S + V + DO; the French sentence merely shows overtly a relationship which is dissimulated by English structure.

The native speaker of English, attempting to give the French equivalent for this sentence, is unaware that the underlying structure of the construction in this case is S + V + DO, with V being a phrasal verb.
When he analyzes the verb, he sees two words and translates them rather than attempting to find the French equivalent for the single concept underlying the two-word English verb.

The criticism here is thus not of the fact that Politzer correctly identified a thorny problem for the student of French. It is rather that he has attempted to integrate this mistake into a schema which does not look "below the surface" in comparing language structure.

A similar example of "hidden difference" causes Politzer to state that "a pattern correspondence between English and French is broken by French" in the case of the partitive and definite articles. He establishes this table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>French</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am buying candy.</td>
<td>J'achète des bonbons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am selling candy.</td>
<td>Je vend des bonbons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like candy.</td>
<td>J'aime les bonbons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't like candy.</td>
<td>Je n'aime pas les bonbons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not buying candy.</td>
<td>Je n'achète pas de bonbons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't eat to much candy.</td>
<td>Je ne mange pas trop de bonbons.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Politzer refers to all the English sentences above as if they were examples of one construction. That this is not the case is demonstrated by the fact that "some/any" may be substituted in some of the sentences and not in others. Specifically, the first and the last pairs of sentences will accept the English partitive, e.g. "I am buying some candy", "I am not buying any candy", with no change in meaning. The middle pair of sentences, however, will not accept "some/any" without a change of meaning; "I like candy" does not mean "I like some candy (but not all candy)". Thus, the structural descriptions of the three sets of English sentences are parallel to those of the French ones; English simply does not mark the changes overtly in this case.

Politzer has provided some interesting data by juxtaposing series of French-English equivalents. In many individual cases, these pairs represent well-documented stumbling blocks for beginning and intermediate students of French. But the above discussion has shown that the descriptive viewpoint represented in Politzer's analysis does not always provide the most accurate explanation for the data. An additional, practical problem is the fact that someone
attempting to utilize Politzer's analysis in a practical language instructional situation will find Politzer's treatments sketchy. But Politzer himself has been modest about the goals of the study:

It is not the purpose of this book to give a complete analysis of French and English syntax showing all the structural differences which are likely to cause trouble for the English speaker. We will content ourselves with explaining the principles involved in such a comparison and we shall cite the most important trouble spots as illustration. 86

While Politzer's treatment of syntax discusses a very limited number of syntactic topics, Valdman mentions most grammar points found in beginning French texts. The most notable exception is perhaps the fact that there is no discussion of dependent infinitive constructions in Valdman. To attempt to discuss here all grammatical points treated by Valdman would be beyond the scope of this study; as with Politzer, two examples are chosen with the purpose of showing that, although descriptive linguistics has had real insights to bring to language study, language remains difficult indeed to classify with any certainty.

Valdman correctly notes in his discussion of mass and count nouns 87 that English mass nouns may
not be pluralized; sentences like "*I have milks" are unacceptable. He goes on to state that "count nouns...can only occur as a member of a nominal phrase: "I have a book", but not "*I have book". Valdman has seemingly neglected the plural form of count nouns in this instance, which occur freely without the obligatory presence of another member of the noun phrase, e.g. "I have books", "I see boys".

Valdman states further that count nouns may not be preceded by "expressions of quantity" such as "piece of", "cup of", noting the unacceptable sentence "*I have part of book". In making this statement, however, Valdman has failed to account for a class of nouns in English which includes such nouns as: "cake", "banana", and "apple". These nouns, while all are count nouns, may be used with expressions of quantity such as "piece of" to form such perfectly acceptable sentences as "I'd like a piece of apple". Thus the distinctions which Valdman attempts to make between English count and mass nouns are contradicted by a class of nouns which seem to demonstrate the properties of both count and mass.

Speaking of French nouns, Valdman notices the fact that mass nouns are frequently used as count
nouns, giving the example "C'est un vin excellent". He goes on to state that the reverse does not apply. However, the same class of nouns noted above as providing trouble for the classification system in English seems to exist in French. Such count nouns as pamplemousse and pêche are perfectly acceptable in the sentence "Veux-tu du pamplemousse ou de la pêche comme dessert?"

In addition, there is a fairly restricted set of nouns dealing with beverages, where the noun is capable of appearing in both count and mass constructions. Examples of such noun usage: Garçon, du café après le dessert. or Garçon, un café après le dessert. These two examples are not exactly synonymous. Du café implies that, if there is more than one person at the table giving the order, they all want coffee. Un café indicates of course that coffee is desired by the speaker alone.

Given the evidence just discussed regarding the lack of definition between noun categorizations "mass" and "count" in both English and French, it is difficult to accept Valdman's assertions that "...the partitive and the indefinite articles are in complementary distribution, the partitive
article singular occurs before mass nouns, and the indefinite article singular occurs before count nouns and the two never contrast... It is consequently more useful and accurate to speak of a non-definite article with two sub-varieties, partitive and indefinite, the particular sub-variety being determined by the context (count or mass noun).

This is of course not to say that Valdman's treatment is without value; his statements are true for a large number of cases. However, his general formulation may only be accepted with the exception represented by the preceding discussion.

Valdman has given a rather specific formulation of the permitted orders of pre-nominal modifiers:

Pre-nominal Modifiers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>quel</th>
<th>ce</th>
<th>même</th>
<th>numerals</th>
<th>Class 1</th>
<th>Class 2</th>
<th>Class 3</th>
<th>Class 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tout</td>
<td>le</td>
<td>poss. adj.</td>
<td>un</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aucun, chaque, quelque, plusieurs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The membership of the various adjective classes is as follows: Class 1, autre and ordinals; Class 2, nouvelle, jeune, vieille, vraie; Class 3, mauvaise, fausse, bonne, belle, jolie; Class 4, grande, petite.

This chart describes well the order of pre-nominal constituents in a noun phrase, provided one
knows beforehand which items he can choose. That is, provided one has the knowledge of the possibilities of co-occurrence between the lexical items in the different columns, a knowledge possessed only by the native speaker, or by someone who happens to control natively just this segment of French grammar. Thus, the native speaker can compare an utterance of his with the chart to conclude that in fact what he has said corresponds to the word order on the chart. But the student, who does not know what word combinations are permissible, cannot get this information from the chart. For instance the string *quelque quatrième garçon is permissible according to the chart. In addition, there is nothing to indicate that if one uses a form of tout with a numeral, le is obligatorily included in the middle, e.g. tous les trois mardis. Finally, the acceptable phrases une jolie nouvelle voiture, une belle jeune femme, un bon vieux camarade are not accounted for in the ordering of the adjective classes.

Pedagogy.

Both Valdman and Politzer claim that their analysis is significant for teaching. For both, language drill is the essential component in a language instruction
program, and "accurate linguistic analysis is the foundation of effective drill." As has been shown above, descriptive analysis of French seems to have its own loopholes, just as it criticized traditional grammar for leaving points unexplained.

Politzer, and particularly Valdman, have included a number of good examples of various types of pattern drill. The basic criticism to which they are susceptible is similar to that of the previous sections of this Chapter, namely that they do not, contrary to Valdman's claim, "illustrate how the student can gradually be led to reproduce the given structure accurately." There is no doubt that a detailed set of exercises with rationale to explain the various minimal steps in difficulty would be impossible for all grammatical points considered in their chapters on syntax. Nevertheless, one detailed example might be given to provide a model.
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CHAPTER XIV
PRACTICAL AND THEORETICAL CRITICISM OF DESCRIPTIVIST APPLIED LINGUISTICS

Introduction

During the period when descriptivist linguistic ideas about the nature of language and language learning were coming to be accepted by the foreign language teaching profession, the field of linguistics was undergoing a profound change in theoretical orientation, due to the influence of the generative grammatical school. Grammarians of this persuasion have attacked descriptivist-structuralist linguistic theory concerning the goals and methods of language analysis and the nature of natural language and its acquisition by human beings. As a consequence, they have questioned the relevance of theoretical linguistics to practical problems of language pedagogy.

This Chapter will discuss these changes in theoretical orientation with specific reference to structuralist precepts about the nature of language as expressed in Chapter I. In addition, some applications of generative language description to pedagogy will be discussed, as well as the criticism which these applications have received on theoretical and pedagogic grounds.
Language as "habit structure"

Descriptive linguists have characterized language usage as a "system of habits" which, in second-language learning at least, must be acquired through "over-learning." Certain "basic patterns," once learned, are "generalized" to account for the structure of all utterances in the language. Second-language instruction supplies these basic patterns during elementary and intermediate courses.

Chomsky has attacked the theory which attempts to describe a natural language in terms of the concept of "basic frames" and "generalization." In the transformational view, a natural language is composed of a theoretically infinite set of sentences. A finite set of frames cannot account for this infinite set: a stronger generative device is thus needed to account for the ability of a human being to use his native language. Generative linguists have shown that a finite number of phrase structure rules, some containing recursive properties, are theoretically able to account for the sentences of a natural language. Generativists conceive of a native speaker's linguistic competence as a "set of rules of great abstractness and intricacy." Therefore,
states Chomsky: "Language is not a 'habit structure'... There are no known principles of association or reinforcement, and no known sense of 'generalization' that can begin to account for this creative aspect of normal language use." 2

Descriptive linguists conceived of the young child as essentially a tabula rasa, whose language behavior was shaped by the adults around him. The infant learned language by gradually discovering that he was to imitate the speech of the adults about him, and he generalized from these imitations to form novel utterances. 3

Generative linguists claimed, and recent research has supported this claim, that the child's role in language-learning was a much more active one than had been granted him under descriptive theory. Klima and Bellugi have noted a step-by-step approximation to adult negation and question systems in the language development of children. 4 McNeill has remarked that even the earliest speech of children is characterized by basic grammatical relations, even though these relations might not be expressed in an acceptable manner according to adult usage. 5 Brown and Fraser put forward the hypothesis that child language is an abstraction of adult usage accomplished by omitting certain words that are low in
information. The child induces rules from these abstractions which govern his speech. 6

Transformational grammatical theory thus seems to describe better at least two phenomena which the descriptive analytic framework could not accommodate: 1) the infinite nature of the set of sentences in natural language, and 2) the innovative behavior evidenced in child speech.

Language as an "oral phenomenon"

Structural linguists have placed great emphasis on what they describe as the predominantly oral nature of language. Transformational grammarians do not dispute this assertion, but they do not consider it to be an important question for discussion: it is tacitly admitted in their writings. One closely allied notion in the descriptive theory is disputed by transformationalists: the idea that language analysis should limit itself to the consideration of linguistic behavior which is overtly observable.

The structuralist conception of a "discovery procedure" in language analysis was outlined by Trager and Smith:
The presentation of the structure of a language should begin, in theory, with a complete statement of the pertinent linguistic data. This should be followed by an account of the observed phonetic behavior, and then should come the analysis of the phonetic behavior into the phonemic structure, completing the phonology. The next step is to present the recurring entities—composed of one or more phonemes—that constitute the morpheme list, and go on to their analysis into the morphemic structure. In that process the division into morphology and syntax is made. After the syntax, one may go on from the microlinguistic (linguistics proper—phonology and morphemics) to metalinguistic analyses.

Fundamental to the transformational view of language is the idea that analysis cannot limit itself to the consideration of observable data only to account for regularities in natural language. One must make a distinction between performance, i.e. overt language usage by humans, and competence, the system of rules or "language generating device" which is hypothesized to underly the performance of every speaker. The goal of transformational linguistics does not limit itself to arrangement and classification of performance data; rather, it attempts to penetrate this sometimes misleading level in order to discover "a mental reality underlying actual behavior."
linguists. Saporta has pointed out that the writing systems of languages sometimes provide information which is absent from the oral signal. He gives as examples the possessive and plural marks in English (dog's, dogs, dogs') and German capitalization of nouns within sentences. 9 Dubois has noted that written French provides at least an equal number, and sometimes a larger number of plural markers than oral French. 10 In a study of the morpho-phonological structure of French, Schane has demonstrated that the oral forms of the language may be linked only by a theoretical structure of some abstractness, which involves underlying representations that approximate standard orthography, especially regarding phenomena such as latent final consonants and occurrences of schwa. 11 Valdman concurs in this view, and states his case in rather dramatic terms:

...without their being aware of it, generations of French "scriptors" have evolved a way of writing their language which enables the perceptive investigator to discover its fundamental phonological processes. 12

"Languages are different"

Descriptive linguistics has emphasized the fact that overt differences exist between languages on all
levels of analysis, phonological, morphological, syntactic, and semantic. These differences, according to some linguists, are responsible for virtually all the difficulty which a learner will experience in learning a second language.

Transformational linguists have attempted to show that different languages have more in common than has been admitted by structuralists, and that these basic similarities are obscured by "surface" phenomena which do differ from language to language. The aim of linguistic investigation has become to show how phenomena exhibited by individual languages are in reality manifestations of general linguistic principle. This attitude is demonstrated in the following citations:

The crucial problem for linguistic theory seems to be to abstract statements and generalizations from particular descriptively adequate grammars and, wherever possible, to attribute them to the general theory of linguistic structure, thus enriching the theory and imposing more structure on the schema for grammatical description. Whenever this is done, an assertion about a particular language is replaced by a corresponding assertion, from which the first follows, about language in general.

...I regard each simple sentence in a language as made up of a verb and a collection of nouns in various "cases" in the deep structure sense. In the surface structure, case distinctions are sometimes preserved, sometimes not--depending on the language, depending on the noun, or depending on idiosyncratic properties of certain governing words.
Accuracy of description

Structuralists have claimed that their "scientific", i.e. non-mentalistic view of language has led to more accurate description. Generative grammarians concede that "modern descriptive linguistics has enormously enriched the range of factual material available, and has provided entirely new standards of clarity and objectivity." However, they state that the descriptive framework limits itself unduly in its refusal to consider matters beyond organization and classification of observable data. Generativists have proposed a correspondingly stronger definition of the "grammar of a language," the competence every native speaker has acquired, which consists of at least these four skills:

1. the ability to distinguish between the grammatical and ungrammatical strings of a potentially infinite set of utterances
2. the ability to interpret certain grammatical strings even though elements of the interpretation may not be physically present in the string.
3. the ability to perceive ambiguity in a grammatical string
4. the ability to perceive when two or more strings are synonymous

Katz has described this capacity in terms of foreign language acquisition:
...if we think about learning a foreign language, the significance of (a native speaker's control over the members of an infinite set of sentences) becomes apparent immediately. We do not credit a person with mastery of a foreign language if he is able only to understand those sentences which he has been previously taught. The test of fluency is whether he can understand sentences that he has not been taught. 17

Given this more ambitious goal of linguistic theory, generative grammarians have shown how various grammatical models are inadequate to attain it. Chomsky's early work provided the basis for theoretical rejection of finite-state and phrase structure models. 18 Postal has shown that for Mohawk, and by implication for all natural languages, context-free phrase structure grammars are insufficiently powerful to generate all and only the set of grammatical strings. 19 Lees has noted that any attempt to define nominal expressions by specifying their location with respect to other elements in a string is doomed to failure, since "there is no particular position which can be specified explicitly in which subjects of sentences will be found, except for some previously chosen type of sentence." 20 This statement is generalizable to all other constituents.

In addition to demonstrating that word-class definition through substitutability in a pre-determined
is impossible, transformational grammarians have shown that the attempt to separate language into "grammatical words" and "content words" is futile. This "function-word" analysis is inadequate in at least two ways. First, "grammatical words" cannot indicate unambiguously the structure of a sentence, and secondly, "content words" are subject to restrictions in occurrence which may be predicted in no way by overt grammatical cues.

The first inadequacy is demonstrated by the following example. Fries notes that "with" is a function word of "Group F" and may be followed by words of Class I (nouns). 21 The sentences "He built the house with hammer and saw." and "He went downtown with George and Bill." fit this description. Any native speaker of English will recognize that "He and George and Bill went downtown." is a paraphrase of the second sentence whereas "*He and hammer and saw built the house." is ungrammatical as a paraphrase of the first. The function word "with" is thus signalling two different grammatical entities in the above sentences, and can in no way be considered an unambiguous indicator of structure.

Chomsky has shown that occurrence of words is governed by word "features" which are in no way overtly
manifested. These features limit the environments in which words are capable of being used in terms of (1) the categorial context ("strict subcategorization" features) and (2) the syntactic context ("selectional" features). Thus, the verb "become" has strict subcategorization features which limit its occurrence to sentences containing a predicate adjective or a predicate nominal. Sentences such as "John became angry," and "John became an engineer," are grammatical, whereas "*John became." is not. The French verb devenir demonstrates similar restrictions of occurrence: "Jean devient fâché," "Jean devient ingénieur," but not "*Jean devient." Similar examples may be given for selectional features. For example, the verb "elapse" requires a subject which contains the feature (Time). Thus we may say "A minute elapsed," "An eternity elapsed before he spoke again," but not "*The dog elapsed exhausted on the floor."

Transformational formalism and language teaching

Descriptive linguists have traditionally been concerned with language acquisition, and have consequently made statements about the relevance of their discipline to language learning both in the field and
in an academic situation. Transformational grammar has no such tradition; in fact, transformational grammarians have been notably conservative about the influence which their discipline would have on language instruction. Best known among many disclaimers by transformational linguists is Chomsky's address to the 1966 Northeast Conference:

I am, frankly, rather skeptical about the significance, for the teaching of languages, of such insights and understanding as have been attained in linguistics and psychology...These disciplines are, at present, in a state of flux and agitation. What seemed to be well-established doctrine a few years ago may now be the subject of extensive debate...there has been a significant decline, over the past ten or fifteen years, in the degree of confidence in the scope and security of foundations in both psychology and linguistics. I personally feel that this decline in confidence is both healthy and realistic. But it should serve as a warning to teachers that suggestions from the "fundamental disciplines" must be viewed with caution and skepticism. 23

In spite of such cautious statements by leading theoreticians, some applied linguists have been quick to attempt to bring language teaching into line with the new linguistic theory. Politzer has stated that language drill which involved changing grammatical structures of sentences was "an old pedagogical device which does not await the writing of transformational grammar." 24 Elsewhere, Politzer has implied that his pedagogical
presentation of the French verb system finds its basis in transformational principle:

The analysis is in turn based on a linguistic principle that seems pedagogically useful in this particular case—namely, that a pattern can be presented in terms of successive transformations starting from a base form. 25

The 1962 Northeast Conference contained the following statement in the report of Working Committee I, chaired by Robert A. Hall:

...in transformational grammar, constructions are treated as 'transforms' of other constructions, and principles are set up whereby one sentence is derived from another... This procedure is by no means new; any experienced language teacher is familiar with exercises in which the student is told to change active into passive, etc. 26

Molina has attempted to apply transformational principles to the teaching of Spanish pronoun objects. He gives the following examples of "transformations":

Voy a comprar los libros.  \[\longrightarrow\] Voy a comprarlos.
Voy a comprar las plumas.  \[\longrightarrow\] Voy a comprarlas.

Molina further states that "from the above sentences, we can go directly to Voy a comprarlo and Voy a comprarla, by merely deleting an s, giving us the singular form of the pronouns...The fact that we can precisely trace the derivational history of a form makes this a powerful teaching procedure." 27 Although Molina makes no mention of the fact in the article, it is presumed that the moti-
vation for his explanation was the existence of the article el in the sentence Voy a comprar el libro, which, upon pronominalization becomes Voy a comprarlo, thus destroying the symmetry of the relation between the other three articles and their corresponding object pronoun forms.

Mayer has taken an eclectic view in his description of French structure. He states:

I believe that "traditional" structural linguistics and generative-transformational grammar are not mutually exclusive but on the contrary complement each other: the former is our best tool for analyzing the smaller (phonemic and morphemic) structures, while the latter is superior for putting the smaller structures together into larger (syntactic) structures.

Mayer defines "transformation" in a special way. He gives the example

Demon + Def-Gen $\Rightarrow$ ce

and explains the formalism thusly:

A transformational rule...indicates that the items on the left of the arrow are to be changed to the items on the right. It switches them around; that is, it combines or changes their order and so forth.

Valdman has attempted to find a linguistic justification for teaching the "est-ce que" question form before the "inversion" form. Valdman contends that the "est-ce que" form does not derive from a simple "pre-positioning" transformation, which would simply place "est-ce que" in front of the subject of the sentence.
Rather, a sentence such as Est-ce que le facteur voit le chien? is derived by two transformations.

The derivation starts with the declarative sentence: Le facteur voit le chien. Application of an "emphatic" transformation gives C'est que le facteur voit le chien. And a subject-verb inversion transformation gives the desired Est-ce que le facteur voit le chien? Valdman's motivation for this procedure is that use of these transformations enables one to derive the interrogative and the subordinate clause with the same transformations; Valdman does not demonstrate how derivation of the latter would work. It would seem that he would intend the C'est que... transformation to apply; a subsequent transformation would delete C'est, leaving que... ready for embedding in the matrix sentence. Valdman states that rigorous experimentation is called for to determine whether "Est-ce que..." or "inverted" question forms are learned faster, since "neither the native speaker nor the student are necessarily sensitive to these internal processes and could interpret the above sentence (Est-ce que le facteur voit le chien?) simply as the pre-position of Est-ce que..."
Criticism of transformational formalism in language teaching

Transformational linguists have tended to look with disfavor on these attempts to implement transformational terminology to practical language teaching situations. Most criticism of these efforts has been the accusation that applications to language pedagogy have been "hollow formalism" which has not succeeded in capturing the philosophical change in point of view which is characteristic of generative thought. Lakoff, in an article criticizing authors who have written "applied" transformational grammars of English, has stated:

...they are not employing rationalism at all, but resorting to new forms of the same old mumbo-jumbo; they have substituted one kind of rote learning for another, and the new kind is harder than the old. 31

Rosenbaum has noted that certain English books misunderstand the concept of the transformation, considering it to be a device which changes surface representations (sentences) into other syntactically related representations. Syntactic relatedness in a generative grammar, states Rosenbaum, stems not from the transformational component of the grammar, but from the base component which determines the underlying structures of sentences. 32
Rutherford makes a distinction between the terms "linguistic transformation" and "pedagogical transformation", the latter representing a "relationship between two surface patterns having similar deep structures."

These criticisms of applied transformational grammar have been directed primarily in the area of instruction in English as a native or a foreign language. They are equally applicable, however, to the arguments discussed above. Hall and Politzer refer to what Rutherford calls a pedagogical transformation, which is certainly not "linguistic principle", as Politzer claims. Molina's derivation of the singular object pronouns from the plural ones may in fact be an effective pedagogical device, but to claim that one has given the "derivational history" by so doing in no way corresponds to the sense of the term in transformational grammar.

Perhaps the most serious criticism of transformational application may be leveled at Valdman who, at least by implication, has attributed physiological or psychological reality to the constructs (he calls them "internal processes") of transformational linguistics. Lamendella has stated well the case against this misconception:

Comments by transformationalists (in contrast to claims of the theory) about the "competence-performance distinction and statements about a grammar "accounting" for the ideal speaker's linguistic knowledge, have sometimes served to prevent the
realization that a transformational grammar has nothing at all to do with people but is a formal descriptive device. We cannot assume that the structures posited in transformational grammar have psychological validity. The fact that the theory assigns different structures to sentences which our intuition tells us are different does not mean that the two structures we have assigned are related to the cognitive structures which underlie these sentences, but merely that we have descriptively "accounted" for our intuition that the sentences are different. 34

From the above discussion, it seems clear that adoption of generative formalism does not appear to change language pedagogy in any important way. The generative distinction between competence and performance could, in the eyes of some applied linguists, greatly influence language teaching practice, however.

"Competence" and language teaching

Chomsky characterized competence as "the knowledge of the language that provides the basis for actual use of language by a speaker-hearer." 35 Saporta states essentially that the development of linguistic competence is the aim of language instruction, when he says: "The pedagogical grammar ideally attempts to develop the native speaker's ability to recognize and to produce sentences." 36 Saporta also accepts the generative statement that linguistic competence, i.e. a native speaker's "generative grammar," must be composed of
a set of ordered rules. Thus, for Saporta, "language is rule-governed behavior, and learning a language involves internalizing the rules." Saporta seems to subscribe to the descriptivist idea that overt knowledge of rules can impede their internalization, thus hindering the acquisition of competence. This leads him to the "paradox of second language learning": to learn a language, a human must internalize a set of rules, but the overt knowledge of these rules impedes language learning.

Saporta bases his pedagogical drills on transformational syntax, since this is the only theoretical framework which allows the student to be drilled on his knowledge of underlying syntactic relations, i.e. linguistic competence. But Saporta contends that this type of drill cannot be a learning drill: its successful completion depends upon the previously acquired competence of the student. Therefore, Saporta rejects language drill as a pedagogical device: "The drill which serves as input to a naive student and which is somehow converted into command of precisely the appropriate rule is an illusion." Hanzeli echoes this assertion, stating that Saporta’s argument that by definition, drills cannot teach rules is a very convincing one.
Rutherford, while he considers that knowledge of deep structure is essential to language acquisition, does not reject the concept of the language drill. Rather, he contends that drills should be constructed to enable students to practice their knowledge of the deep structure of English.

...materials are oriented almost invariably toward imparting as a final goal the ability of the student to give phonological shape to surface structures. Yet, a mastery of deep structure principles is just as important, if not more so, since it is these which govern semantic interpretation. It follows, however, that control by the student over deep structure differences will not take place unless he is aware of them. And I believe that one of the aims of language pedagogy must be to bring about that awareness. 41

An example of Rutherford's conception of deep structure may be drawn from the discussion of "prenominal and postnominal modification" in his textbook, Modern English. Transformational analysis shows that one class of pre-nominal modifiers may be explained as the embedding of a S of the description: NP + be + Prep phrase. Deletion of copula accompanies embedding, and an optional transformation places the head noun of Prep phrase before the noun in NP, at the same time deleting the preposition.

\[ S_1 = \text{matrix sentence}\quad S_2 = \text{embedded sent.} \]

\[ S_2 = \text{The movie was about war.} \]
Upon embedding with deletion, we have:

The movie about war was pretty gruesome.

The second (optional) transformation gives:

The war movie was pretty gruesome.

Rutherford has constructed exercises in Modern English to develop the ability of learners of English to see the relationships between sentences such as those just given as examples. 42

Criticism of "competence" and language pedagogy

Spokesmen for language teachers have been quick to evaluate both the theory and the practice of the notion of linguistic competence applied to language pedagogy. Rivers has argued that the literal interpretation of Chomsky's conception of linguistic competence can be dangerous in the context of the language classroom. She points out that the rules Chomsky refers to are of "great abstractness and intricacy" and in no way resemble

...the pedagogic 'grammar rules' (often of doubtful linguistic validity) of the traditional deductive, expository type of language teaching according to which students docilely constructed language sequences. 43

She adds that in a classroom situation language learning cannot be conceived as the acquisition of rules
plus some practice with these rules. This plan is not enough to ensure the internalizing "of the system of rules so that it operates in the production of sentences without the students being aware of its role." 44

In Rivers' view, Chomsky's model of competence must be a long-range goal, not an immediate one which determines the form of linguistic practice in an actual classroom situation. Although she does not mention Saporta's article, she would accuse him of taking too literally the transformational formulation of language acquisition. Unlike Saporta, she would not reject memory work in language learning as "self-defeating" in favor of an ill-defined process involving "internalization of rules." Rather, Rivers makes a distinction between two kinds of learning which must take place in second language instruction: learning by analogy for the closed systems of the language: verb paradigms, agreement, other morphological phenomena; and learning by analysis for the syntactic systems:

Practice at this level must be practice with understanding, where the student is conscious of the implications and ramifications of changes he is making. This he will best do if the practice involves making decisions in real communication situations devised in the classroom, rather than in continual drills and exercises. 45

Rivers has noted that the domain of the language
teacher is language performance, and has implied that the elaboration of a program of instruction need not find its justification in the theory of competence. Rather, a different question should determine language pedagogy:

Basically the question of how to inculcate the grammar of a language will depend on the type of activity we believe communication in a foreign language to be: is it a skill or an intellectual exercise? 46

Rivers concludes that language usage actually demonstrates aspects of both intellectual and habitual activity, and arrives at the above-mentioned synthesis between learning by analysis and learning by analogy.

Lamendella, in a review of Rutherford's Modern English, has demonstrated that elemental considerations such as vocabulary control and unambiguous construction of exercise types are more important considerations than the theoretical grammatical groundwork upon which one bases instruction. Having used the book with several classes of learners of English, he found that although vocabulary selection was excellent in that it represented all levels of American usage, "...it was disastrous in that it interfered with the teaching of grammar and the execution of the exercises." 47 In addition, though he recognized the fact that Rutherford's
exercises represented an attempt to break away from restrictive, stimulus-response paradigms, the exercises as they exist make the book impractical for classroom use.48

In sum, available evidence seems to indicate that although speculation about transformational grammatical formalism and theoretical distinctions may be interesting to the language teacher because they represent a new perspective of the way language may be analyzed, application to actual classroom procedures has not demonstrated any advantages of the system over other methods of presentation, and in one case they have proven an inhibiting factor to learning. The most conservative claims for studying transformational grammar seem to be the only justifiable ones:

...individual teachers owe it to themselves to study current developments in linguistics, not in the hope of finding in them immediate answers to specific teaching questions, but because it will further their understanding of the subject they teach.49

(The study of generative grammar)...enables us, hopefully, to see better than someone who has not been trained the relationships among Ss in English, their relationship to universal facts and language-particular rules of the learner's native language. Then, when we say that a S of a certain type in English is related to, or obeys some of the constraints of, a sentence of maybe a quite different-looking type in the learner's language, we have a reasonable idea that we are basing our conclusions on more than personal caprice.50
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CHAPTER V

SOME SUGGESTED ACTIVITIES FOR
AN ECLECTIC COURSE IN APPLIED LINGUISTICS

Introduction

The course material outlined in this Chapter does not deal with how the language teacher should gain contact with the considerable amount of linguistic, psychological and philosophical literature which exists about the nature of language, its relation to cognitive processes, and the nature of first and second language acquisition. Although the study of these topics is certainly to be encouraged for all language teachers in order to broaden their understanding of the subject they teach, the direct applicability to language methodology of precepts taken from psychology and linguistics seems to be more in doubt today than it has been in recent history. It would seem that topics which could fit under the heading "introduction to language" would best be found in an introductory linguistics course, which might hopefully precede the one described here.

The aims of the course described in this Chapter are entirely practical: to provide the language
teacher with an adequate knowledge of the sound structure and grammar of the language he is to teach. "Adequate knowledge" here means the knowledge enabling the teacher to evaluate teaching materials, to construct his own materials, and to plan classroom presentations which will demonstrate an awareness of 1) the structure of the foreign and native languages, and 2) the realities of second language instruction as it exists in the academic environment. The language used as an example here is French, but a similar approach could be used for other languages, with the areas emphasized in phonology and grammar varying according to the language involved. A course for teachers of Spanish or Italian, for instance, could treat the article systems in those languages, since they function like French articles and will cause English-speakers similar problems to those outlined below.

**Phonology**

The aim of this section of an applied linguistics course should be triple: 1) enough knowledge of articulatory phonetics should be acquired so that the teacher has clearly in mind the phonological differences between French and English, and so that he
knows which of these differences are the most serious for the purposes of communication. This knowledge should include information about segmental units, phonological processes, "modes articulatoires", and prosodic features. 2) The teacher should gain some practice at diagnosing and correcting student errors in pronunciation. 3) He should learn a repertoire of exercise-types to use for practice in pronunciation drill, and should become acquainted with some of the exercise material in basic handbooks of phonetics.

The study of phonology should begin with a treatment of the elements of articulatory phonetics. A phonetic alphabet should be learned to the point where students can handle the symbols easily. The International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA) seems to be widely used in pronunciation manuals for French, in spite of claims of better descriptive power for other alternative symbol systems, cf. Valdman (1961) and Mayer (1969). These alternate alphabets could be discussed briefly once students have enough knowledge about phonetics and the phonemic concept, in order to understand why they were proposed as alternates to the IPA. Work with the IPA should include practice at transcription, dictation, and reading of phonetic notation. If students
have taken previously a course in corrective phonetics, this aspect of the course should be merely a review exercise. Suitable materials for this work are to be found in Delattre (1951), M. Léon (1964), and Valdman (1970).

After mastery of the alphabet, students study the articulatory descriptions of the vowel and consonant systems of English and French. Students should become familiar with articulatory terminology and with sagittal sections showing the disposition of articulators for the pronunciation of both French and English. The above-named texts also provide good reference texts here.

At this point the students are asked whether there is a one to one correspondence between the symbols representing consonants and vowels described on articulatory charts, and these sounds as they occur in actual speech. Students are asked, for instance, whether there is one "p" sound in English. It will be discovered that the phonetic reality of a sound is determined by its environment, and that in English the sound "p" manifests itself in three distinguishable phonetic forms. In this way the concept of the phoneme is introduced, to designate all the phonetic forms.
of a particular vowel or consonant. This definition of the phoneme is intended to be strictly a utilitarian device, with no claims for theoretical validity whatsoever. To attempt to elaborate a coherent theory of the phoneme based on distinctive features or to develop a generative schema for representation of varying phonetic forms does not seem expedient in this context. Phonetic manifestations of several phonemes are discussed, in French and English, to demonstrate how the "same phoneme" can have "different forms" in differing environments. Exercises such as Problems 1-5, Appendix B, are assigned to consolidate control over segmentals, and to get students to think systematically about difficulties encountered by American students learning French.

Having studied both phonetic detail and phonemic system, students are better prepared to identify important aspects of pronunciation, to explain to future pupils and to model for them correct utterances in French, and to achieve phonetic accuracy with those few pupils who are motivated to do so.

In discussing pronunciation errors in French, no attempt is made to classify these errors as "phonemic"
or "phonetic", since these appellations can be misleading. Houlton \(^1\) separates errors into phonemic and sub-phonemic categories, the former resulting in incomprehensibility, the latter "sometimes lead(ing) to incomprehensibility, but more often merely sound-ing) very foreign and slightly ridiculous." But supposedly "phonetic" differences cause lack of comprehension in some important cases.

For instance, both English and French have an /r/ and an /l/. In spite of the wide phonetic difference between French and English /r/, the latter usually is recognized by the French. However, Valdman \(^2\) has pointed out that English retroflex /r/ affects the articulation of preceding vowels in such a way as to render them incomprehensible. A similar phenomenon exists in the articulation of certain dialectical variants of American /l/. In the pronunciation of /l/ in the words "ultimate" and "multiple", for example, many Americans make no apical contact whatsoever. This articulation, transposed to French, makes the pronunciation of the words "ultime" and "multiple" incomprehensible, since the American's anticipation of lateral /l/ and his lack of apical contact will make the high front rounded /y/ unrecognizable.
The distinction between "phonemic" and "phonetic" mistakes can be misleading in another way, since "phonemic confusion" by novice speakers in communication situations with native speakers does not predictably result in lack of comprehension. This is due to the fact that a native speaker of a language can often attune himself to the speech of a foreigner, using clues at the word, phrase or sentence level to disambiguate segments which would be misunderstood if pronounced alone.

For these reasons, in discussing the problems which Americans experience in articulating French, attention centers on the practical question: "Which sounds will cause English speakers to be misunderstood?" rather than on the theoretical one: "Which are the phonemic problems?" Such an approach has been taken by David Harvey in his Exercices de phonétique corrective pour anglophones (B.E.L.C., 1966).

A realistic attitude toward pronunciation is one expected outcome of this treatment of phonetics. Future teachers should realize that most pupils will never attain what has been described as "native-like" pronunciation, because of lack of motivation or lack of auditory gift. They should realize also that native speakers have considerable power to disambiguate, as mentioned above.

In light of these facts, language teachers should
emphasize in their drill those pronunciation points most likely to be difficult for the learner, and should not demand accuracy of pronunciation which can only be frustrating to the average pupil. These arguments of course do not change the fact that the language teacher himself should possess very good pronunciation. And the small segment of the student population in his classes which demonstrates auditory gift should be encouraged by him to set higher standards than those of the class as a whole.

After studying the topics outlined above, prospective teachers are ready for practical application problems, where they are required to identify pronunciation errors in the speech of beginning French students. Exercises consisting of the recorded errors of these students are made available in the language laboratory. The prospective teacher's job is 1) to identify in articulatory terms the mistake being made, i.e. the English feature being substituted for the French, 2) to describe how (or whether) he would explain the error to a pupil, and 3) to describe with examples the exercise material he would suggest to remedy the problem. Any standard manuals of corrective phonetics could of course be consulted in doing these problems.

The final activity of this aspect of the course
requires the prospective teacher to find among his acquaintances an elementary student of French who has a pronunciation problem, to diagnose the problem, and to work with the student by suggesting exercise materials until the problem has been corrected. In doing the project, a teacher will record himself the appropriate drill material and a sample of the pronunciation error both before and after remedial work. A short report of the experience, together with the tapes made, is submitted to the instructor.

**Morphology and syntax**

The problems of the language learner in acquiring the morphology and syntax of a language are basically two: 1) he must know the forms of the language, and 2) he must know where and how to use them. A course in applied linguistics should address itself directly to these two problems, with the ultimate goal being to prepare the language teacher to aid pupils in both problem areas.

Descriptive linguistics has been most effective in treating the first of these areas. Morphological statements such as those found in the books analyzed in Chapter III have provided the teacher with interest-
analyses of adjective and verb systems, which should increase the teacher's knowledge of the oral language, even if they do not modify significantly his presentations in class. Descriptive linguistics, in emphasizing the difference between oral and written language, has caused a change in at least some text presentations, which treat oral and written language separately in parallel columns on the printed page. An applied linguistics course should certainly include study of morphological analyses such as Politzer (1965) and Veldman (1968), and should likewise include a close study of several texts such as the ones just mentioned.

It would seem that the descriptivist answer to the language-learner's second problem as stated above has been less satisfactory. Descriptive treatments of French syntax for the enlightenment of teachers have perhaps not been able to provide knowledge of practical utility in teaching the syntactic patterns of the language. Evidence discussed in Chapters I and IV has shown a recent trend away from empiricist theories of language learning. Chapters II and III have shown that the descriptive syntactic model may be intimidating in its formalism. The same criticism may be made of all but the most rudimentary transformational
analyses. This in addition to the repeated questioning by renowned linguists and language teachers about the relevancy of linguistic training to the practical concerns of the second-language classroom. In consequence, as Chapter II has shown, many NDEA institute linguistics courses emphasized language instruction or pedagogy.

With these facts in mind, an attempt was made to find an approach to syntax for teachers which could address itself to the exigencies of a foreign language classroom. This approach could perhaps best be described as applied grammar for teachers of language. It is eclectic in that it attempts to consider the classical grammatical school of language analysis as well as the more modern linguistic approaches. The syntactic analysis in such a course will attempt to enable a teacher to answer questions which students will have about how to use words to form sentences in the foreign language.

The following section of this Chapter consists of a comparative analysis of French and English article systems which might be attempted in the kind of linguistics course proposed here. The reasons for choosing the article as an example are several. First,
the article is well-defined morphologically in both French and English. Secondly, the semantic categorizations involved are not numerous. At least this is the case for the present analysis, which limits itself to the "regular" functioning of the article systems. To attempt to treat all exceptional cases is beyond the intent of the analysis. Finally, the article is an extremely important semantic categorizing signal, which marks the manner in which nouns are perceived: specific, general, quantitative, non-quantitative, count, mass, and abstract. Little attention is paid to this important fact in elementary and intermediate language instruction, and consideration of it is relegated to advanced grammar courses. It would seem, then, that the article is an appropriate topic indeed for consideration in the type of course contemplated.

Students would of course not be expected to arrive immediately at an analysis such as the one given here. Study could be organized in the following manner.

The first step is an assignment requiring students to review the syntax and semantics of the French and English article as discussed in specified grammatical
treatments of the two languages. Part of the assign­
ment would necessitate thinking up examples, such as
those found in the analysis presented here. This re­
search is discussed in following class periods, and a
statement of the main problems facing the language
learner is made. This statement would resemble the
one found below in the summary.

The next step involves critical evaluation of
text presentations, in the light of the contrastive
analysis just completed, with the intent of finding
points where the text might need supplementation
to account for actual usage. This is done in a prac­
tical manner, including the kind of statements that
the teacher might want to make about language in the
classroom. The final step involves the creation of
exercise material which seems indicated from the
lacunae in textbook presentations.

Evaluation of students' progress is also done
in a practical way. Students should be prepared to
answer questions which future pupils will ask regard­
ing grammatical usage. An attempt might even be made
to differentiate between a "quick answer", to be
given without interrupting class routine, and a "com­
plete answer", which could be given to an individual
pupil seeking aid or to the whole class upon initial explanation of a grammatical topic. Examples of such questions with reference to the following analysis are:

1. When do you use "de" by itself?
2. Why don't you say "Amour est beau" in French?
3. Why do you say "des" rather than "de" in the sentence "Ce sont des crêpes, pas des gauffres".

The analysis which follows is inspired by that of R.A. Close. It differs chiefly in the respect that a more detailed consideration is made of the varying occurrences of articles with mass, count, and abstract nouns. Some generalizations may have been missed for this reason.

**Analysis of French and English Articles**

**Part 1: UNMARKED NOUN.** Some grammarians consider the case of the unmarked noun as "omission of the article," i.e. a special case where the noun is somehow "weaker" than the determined one. There are numerous constructions in French in which the undetermined noun appears; the "force" of the noun seems to be reduced by this usage in no way. The question seems to be rather one of specificity of reference. Consider the following examples:
1) Barnabé s'est marié.

2) Son père est balayeur.

3) Il s'est procuré un sac de blé.

4) Cet homme attaque les étudiants sans pitié.

In the first example, Barnabé, a proper noun, takes no article. This is a characteristic of the category, since proper nouns, at least in ordinary usage, are defined as the names of unique objects which do not need to be further determined. There are special cases where articles are used with proper nouns in French, e.g. the names of many geographical phenomena and the names of countries. Also, the definite article may be used with a person's name, as in the example

5) Depuis qu'il est marié, ce n'est plus le même Barnabé.

These uses of article with proper noun are varied and extensive; they constitute exceptions to the general rule as noted above and will not be discussed further here.

Sentences (2)-(4) demonstrate examples of count, mass, and abstract nouns, respectively. The sentences demonstrate also several structures where nouns are permitted without articles. Sentence (2) shows the noun balayeur in an adjectival capacity: it qualifies the subject of the sentence, son père. The prepositional
phrase de blé in sentence (3) plays a similar adjectival role, except that it qualifies the direct object of the sentence, un sac. Finally, the prepositional phrase sans pitié of sentence (4) acts as an adverbial of the verb attaque. There exists then a group of prepositions in French which appear with undetermined nouns to form adjectival and adverbial phrases. In addition, there is a set of nouns which may appear without the article as predicate nominals and which have the adjectival function of qualifying the subject of the sentence.

Sentences (6)-(8), which differ from (2)-(4) only in that the nouns in question have been made definite, make clear the fact that the French noun used in the context discussed demonstrates a concept in general, conceived as a quality and including no notion of amount or number, either limited or unlimited.

(6) Son père est le balayeur que nous connaissons.
(7) Il s’est procuré un sac du blé que nous lui avons recommandé.
(8) Cet homme attaque les étudiants sans la moindre pitié.

Sentences (9)-(11) are the English equivalents of sentences (2)-(4):

(9) His father is a street sweeper.
(10) He got himself a sack of wheat.

(11) That man attacks students without pity.

Sentences (10) and (11) show that English usage parallels French with respect to adjectival and adverbial prepositional phrases. The English nouns in the example sentences are clearly representative of the concepts "wheat" and "pity" in general, without regard for quantizing. Sentence (9) shows a difference from its French counterpart, sentence (2). Whereas the French noun applies adjectivally to son père, the English noun is represented as a member of a class of sweepers. This conceptual difference is a possible explanation of the difficulty which English-speakers have with this structure in French.

Part 2: UN, UNE. Observe the following sentences:

(12) Un certain Serge est venu te voir.
(13) Il a montré un courage singulier.
(14) Je dois procurer un bouton.
(15) Il te manque un bouton sur ta veste.
(16) Une farine en vaut une autre.

Sentences (12), (13) and (16) represent "anomalies" with respect to some normative grammars, which prescribe the use of the indefinite article with proper, abstract and non-count nouns. The fact that French
allows these usages with certain nouns is demonstrated by the acceptability of the above sentences, however.

A proper noun used with the indefinite article does not have the same value as when used alone: usually the person named is unknown to the speaker, and thus represents a conception which might best be rendered by the English paraphrase "a man named ...". Thus, in the eyes of the speaker, the person named in the case of (12) above is represented as little more than a member of a class, since the proper noun carries no associational ties as do the names of known people.

In sentence (13), reference is made not to the quality "courage" in a general way, but to a particular demonstration of courage, an example of courage. The same is true of (16), where "farine" has assumed a count-noun aspect, representing not "flour in general" but a "kind of flour."

In sentences (14) and (15), "a button" represents a member of the class which includes all buttons. It is one, integral example of the concept "button", though it is not specified which example. Notice in addition that the article un may refer both to a definite and an indefinite object. In (14), the button is indefinite; any button of a number will do. The important thing here is class, i.e. it is important to the
speaker that the item procured be a button and not something else. In (15), the button is definite, or rather its absence is. Both speaker and hearer may look at the jacket and see exactly which button is missing. The emphasis in this use of un is on the fact that one button is missing, not two or three.

Sentences (17)-(21) are the English equivalents of French sentences (12)-(16):

(17) A certain Serge came to see you.
(18) He showed a singular courage.
(19) I have to get a button.
(20) You're missing a button on your jacket.
(21) One flour is as good as another.

These examples show English usage to parallel that of French in every case but one, (21). Where the French article is homophonous with the numeral "one", English uses two words. It is clear, however, that the semantic relation between the two English words is very close, with "one" appearing where the speaker desires to emphasize the specificity of the referent, and "a" appearing where the class membership is uppermost in the speaker's mind. Close equates "one" and "a", stating that the latter may be interpreted as an un-emphasized form of the former.
The parallelism which has been shown to exist between the usage of the singular definite article in French and English indicates that this should be one of the easiest aspects of the French article system for the English-speaker to assimilate. This statement is based upon syntactic and semantic function only, however. Students may still be expected to have difficulty with the morphophonology of the article and with the association of correct forms to gender-type.

**Part 3: **DU, DE LA, DE L', DES. The following sentences represent examples of the "partitive construction" in French for count, mass and abstract nouns. English translations are furnished consecutively in this section.

(22) Ils ont montré du courage.
(23) They showed courage.

It will be noticed in each of the examples from (22)-(33) that two notions are present in the nominal groups in question: the notion of a sample of undefined quantity, and the notion of class, i.e. the mass or group of objects which comprises the whole set from which we are taking a sample. Both these concepts are present in any partitive article construction; one or the other may be predominant, depending on the
type of noun or on the intent of the speaker to underline either the quantitative or the class aspect of the construction.

Sentence (22), using the abstract noun courage, emphasizes the identity of the character trait demonstrated: they showed "courage" rather than lâcheté or paresse or timidité. The fact that reference is made to a sample or an example of this quality is not predominant in the sentence although it is present. English signals this meaning by using the unmarked noun as in (23). In French, however, the notion of sample, of example of an entity, must be preserved: hence the obligatory du in the case of abstract nouns.

(24) On a acheté de la farine.
(25) We bought (some) flour.
(26) On a trouvé de la farine chez les voisins.
(27) We found (some) flour at the neighbors'.
(28) On a acheté de la farine, non pas du maïs.
(29) We bought flour, not corn.
(30) J'ai trouvé des boutons sur l'armoire.
(31) I found (some) buttons on the chest.
(32) Que veux-tu pour ton anniversaire? Des boutons.
(33) What do you want for your birthday? Buttons.

In the cases of mass and count nouns, (24)-(33), French is also constrained to use a marker to indicate
the notion of "sample of a class". For nouns used in the mass sense, this marker is du, de la or de l', as shown by sentences (24), (26) and (28). In each of these sentences, reference is made to an indefinite sample of a substance. Notice, however, that in going from the first to the third example, (24) to (28), the notion of quantity of sample diminishes in importance and that the notion of class increases in importance. Thus, we speak of a quantity of flour bought in sentence (24), whereas in sentence (28) we are emphasizing that one class of substance was purchased and not another. In English, this difference in emphasis may be made overt by the insertion of the quantifier "some", as in sentences (25) and (27). This substitution is less likely in (29), where the notion of class rather than sample predominates, though it would not make the sentence ungrammatical.

For count nouns in French, the idea of "non-specified sample" is conveyed by "des", with the sample conceived as "more than one unspecified unit of the class of objects in question". The same differentiation may be made between emphasis on sample and emphasis on class that was described above regarding sentences (24)-(29). In sentence (30), the article
conveys above all the idea that there is more than one object in the sample, whereas in (32), the emphasis is on the class of objects, as opposed to another class of objects which might have been desired as a birthday gift.

This "partitive" usage of the French article is a traditional stumbling block for the beginning student. Although speakers of English do distinguish the category semantically, the use of an overt signal to denote sample or example of a class is optional. The partitive sense is thus frequently unmarked in English, as sentences (23), (25), (27), (29), (31), and (33) show.

(34) Voilà un morceau du bouton.
(35) Here's a piece of the button.
(36) Voilà un morceau de bouton.
(37) Here's a piece of button.

Sentences (34)-(37) represent examples of what is usually called the partitive. However, neither of the French sentences (34) and (36) fit the partitive category which has just been described. In (34), the button in question is conceived of neither as an example of a (countable) class nor as a sample of an (uncountable) substance. It is rather a definite,
specified button, one which is known to both speaker and hearer in the situation. Thus, if this construction is to be considered as a "partitive" one, it must be classed with a set of "quantized" partitive constructions, which include such expressions as un morceau de, une grappe de, un litre de, etc.

Sentence (36) might thus be considered an example of this "quantized partitive". However, the substance being quantized is no longer specified; bouton here refers to the quality, the "button-ness", of the particular morceau in question. This phrase, which contains no article, may thus be seen to fit the category discussed in Part 1, above. Sentences (35) and (37), the English equivalents of (34) and (36), support these conclusions: (35) shows "button" being determined by a definite article, which specifies the reference of the noun, while (37) has no article at all, placing it in the "general concept" class of Part 1.

Part 4: LE, LA. The "singular definite article" in French refers to either 1) a single, identified example of a class or concept, or 2) the concept or class in its entirety. Consider the sentences:
(38) Le Barnabé d'autrefois n'est plus là.
(39) Le courage qu'il a montré a disparu.
(40) Le courage lui manque.
(41) Je ne vois pas le bouton que tu cherches.
(42) Le bouton sert à attacher les vêtements.
(43) Voilà la farine que je t'ai apportée.
(44) Je n'aime pas la farine.

The examples are designed to include occurrences of all types of nouns: proper, abstract, count, and mass. Proper nouns preceded by le have been discussed above under Part 1.

Notice that sentences (40), (42) and (44), examples of abstract, count, and mass nouns respectively, indicate clearly a reference to a class in its totality. This is usually called the "general" use of the definite article in French. English equivalents of these sentences are:

(45) He lacks courage.
(46) The button serves to hold clothes together.
(47) I don't like flour.

Although English abstract and mass nouns do not use the article to name a class, sentences (45) and (47), notice that English count nouns are free to do so, sentence (46).
The following sentences, English equivalents of (39), (41) and (43), demonstrate that French and English usage parallel one another when the definite article is used to specify one particular example of a class.

(48) The courage he showed has disappeared.
(49) I don't see the button you're looking for.
(50) Here's the flour I brought you.

Notice, however, that when used in contexts other than the "general" one discussed above, the article itself in both French and English is not enough to specify completely the object or substance in question. The demonstrative adjective, for example, specifies completely; no additional qualifying information is needed, as demonstrated by (51) and (52):

(51) Je voudrais ce pamplemousse.
(52) I'd like that grapefruit.

The definite article needs additional qualifying information supplied 1) by the situational or discourse context, as demonstrated by sentences (53)-(56), or 2) by a grammatical qualifier, either adjective, phrase or clause. These are demonstrated respectively by sentences (57)-(62).

(53) Prends la voiture.
(54) Take the car.
Both speaker and hearer are aware here which car is referred to: either they have only one car, or any other cars which might be at their disposal are for some reason not present in their minds.

(55) Un train approchait. La locomotive ne faisait point de bruit.

(56) A train was approaching. The engine was making no noise at all.

In sentences (55) and (56), the surrounding discourse supplies information sufficient for the reader to know which engine is being referred to with the definite article.

Sentences (57)-(58) show simple adjectival qualification:

(57) Elle aimerait le camion rouge.
(58) She'd like the red truck.

Sentences (59)-(60) show phrasal qualification:

(59) Elle aimerait le camion à droite.
(60) She'd like the truck on the right.

Sentences (61)-(62) show clausal qualification:

(61) Elle aimerait le camion que vous nous avez montré hier.
(62) She'd like the truck you showed us yesterday.

This discussion has shown that although in many respects le and "the" are used similarly, the use of
the singular definite article to designate a class is foreign to English usage, with the exception of sentences such as (46).

Part 5: LES. Les does not occur regularly with abstract, proper, or mass nouns. Examples with them are given here, since such examples are in fact grammatical, though perhaps rare. Both abstract and mass nouns assume a "count" sense when they are used in this way.

(63) Les deux Samuel étaient là.
(64) The two Samuels were there.
(65) Les amours de Prosper sont sans nombre.
(66) The loves of Prosper are innumerable.
(67) Les deux farines ne se ressemblent pas.
(68) The two flours are not alike.

For count nouns in French (or nouns used in the "count sense", such as those just given), the article les may designate two different aspects of objects: 1) objects seen as a group of units representative of a class of objects, or 2) the class of objects itself, seen as a composite of entities. These aspects are exemplified by (69) and (70), respectively:

(69) Les boutons que tu voulais sont là.
(70) Les boutons se vendent cher cette année.
English, however, represents these two aspects of count nouns in two different ways. Objects seen as a group of units representing a class appear with "the", as seen in the equivalent of sentence (69):

(71) The buttons you wanted are there.

The class of objects itself, the so-called general usage of the article, are represented with no article at all, as seen in the English equivalent of sentence (70):

(72) Buttons are selling high this year.

**Summary:** Let us present the main problems facing the English-speaker as he attempts to manipulate the syntax of the French article system with his background of English noun-classifying procedures. These "interference-points" may be classified under the following four headings, as the examples show.

**A.** Unmarked singular mass or abstract English noun is used to designate an unquantified class; French uses the singular definite article.

(73) Milk is good for the health.

(74) Le lait est bon pour la santé.

(75) Love is beautiful.

(76) L'amour est beau.
D. English uses unmarked plural count noun to designate a class composed of units; French uses the plural definite article.

(77) Apples are good for the health, too.
(78) Les pommes sont bonnes pour la santé aussi.

C. Unmarked English singular mass or abstract noun is used to designate an unspecified sample; French uses the singular partitive article.

(79) Do you want milk?
(80) Veux-tu du lait?
(81) We saw only hate in their eyes.
(82) Nous n'avons vu que de la haine dans leurs yeux.

D. Unmarked English plural count noun is used to designate a sample composed of an unspecified number of discrete units; French uses plural partitive article.

(83) Do you want potatoes?
(84) Veux-tu des pommes de terre?

Although the final statements given here resemble those to be found in grammar books, they differ in two respects. First of all, the statements are contrastive; usually, grammar books do not attempt to describe systematically English usage. Overt comparison of French and English structures and methodical discussion about
application to classroom situations are not typical of grammar book discussion.

Secondly, this analysis combines what is traditionally split into several areas of coverage: definite article, indefinite article, and partitive. The article systems of French and English are seen as what might be called an aspectual system for nouns, i.e. the noun seen as an unspecified mass or collection of objects, as a sample of objects or of a mass, as an identified group of objects, etc.

Conclusion

The activities which have been proposed above are practical in nature, having as their central aim the preparation of a teacher to cope with actual problems which language learners face in learning the sound system, the forms and the grammar of a foreign language.

Descriptively based formulations of applied linguistics have been beneficial in that they have provided a framework by which the teacher can easily become aware of the morphological structures of language. They have had a questionable effect where their adherance to formalism has prevented adequate consideration of the two basic characteristics of the lang—
uage learning situation. The first of these characteristics concerns the nature of language, the second concerns the attitudes which a language learner brings to the classroom.

Firstly, then, language behavior is basically cognitive activity. Teachers cannot be led to believe that overt structure in language is the only basis upon which to design learning procedures. Semantic organisation of language must be taken into account, and the desire of a language learner to "say something" in the foreign language at the earliest possible moment must be fulfilled if motivation is to be maintained.

Secondly, a language learner sees a foreign language as basically a set of vocabulary items which he must learn how to use in different contexts, and a set of rules which tell him how these items fit together. For the past decade, some audio-lingual theorists have been suggesting that language is best learned through unconscious "internalization" of the patterns by which words arrange themselves. The teacher has been told to get the language-learner's attention away from the meaning of individual words, away from grammatical structure, at least until a "generalization" could be made. Teachers have been informed that the
language-learner's conception of learning; a language does not correspond to reality. In this view, the learner must be taught language in spite of his natural inclinations to see meaning in terms of his mother tongue and to analyze the structure of the language being learned.

Teachers in preparation would perhaps be well-advised to recognize these attitudes of language-learners and to teach language in such a way as to satisfy language pupils' desire to analyze and to understand what he is saying. In recognizing these attitudes and in attempting to take them into account in teaching, the future teacher must not lose sight of important notions such as vocabulary control, systematic introduction of syntactic and morphological matter and the idea of language practice for mastery. It is hoped that the approach to language analysis which has been discussed above will aid the future teacher in finding a realistic approach to the teaching of language structure.
NOTES TO CHAPTER V


3. Two elementary texts using this technique are: Desberg and Kenan, Modern French, and Brown, French. See bibliography for full reference.


7. Ibid., p. 52.
APPENDIX A

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL TABLES OF TEXTS USED IN INSTITUTE LINGUISTICS COURSES, 1964, 1966
## Table 5

FRENCH: Texts used in institute applied linguistics courses, 1964, 1966 (Number of syllabi consulted: 30.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Times mentioned</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>APPLIED LINGUISTICS:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LANGUAGE AND PHONETICS:**


**METODOLOGY:**

TABLE 5 (continued)

GENERAL LINGUISTICS AND OTHER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Martinet, André</td>
<td>Éléments de linguistique générale</td>
<td>Paris: A. Colin, 1960</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Marty, Fernand L.</td>
<td>Linguistics Applied to the Beginning French Course</td>
<td>A-V Publications, 1965</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Times mentioned</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>APPLIED LINGUISTICS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LANGUAGE AND PHONOLOGY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cany, Semantica hispanoamericana.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENERAL LINGUISTICS AND OTHER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE 7**

GERMAN: Texts used in institute applied linguistics courses, 1964, 1966 (Number of syllabi consulted: 8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Times mentioned</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>APPLIED LINGUISTICS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>LANGUAGE AND PHONETICS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Wängler, H. <em>Instruction in German Pronunciation for Americans.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>GENERAL LINGUISTICS, METHODOLOGY, OTHER</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

SAMPLE EXERCISES IN
COMPARATIVE PHONOLOGY: FRENCH - ENGLISH
Problem 1: What differences are remarked in the pronunciation of English and French /p/, and how will this affect the American's pronunciation of the French sound? Base your answer on the example words given below. Take into account the environment of the sound, whether or not it is pronounced differently if it occurs in stressed syllable, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>French</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>père</td>
<td>pan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apparent</td>
<td>aptitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>appendage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apprends</td>
<td>top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apte</td>
<td>napalm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample answer: The above examples show that English /p/ varies with it's position in the word (or group). Initial [p] is aspirated, as is intervocalic, only less so. Before a consonant, [p] is unreleased. At the end of a word (or group) /p/ may be either released or unreleased, depending usually on emphasis desired by the speaker. French /p/ is always unaspirated and fully released, except when followed by a stop consonant. The American will tend to aspirate initial [p] and to keep final [p] unreleased. The former mistake is usually not a serious one, but the latter must be avoided, since the French are not able to distinguish between unreleased /p/, /t/, /k/.
Problem 2: What differences do you notice in the pronunciation of French and English /t/, from the following data? How will these differences affect the pronunciation of the French sounds?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>French</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tambour</td>
<td>melting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>automne</td>
<td>travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bête</td>
<td>partition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>bet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trembler</td>
<td>atom, atomic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voltiger</td>
<td>Tom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Problem 3: Same problem as above for /k/:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>French</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>carton</td>
<td>reclaim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bac</td>
<td>carton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>action</td>
<td>back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accord</td>
<td>barking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arcade</td>
<td>action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>réclame</td>
<td>echo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>le bac tourna</td>
<td>acting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Problem 4: There are several varieties of American /l/. Compare your pronunciation(s) of English /l/ with French /l/, from the following data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>French</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lys</td>
<td>multiple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blâner</td>
<td>gland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ample</td>
<td>pale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alarme</td>
<td>aloud</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Problem 3: What differences do you notice in the pronunciation of French and English /b/, /d/, /ɡ/; how does an American have to change his speech habits to correctly pronounce the French sounds?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>French</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pâle</td>
<td>lice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gland</td>
<td>blame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>multiple</td>
<td>ample</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>French</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>banc</td>
<td>ban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>snob</td>
<td>grab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>identique</td>
<td>udder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dans</td>
<td>dam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>raide</td>
<td>lad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abondant</td>
<td>abound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gant</td>
<td>gaunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lègue</td>
<td>beg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>onquent</td>
<td>aghast</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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