The British Association for Applied Linguistics

No.18	NEWSLETTER	Summer 1983

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL & NEWSLETTER PROSPECT

This issue begins, unusually, with two Letters. I had made Letters of
them and put them in their usual place at the very end of the Newsletter
before I realised how important they were, in their different ways.
John Roberts' letter about conditions in Poland is an appeal to members
of BAAL as individuals (the first person to read it after me said simply
'If you each send one pound, that's over £400 for a start'). Michel Blanc's
letter about Birkbeck is a warning to us collectively, and also a call to
celebration. I have kept them as Letters and brought them to the front of
the Newsletter in recognition of their special nature, and in the hope
that others may find this format valuable for voicing deeply felt concerns,
whether external to us in this country, like John's, or internal, like
Michel's.

Conference reports, Articles, Reviews and Notices/Notes follow in their
usual order. I fancy a record number of members have contributed to this
issue —my thanks to them all! But let me thank especially, in addition to
John and Michel, Pat Wright and Phyllis Gove for their articles —the sound
of new ground being broken is a sweet sound to the Newsletter ....

The Autumn issue will contain the abstracts of the papers from the
Association's 16th Annual Meeting (at Leicester Polytechnic, Fri. 16 —
Sun. 18 September: local organiser, Pam Grunwell, School of Speech Pathology).
Books under review at present include Swain & Lapkin's Evaluating bilingual
education: a Canadian case study (Alan Thomas), Abdelâli Bentahila's
Language attitudes among Arabic-French bilinguals in Morocco (Afaf Elmenoufy),
and Braj Kachru's (ed.) The other tongue: English across cultures (Peter
Trudgill). The present issue's exceptional clutch of reviews will be
worthily followed!

If the Newsletter pleases, or if it displeases, —if you want to use the
Newsletter, —if you have contributions, ideas, suggestions, news or views,
or questions, do not hesitate to write or ring, or call on:

                                        John Mountford
69 Glen Eyre Road   Editor
Southampton SO2 3NP
(Tel: Southampton (0703-) 767373)

N.B. The copydate for the Autumn issue, N/L19, is Saturday 8 October
      1983, and for the Spring issue, N/L20, is Saturday 14 January 1984.
      Copy is always welcome in advance of copydates.

I

LETTERS

1. From <u>John ROBERTS</u> about colleagues in Poland (Katowice).

Dear John,

I recently visited Poland to organise an in-service training course on behalf of the British Council for the Foreign Language Institute of the University of Silesia. The other half of the teaching-team was Patrick Hanks, who has been engaged on a research-project at Essex for the last few years, but who is about to depart to Birmingham. He is, of course, one of our most eminent lexicographers, his achievements including editorship of the Collins <u>English Dictionary</u>, and working with him proved to be a most pleasurable privilege. They don't seem to build many <u>real</u> language scholars of his sort any more — we should preserve them!

The experience was both bitter and sweet. The courtesy, warmth, friendship and hospitality we were shown were quite overwhelming. But so, too, were many of the other things we observed — in a totally different way. For example, there is very little chance that any of the teachers of English we met could obtain permission to visit the West at present — which is no doubt why many of them came prepared with long lists of 'points' to check against native-speaker intuitions. For example, there is no chance, but no chance, of their obtaining Western books unless donated. For example, we treated two of our Polish colleagues to a meal which cost about 40% of a Polish University lecturer's monthly salary, but which, converted in accordance with at least one of the rates of exchange currently obtaining, could be said to have cost no more than the equivalent of the loose change we carry about with us here every day. The courage with which our Polish colleagues cope with their personal and intellectual privation and isolation is amazing. To borrow a phrase from Patrick: 'Poland is a country in which First-World teachers and scholars are obliged to work in Third-World conditions.'

The parting pledge which Patrick and I made to our colleagues at the University of Silesia was that we would do our very best to raise money in order to be able to send them, via the British Council, at least a good selection of modern, Western-produced EFL materials. We are both writing round to publishers for help, BUT I SHOULD LIKE TO TAKE THIS OPPORTUNITY TO APPEAL TO ALL BAAL MEMBERS FOR ASSISTANCE IN THIS MATTER. <u>ANY</u> DONATION WHICH ANY OF YOU WOULD BE PREPARED TO SEND ME WOULD BE GRATEFULLY RECEIVED, AND WOULD BE SPENT ON MATERIALS TO BE DESPATCHED THROUGH THE BRITISH COUNCIL. JUST AS WELCOME AS MONEY, HOWEVER, WOULD BE ANY MODERN EFL TEXTBOOK OR TEXT ON LANGUAGE TEACHING TECHNIQUES WHICH YOU COULD SPARE. A COPY OF A BOOK OR ARTICLE WHICH YOU HAVE WRITTEN YOURSELF, PERHAPS? The simple fact is that, by comparison with us, they have <u>nothing</u>. The equipment-inventory of the Foreign Language Institute in Katowice seems to run to two antediluvian typewriters. It is instructive to think of that every time we, over here, use a Xerox machine, an electric typewriter or a word-processor — or, perhaps, every time we feel irritation at being flooded with the latest offerings from the textbook publishers. We can't even keep up with what is offered to us!

/

Of course there is a great need in Poland as a whole, and Patrick and I have made strong recommendations to the British Council with regard to an increase in aid. But here we have identified a specific case of great and urgent need, and have seen ourselves conditions which are almost unbelievably bleak. Even the paper on which I am now writing would be a luxury to our Polish colleagues. WILL YOU HELP? IF SO, PLEASE GET IN TOUCH.

Sincerely,

John.

John Roberts,   2.6.83
Department of Language & Linguistics,
University of Essex,
Colchester CO4 3SQ

2. From <u>Michel BLANC</u> about the recent crisis in his Department (and its happy outcome).

Dear John,

I am grateful for this opportunity to reflect on the crisis which the Department of Applied Linguistics and Language Centre at Birkbeck College has undergone, in the hope that it might help other departments faced with a similar predicament.

At the beginning of the 1981-82 session one of our four members of staff applied for retirement in the normal way; it must be stressed that he did not apply under the Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals' Scheme, which would have meant the permanent loss of the post. At the time, therefore, we had no reason to suspect that we were at risk. Our Department is rather "unique" in London, not only because it caters for in-service language teachers who wish to pursue further studies part-time, but also because it runs the only M.A. course that trains qualified and experienced language teachers in experimental research methods and techniques in second language learning and teaching and involves them in individual experimental research projects (which requires a great deal of constant supervision as our students are Arts graduates). We had recently changed from a biennial to an annual intake into the M.A. in Second Language Learning and Teaching course, and we had achieved this without any increase in the full-time complement of teaching staff; we had 48 M.A. students and a growing number of post-graduate research students working on the psycholinguistics of second language learning and the social psychology of bilingualism (there are at present 11 students registered for the degrees of M.Phil. and Ph.D.). Our average degree output was 20 per year, or 5 per member of staff, one of the best in the College. In 1981 the University of London Subject Area Review Committee on Languages and Linguistics had recommended that our Department should continue alongside the Linguistics departments at U.C.L. and S.O.A.S., and the College's own Emergency Planning Committee also recommended that the Department should not be reduced in its establishment of teaching staff.

To our surprise and shock the post was frozen for an indefinite period, in the interest of economy; an aborted attempt was even made to

/...

apply the early retirement formula. Our Department, faced with a 25% drop in its teaching strength, had no alternative but to revert to a biennial intake policy and cancel the 1982-84 intake, thereby losing potential students, two years' fee income and, more importantly, losing faith and morale. The future looked grim. However, we decided to fight back and alerted academic public opinion. The support we received was magnificent: past and present students, Birkbeck colleagues, BAAL, LAGB, CILT and the University of London Board of Studies in Linguistics, to name but a few, appealed to the Administration of the College to unfreeze the post as soon as possible. Early in the 1982-83 session the Emergency Planning Committee authorised us to fill the vacant post, albeit at a fairly junior level.

The response to our advertisement was staggering: 83 candidates applied, 14 were under 30, 22 between 30 and 34, and 47 were 35 or over. Of the 83, 45 were in post in Higher Education, 27 had M.Phil. or Ph.D. degrees, and 37 had published at least one book or three research papers. We were looking for someone with a good Linguistics background, research experience in either psycholinguistics or sociolinguistics or language education, preferably with teaching experience as well. This we found in the shape of Jenny Cheshire and Viv Edwards, who had applied for a "job-sharing" lectureship. Viv and Jenny need no introduction from me. Needless to say the Department, the College, and, I think, the successful candidates are all delighted; and it is very good news also for our subject. We can now revert to an annual intake and forge ahead. And I can look forward with some confidence to introducing in the near future a new Taught Master's Course in Multilingualism and Multiculturalism in collaboration with the University of London Institute of Education. A quelque chose malheur est bon.

Or is it?

Looking back, I do not regret the time and energy spent fighting on every committee against what I considered to be an arbitrary and irrational decision. But it badly disrupted our research projects and the continuity of the Department as a whole. It shook my confidence in the ability of Academics to come to rational decisions. The response I got from my colleagues and students, though, more than compensated for the anger and the sadness generated by the whole episode. It is their confidence in us that stopped me from giving it all up and going to Canada to concentrate on my research on Bilingualism.

Sincerely,

Michel Blanc
Head of Department of Applied
  Linguistics and Language Centre,
  Birkbeck College, University of London.
Membre Associé, Centre International de
    Recherche sur le Bilinguisme,
    Université Laval, Québec.

Michel.

4.5.83

II   CONFERENCES AND ACTIVITIES ELSEWHERE

Conferences

1. Hatfield (BAAL) Conference on Discourse Structure (Hatfield Poly, April)

2. LAGB Spring Meeting (Sheffield Univ., March)   C. Cullen

3. 34th Georgetown Round Table (Georgetown Univ., March)   (i) C. Brumfit
                                                            (ii) P.Strevens

4. 8th Trier Linguistic Symposium (Trier Univ., March)   R. Alexander

5. Colloquium on Psycholings.& Lang. Pathology (Newcastle Univ., Nov.'82)
                                                              R. Beresford

6. 11th Gregynog Anglo-French Conference (Gregynog Hall, Powys, March)
                                                              J. Mountford

Other activities

7. CILT   H. Lunt

8. NCLE   R. Powell

---

1.   Hatfield (BAAL) Conference on Discourse Structure
      Held at Hatfield Polytechnic, 11-13 April 1983

                                                The Linguistics Group, School
Conference Organiser: Dr. James Monaghan   of Humanities, The Hatfield
Conference Secretary: Dr. Eugene Winter   Polytechnic, PO Box 109,
                                               Hatfield, Herts. AL10 9AB
                                               (Tel: Hatfield 68100).

*** This Conference, by all accounts a great success, was not strictly a BAAL
Seminar; and, though it was the direct successor both in time and spirit to
the Aston Seminar on Intonation & Discourse of April last year (see N/L16),
I was wrong to write of it as though it automatically joined the list of BAAL
Seminars which appeared in N/L17. It was, however, associated with BAAL; and
I am grateful to the organisers for their close cooperation with the Newslet-
ter —always grateful for one organiser's report, I am doubly grateful for two!
I can't disentangle the roles of organiser and secretary, but I can state
positively that Eugene Winter is a member of BAAL, that James Monaghan is Head
of Linguistics, in succession to Eugene who headed it from its inception in
1972, and that the other members of the Linguistics Group at Hatfield Poly are
Winifred Crombie, Alex de Joia, Roger Horrocks, and Geoffrey Turner.

   News of the Conference follows in the form of: "home-team" reports from
(i) James MONAGHAN as Conference Organiser, (ii) Eugene WINTER as Conference
Secretary, (iii) a report from Afaf ELMENOUFY, as a participant, and (iv) a
report from Lars EVENSEN on one of the Tuesday evening workshops, Applied
Discourse Studies, mentioned by James Monaghan.
   These reports are followed by (v) list of speakers and their papers, and
(iv) list of participants.

Hatfield Discourse Conference, cont.

i) James MONAGHAN:

This conference was run by the Linguistics Group at the Hatfield Polytechnic in association with BAAL, who put their mailing list at our disposal as well as allowing us to use their name. The result can be described as a credit to both parties and we look forward to our next cooperation. In short, the conference was a noted success both in numbers of speakers and other participants and also in the level of discussion and the impetus it has given to the applications of our science in several directions, to which I will return below.

But first the outline. There were over 110 participants from home and abroad including representatives from Belgium, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, Germany, The Netherlands, Norway, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Spain, Sweden and Yugoslavia. In spite of several much regretted last-minute withdrawals there were 28 fine papers on a wide range of topics, which forced us to run parallel sessions and record the lectures. This was a great boon to me as organiser as I missed most of the papers because I was doing something else! The papers I did catch were obviously as good as the ones I didn't, and I am now engaged in the onerous task of selecting those to be published. Watch this space for further details of what will be a most significant volume.

It would obviously be invidious for me as organiser to select favourite papers, especially since I am also editing them, but I would like to draw attention to what was one of the most successful events of the three days. This was the Workshop Evening, totally organised by the participants themselves. On the evening of the 12th April, in spite of being on the go since 9.15 a.m. and hearing up to eight 45-minute sessions, Lars Evenson (Trondheim), Andrew Gilling (Nottingham), Monika Krenn (Munich) and Eugene Winter (Hatfield) ran workshops as diverse as 'Applied discourse studies','Discourse analysis and Foreign Language teaching', 'Utterance structure and utterance function', and 'Texts in English Language teaching'. About sixty people took part in the four sessions, which were a resounding success. The Krenn meeting on EFL went on from 7.30 until well after 10 with a most distinguished range of discutants, and one result of the Evensen group is that it is planned to look into the setting up of a Nordic Group/Project for Applied Discourse Studies. Details of this will be discussed at the Second Nordic Conference for English Studies at Hanaholmen, Finland, and anyone who wishes to get involved should get in touch with Lars S. Evensen whose report on the workshop appears below.

My abiding impression of the Conference as a whole was the friendly and positive approach of my fellow scholars to the problems, both theoretical and practical, of a very wide range of work associated with texts. The sorts of text discussed included schoolroom interaction, police interviews involving the exercise of power by one participant on the other, translations where the differences between the interpretative strategies of the expert and the outsider were highlighted, literary texts, children's reading, and the speech of the mentally disturbed. Practically the whole range of uses of language in the modern world was represented by one or other participant. That all this was enjoyed by other participants can be seen by the number of our guests who were kind enough to write afterwards to express their appreciation. I would like to urge anyone else contemplating cooperation to get going, as it can only be recommended!

We at Hatfield are hoping to capitalise on the momentum generated by the success of the Discourse Conference by having a follow-up event in the autumn

of 1984 on current work on the Contemporary English Language. I have the feeling that textual studies will bulk large again, but we also hope to attract papers on grammar and phonetics, over and above the areas handled this year. Pre-planning is well under way and we hope to make an announcement soon.

ii) Eugene WINTER:

This conference was run between the 11th and the 13th April 1983 on the Hatfield Campus. Arrangements were made so that foreign visitors could stay overnight until the 14th April. The Conference was a success both financially and in terms of the goodwill it generated for BAAL and the Polytechnic in the British and European Community.

There were in excess of 110 participants (counting casual visitors not included in the list below), of whom 25 came from abroad. There was a particularly strong contingent from Sweden where work on The Survey of English Usage is being conducted by Professor Jan Svartvik. Of British participants, both the universities and the polytechnics were well represented. The standard of papers was high, with speakers from most of the institutions known for their work in this area, in which group Hatfield must be included.

Because of the large number of papers offered for this conference, we ran two sessions in tandem, with 17 papers in each strand. This was unfortunate for those who had clashes of interest but it was the only way we could give all speakers a fair hearing. As it was, all the papers attracted healthy and keen audiences. We stuck to the rule that the speaker speaks for 30 minutes and answers questions for the remaining 15 minutes, and nobody had any difficulty in complying. Where permission was granted, the talks were tape-recorded so that members of the audience could get their own copies. On Tuesday evening (12th April) there were four informal workshops in which interested speakers addressed the audiences which were attracted to their particular approaches to discourse analysis (see reports by Monaghan and Evensen). It does seem as if there was something for everybody to think about. Many old friends met again and new friendships were made, with exchanges of addresses and presumably papers to follow.

As is usual in conferences, three of the speakers were unable to come for various reasons. They were: Professor G. Graustein from Karl Marx University, Leipzig, and Michael Gregory and Karen Malcolm from York University, Toronto. In these cases we simply moved up speakers from the rear to fill their places. We were very impressed the Mersedeh Proctor, who moved to the 14.00 slot on Wednesday afternoon, had a 'full house'.

It is very difficult to single out performers from the excellent speakers at this conference, but some of the highlights were as follows: Dr. Gillian Brown (Edinburgh), as one of our lead speakers, on 'Modelling discourse participants' knowledge'; Bengt Altenberg (Lund) 'Causal connection in speech and writing'; Ivan Lowe (SIL) 'Two approaches to the pragmatics of cause and reason'; Peter French (Ripon) & John Local (York) 'Lexicosyntactic clues to illocutionary meaning'; Geoffrey Lewis 'Young children's perception of text dynamics in prose'; Jean Withington (Hatfield) 'Interclause connection by coordination with and in spoken narrative'; Basil Hatim (Heriot-Watt) 'Discourse structure in advanced language teaching'; and finally special mention should be made of the contingent from Ulster: John Wilson & Brendun Gunn 'Initiating topic in conversation: The intonational ordering of entailments', and Michael McTear 'Conversational incompetence: a case study'.

The publishers were well in evidence, with stalls by Geo. Allen & Unwin, Cambridge University Press, Longman and Oxford University Press. A measure of the success of the conference speakers was that we have since had offers of publication for the proceedings from two interested publishers who were also participants to the conference.

Finally, we come back to the physics of the conference. We have not met such a lively, stimulating audience for years, and there is no doubt that it was this keen participation that ensured the success of the speakers themselves. We made sure the food was good so that if anyone needed conso-lation in the simplest way, they had it. We learned a lot from this confer-ence and hope to put it into practice with our next one. This is planned for early September 1984, and is concerned with a discussion of English Language Syllabuses for Tertiary Education. As an application of Linguistics to the teaching of English it ought to interest everybody.

iii)   Afaf ELMENOUFY:

The word 'discourse' is the most frequently used word nowadays —it has almost replaced the word 'language'! So it was not surprising that the Hatfield conference on discourse structure should attract so many participants: some of whom, like myself, baffled and bewildered by the great amount of material published in the field, were anxious to find some 'leading threads'.

The number of papers presented at the conference was great, as showed the two 'programmes' running parallel in the two conference rooms. One always had to make a choice and this was not always easy when all the titles were equally interesting. However, this allowed for smaller groups of partici-pants in each paper and consequently more chance for questions and interes-ting discussion.

Among the papers that stimulated discussion were the two (related) papers: Bengt Altenberg's (Lund, Sweden) 'Causal ordering strategies in English con-versation' and Ivan Lowe's (Summer Institute of Linguistics, England) 'Two ways of looking at causes and reasons'. The former raised arguments as to what a 'causal relation' is and the status of certain connectives (e.g. 'so') as regards this relation. The latter, being a descriptive account of the two types of because-clauses (cause and reason) at the linguistic (grammatical) and pragmatic levels, was interesting in the way it reflected the interrelation between the varied dimensions —grammatical, pragmatic and even logical— that have to be taken into account in the description of this fragment of English.

Hans Arndt's (Aarhus, Denmark) 'Cognitive verbs and the indication of utter-ance function' was particularly illuminating in its discussion of the role of certain verbs which are traditionally grouped together as being structurally similar (i.e. the 'reporting' verbs, like 'know', 'think', 'suggest', 'wonder' etc.) in signalling different functions for utterances in discourse —thus suggesting interesting similarities with the modal verbs on the one hand and the so-called performative verbs on the other hand.

The much discussed time-tense relations in English —also a source of many problems in language teaching— were the subject of Werner Hüllen's (Essen, West Germany) paper 'On denoting time in discourse', interestingly showing time as a textual, not sentential, feature, realised over chunks of texts through tenses, adverbs, and certain particles and lexical features, and then relating the textual feature to particular 'genres' of discourse.

/...

The very interesting presentation of Jenny Thomas and Christopher Candlin's (Lancaster, England) 'The language of unequal encounter: a pragmatic analysis of a police interview', made one (at least me!) wonder whether the hordes of paralinguistic and non-linguistic elements involved in such a communication situation can actually be pinpointed in a way that shows their systematic relevance to and interaction with the linguistic elements.

An attempt to do that was presented by Erich Steiner's (The Polytechnic of Wales) 'theory of activity', put forward in his 'Proposal for the analysis of spoken discourse in children's talk': "it is necessary to bring together a theory of activity and a theory of language to cover doing, meaning and saying in human interaction."

The excellent performance of Basil Hatim's (Heriot-Watt, Edinburgh) 'Discourse structure in advanced language teaching, with special reference to Arabic', showed that he must be a very good teacher: not a dull moment and very convincing!

In fact one can say this about this (semi-)international conference as a whole: that there was no dull moment at any point. The excellent organisation, reflected even in the catering, meant that we were well nourished not only mentally but also physically —a pleasant surprise for foreigners, among whom English food is as notorious as English spelling! The list of participants' names and addresses given on arrival facilitated social contact during the period of the conference and academic contact afterwards —a goal that any conference must primarily aim to achieve. I am sure that all participants share my feeling of having benefited from and enjoyed this occasion very much.

* * *
* Dr. Elmenoufy is at present spending a sabbatical year in London attached to the University of London Institute of Education (ESOL Dept). She can be contacted c/o June Card, 16 West Park Avenue, Kew, Richmond TW9 4AL. She teaches in the Dept. of English, Faculty of Arts, Cairo University.

iv) <u>Applied Discourse Studies Workshop</u>, chaired by Lars Sigfred EVENSEN (Dept. of Applied Linguistics, Univ. of Trondheim, N-7055 Dragvoll, Norway), who writes:-

The first part of the workshop focused on the problems confronting a researcher approaching a large corpus of student compositions.

The Trondheim Corpus of Applied Linguistics was referred to as an illustrative example. This Corpus consists of 2943 student compositions, half of which are written in Norwegian (L1), and half in English (FL). The compositions are coded in such a way as to make it possible to relate linguistic analyses of each composition to a questionnaire filled in by the student writer, giving his/her views on what constitutes problem areas in the learning of the language. The questionnaire also contains some background information about each student. Approaching such a corpus, the researcher has to decide which linguistic features to focus on and which methods to use in the analyses. For larger corpora, the question of methods is very problematic. Large corpora require computer-aided analyses, and, although some programs are becoming available, there still is a very long way to go before enough theoretically adequate and operative programmes are available.

The second part of the workshop was devoted to a discussion of specific discourse problems in language teaching.

Several of the problems that were discussed rest on the pragmatic differences between speech and writing. In speech, reference usually presents no problem because the extra-linguistic context is common to the interlocutors, and they can usually make adequate assumptions about each other's knowledge of the world. Furthermore, in oral communication, logical relationships within the discourse may to a considerable extent be left unmarked, or, when markers are used, a very small number may play a multifunctional role (e.g. the item 'and').

Many students, when writing, are unable to adjust the message to the new pragmatic situation. The discourse effects of this lack of adjustment is felt particularly strongly in the areas of reference items/deictics and discourse connecters (adverbials and conjunctions). Some students use pronouns where no referent is available to the reader either in the text or in the extra-linguistic context. The effects of such 'zero referent items' (Paula Lieber's term) may be that a passage becomes totally unintelligible. The lack of logical markers in written (esp. argumentative) discourse may also result in breakdowns of communication, as was shown by examples taken from Joost Buysschaert's (Kortrijk) corpus. Text-type/verb-form correspondences are a second class of rules that are problematic in language teaching. In narrative texts, unmarked sentences have a past form of the verb. In expository/ argumentative texts, unmarked sentences have a present form of the verb. Such unmarked sequences may be broken according to a complicated rule system. In a few instances, the rules are relatively easy to state (e.g. the pluperfect marking of breakdowns in the verbal sequence = chronological sequence correspondence in narrative). In many instances, however, the rules are not adequately described yet.

In the third part of the workshop, the discussion centred around practical approaches to the teaching of discourse.

In the preceding section, problems with reference and logical markers were ascribed to students' lack of recognition of the different pragmatic contexts of speech and writing. Recognition alone might not be sufficient, but several of the workshop participants reported positive effects of recognition exercises on student performance in these areas. A second approach which was reported to be useful is to use the unmarked/marked distinctions to produce alternative text versions that are compared and discussed in class with a view to discourse effects. Such an approach has proved to be successful in the teaching of logical markers and theme-rheme sequences and might be tried out in other areas, too. Cloze procedures represent a third approach which was reported to be useful in the teaching of logical markers. Such procedures have been tried out in Finnish research and seem to work well. A fourth approach, summary writing, may be used in connection with work on the textual macro-level. Such exercises prove to be relatively difficult for some students, however.

The workshop participants felt that the discussions were useful, both with regard to the views expressed and the contacts made. Despite its importance, applied discourse studies is still a relatively new area, and most of the work remains to be done. It is therefore to be hoped that a considerable research effort will be devoted to the study of discourse problems in the years to come.

(Workshop participants: Buysschaert; Coulon; Evensen; R. Hardie, Brighton Poly; P. Hoyle, Hatfield student; Lindeberg; Rogovska; Vandenbergen; White; Wood.)

Hatfield Discourse Conference cont.

v)   Speakers

The Conference provided a booklet of abstracts, which included the
programme as a centre two-page spread and an alphabetical list of speakers
and their papers.

Altenberg (Lund):   Causal connection in speech and writing.
Arndt (Aarhus):   Cognitive verbs and the indication of utterance function.
Bennett (London):   The nature of human discourse of the human nature of discourse.
Brown (Edinburgh):   Modelling discourse participants' knowledge.
Chapman & Anderson (OU):   The effects of increasing amounts of context on the
   resolution of cohesive ties.
Coulon (Kent):   Discourse analysis and the reading of specialist foreign
   language texts.
Evensen (Trondheim):   Student and teacher perceptions of difficulty in discourse.
French (Ripon) & Local (York):   Lexico-syntactic clues to illocutionary meaning.
Haden (Essex):   Discourse error analysis.
Hartman (Exeter):   Contrastive textology and bilingual lexicography.
Hatim (Heriot-Watt):   Discourse structure in advanced language teaching—
   Contributions from Arabic.
Hüllen (Essen):   On denoting time in discourse.
Krenn (Munich):   A problem of reference in discourse.
Lauerback (Frankfort):   Face-work in repairs.
Lewis (Birmingham):   Young children's perception of text dynamics in narrative prose.
Lowe (SIL):   Two approaches to the pragmatics of cause and reason.
MacLure (NFER):   Discourse structure and interpretive strategies in adult-
   child talk.
McTear (Ulster P.) Conversational incompetence: a case study.
Meyer: Some observations on the signalling of structure in technical discourse.
Proctor: An investigation of the analysis of written discourse.
Steiner (Poly of Wales):   A proposal for the analysis of spoken discourse in
   children's talk.
Stenström (Lund): Really in speech and writing.
Thavenius (Lund): Pronominal chains – a structure and function in spoken and
   written English.
Thomas & Candlin (Lancaster):   The language of "unequal encounters":   a prag-
   matic analysis of a police interview.
Toolan (Singapore):   Analyzing conversation in literature.
Wilson & Gunn (Ulster P.) Initiating topic in conversation: the intonational
   ordering of entailments.
Winter (Hatfield):   Two basic text relations in English.
Withington (Hatfield):   Inter clause connection by co-ordination with and in
   spoken narrative.

vi)   Participants   (103 names with mini-addresses, BAAL members' names under-
   lined.   Not everybody present all the time.   Participants received a list
   with full addresses on arrival.)

W.AITKEN Fac Educ Camb. U; Femi AKINDELE Engl Nott. U;   Bengt ALTENBERG Engl
Lund U;   Eleanor ANDERSON Educ Open U;   Hans ARNDT Engl Aarhus U, Denmark;
W.A.BENNETT Fr King's Coll London U;   Margaret BERRY Engl Nott. U;   Ruth B. BIRNIE
Hum Newcastle Poly;   T.C.BOOKLESS Chipping Sodbury BS12 6HW;   Greg BROOKS NFER
Slough;   Gillian BROWN Lings Edin. U; Cathryn BUCKINGHAM Tockwith;   Jean BURRELL
Oxford OX4 1SU;   Joost BUYSSCHAERT Kortrijk Belgium;   Christopher N. CANDLIN
Ling Lancaster U;   Penny CARTER CUP Cambridge;   John CHAPMAN Educ Open U;
R.J.M.COULON Langs & Lings Kent U;   Malcolm COULTHARD Eng Lang Res Birmingham U;

Winifred CROMBIE Ling Hatfield Poly; Ros CROUCH St. Albans; E.C.DAVIES Eng Bedford Coll U London; Florence DAVIES Sheffield; Alex de JOIA Ling Hatfield Poly; Adrian du PLESSIS CUP Cambridge; Sylvia DULLINGER München West Germany; Neville EDWARDS Milton Keynes; Afaf ELMENOUFY Richmond TW9 4AL; Lars Sigfred EVENSEN Appl Ling Trondheim Norway; Salwa FARAG Birmingham; Jane FREELAND Southampton SO1 5AW; Peter FRENCH Coll St. John Ripon; Peter GANNON HMI DES Chelmsford; Andrew GILLING Nottingham NG7 5JE; Brendan GUNN Ling Ulster Poly Newtownabbey; Rod G. HADEN Colchester CO1 2TB; Jennifer Levy HALFORD City of London Poly; R.R.K. HARTMANN Lang Cent Exeter U; Basil HATIM Langs Heriot-Watt U Edinburgh EH1 1HX; Janet M.D. HIGGINS Hilderstone Centre Broadstairs; Tuula HIRVONEN Eng Jyväskyla U Finland; Roger HORROCKS Lings Hatfield Poly; J.P. HOUTKOOP-STEENSTRA Katholieke Hogeschool Le Tilburg Holland; Werner HULLEN U Essen Gesamthochschule West Germany; Tony JAMES Bentley Ipswich; Ries JONES Hilderstone Centre Broadstairs; Irena JURAK, UNESCO-IOCD Ljubljana Yugoslavia; Hugh KEITH Langs Heriot-Watt U; J.P.KENT Queen's College U Cambridge; Joanne KENWORTHY Educ NE London Poly; James KERR Langen W. Germany; Monika KRENN München W. Germany; Margaret LANG Lang Heriot-Watt U; Susan M. LASCHE Bayreuth U, W. Germany; Eeva LEINONEN Exeter EX4 6TG; G.E. LEWIS Sutton Coldfield B73 5DR; Ann-Charlotte LINDEBERG Swedish Sch Econ Helsinki Finland; John LOCAL Lang York; Ivan LOWE SIL High Wycombe; Nicole McBRIDE Lang North London Poly; Margaret MACLURE NFER Slough; Michael F. McTEAR Comm Stud Ulster Poly; Katherine MENDEL-SOHN OUP Oxford; T.W. MESSENGER Lang Brighton Poly; Paul G. MEYER Frankfurt W. Germany; Sam MICKLEM Bradford & Ilkley Comm Coll; W. Keith MITCHELL Eng Stud U Edinburgh; James MONAGHAN Ling Hatfield Poly; David H. MORGAN Telford TF7 5NA; M.J. OCKENDEN Lang Edge Hill Coll of HE Ormskirk; Mersedeh PROCTOR St. Austell; A.K. PUGH Open U, Leeds; Helena RIGBY Warrington WA4 3ER; Ruth RILEY Lit Trent Poly Nottingham; G.T. ROBERTS London E17 6LH; Pauline ROBINSON CALS Reading; Teresa ROGOVSKA London N4; Ramsey W. RUTHERFORD U Bielefeld, W. Germany; Philip SHAW Lang Centre Newcastle U; Paul W. SIMPSON Comm Stud Ulster Poly Belfast; Erich STEINER Comm Stud Poly of Wales; Anna-Brik STENSTROM Eng Lund U Sweden; Janig STEPHENS Datchworth Green SG3 6RX; Michael SWAN Didcot OX11 OSP; P.W. TENCH Eng UWIST Cardiff; Cecilia THAVENIUS Eng Lund U Sweden; Colin THOMAS Jeddah Saudi Arabia; J.A. THOMAS Ling Lancaster U; Sonja TIRKKONEN-CONDIT Transl Stud U Joensuu Savonlinna Finland; Michael TOOLAN National U Singapore; Geoffrey J. TURNER Ling Hatfield Poly; Jean URE Eng Stud U Edinburgh; Anne-Marie VANDENBERGEN Eng Lang U Gent Belgium; Asdis VATNSDAL Laurencekirk AB3 1AA; Natasa VESEL-KRAIGHER, UNESCO-IOCD Ljubljana Yogoslavia; Cliff WATERMAN Hatfield AL10 8LP; Erich WEISSMANN Tech Hochschule Darmstadt W. Germany; Jane WHITE NFER Slough; David WILKINS CALS U.Reading; John WILSON Ling Comm Stud Ulster Poly Newtownabbey; Eugene WINTER Ling Hatfield Poly; Mrs. J.M. WITHINGTON Worcester WR5 3BN; Alistair WOOD, UNESCO-IOCD Ljubljana Yugoslavia.

2.   Linguistics Association of Great Britain
     Connie CULLEN reporting from Another Place

This year's annual general meeting of the Linguistics Association of Great Britain was held at Sorby Hall, University of Sheffield (Wed.23 - Fri.25 March). The meeting was well attended and had a very full programme (24 papers rather than the 18-20 more usual at the Spring meeting).

    A departure this year was the pre-conference workshop on Generalized Phrase Structure Grammar, organized for the uninitiated, to teach them some of the basic beliefs and practices of GPSG. Gerald Gazdar (Sussex), Ewan Klein

(Newcastle) and Bob Borsley (UCL) each spoke for about half an hour and there was considerable discussion. Afterwards, there seemed to be a consensus among the audience that their understanding of GPSG had been advanced and that they would now hear the (many) conference papers written within the framework with greater interest and comprehension.

The conference proper began with the 1983 LAGB Lecture, given by Eve Clark (Stanford) on 'Productivity in the Lexicon'. Professor Clark was interested in the question of how productivity might be objectively defined ... whether it correlated best with frequency, regularity of process or 'simplicity'... and reported on research designed to distinguish these possibilities.

Most striking at the meeting was the large number of papers which made use of the framework of Generalized Phrase Structure Grammar (the increasing importance of which was reported in last spring's BAAL Report (N/L14) from the LAGB). There were papers on relative clauses in Irish (Sells, Amherst) and Welsh (Harlow, York), on coordination of constituents in English (Russell, Sussex), on agreement in Greek (Cann, Sussex), on the status of the feature TRANSITIVE in the system (Trask, Liverpool), on English Auxiliaries (Warner, York), on re-casting Ross's Left Branch Condition (Flickinger, Stanford) and on some theoretical arguments for the existence of phrase structure rules (Barlow, Stanford).

Other syntactic theories were also represented: papers by Borsley (UCL) on Welsh case agreement and by Haegeman (Ghent) on complementizer agreement in Flemish made (critical) reference to Chomsky's theory of government and binding; Wood (UCL) explored the status of 'lexical rules' in a Lexicalist approach to syntax; and Steedman (Warwick) offered a Categorial approach to subject/verb relations in English, German and Dutch.

Two more syntax papers, with less obvious theoretical allegiance, were by van Oirsouw on coordination reduction in English and Dutch, and by Gotteri (the local organizer of the conference at Sheffield) on tense and aspect in Bulgarian. Cormack (SOAS) gave a semantic account of so-called VP deletion.

Non-syntax papers were, you will have noticed, thinner on the ground. Adamson (Strathclyde) looked at narrative structure to explore the question of the relationship between semantics and style; Allan & Carr (Edinburgh) discussed the falsifiability of the Transparency Principle, with reference to the history of the English modals; Coates (Sussex) and Spencer (Speech & Drama, London) combined to produce a session on phonology – with Coates speaking on how to argue for a 'best' solution to a phonological problem and Spencer suggesting that the feature LATERAL should be dispensed with; Brockway (UCL) suggested ways in which the use of pragmatic connectives influences linguistic meaning; Crocker (Newcastle) explored the sexist implications of sexual colloquialisms in English; and Clarkson (Mannheim) reported on new trends in language contact studies in Europe.

News from the Business Meeting Neil Smith (Chairman) and Gerald Gazdar (Secretary) were re-elected (without opposition) for another 3-year term. The membership fee will remain the same next year —£2.50 for membership without the Journal. (Applications of membership to: Andrew Compton, Membership Secretary LAGB, Dept. of Linguistics, University of Nottingham, Nottingham NG7 2RD; further information appears inside the back cover of JL.) And the financial state of the LAGB continues to be robust!

/...

It was also agreed that a permanent section should be established on 'Educational Linguistics', to provide a forum at each LAGB meeting for the discussion of some issue of interest to both linguists and educationalists. The discussions will last for about two hours, and will be timetabled in parallel with other papers. (See V, Notes, for further details.)

C.C.

* *
* I hope the Newsletter will be able to give information on Generalised Phrase Structure Grammar in its next issue.—Ed.

---

3.   **34th Annual Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics**
'Applied Linguistics and the Preparation of Second Language Teachers: towards a Rationale'. Georgetown University, Washington, D.C., 9-12 March 1983.

i)   **Christopher BRUMFIT**

The Georgetown Round Tables —and even more their proceedings— provide a highly valued focus for people wishing to keep in touch with the latest and best work in linguistics, broadly interpreted. Consequently, it is sad to have to report a slight sense of disappointment after the 1983 Round Table, which was on a topic central to the interests of many members of BAAL. Certainly the disappointment cannot be attributed to the organisers. Jim Alatis, David Stern and Peter Strevens collected together as impressive a group of speakers as could be desired by even the most determined name-spotter, with (among others equally eminent) Larsen-Freeman, Rivers, Coste, Freudenstein, Finocchiaro, Fanselow, Di Pietro, Stevick, Candlin, Edelhoff, Krashen, Dulay & Burt and Trim. Altogether thirty-five scholars presented papers, of whom slightly over half were from the States, and the others from Canada, Europe and Japan. All participants had been circulated well in advance with an admirable document outlining the possible scope of the meeting, and David Stern opened with an excellent overview of the important issues.

But perhaps the expectations of some of the overseas participants were raised too high by a misunderstanding of the terms 'Round Table' and 'towards'. Instead of tournaments and jousting, a pursuit of the Grail —or at least of the best available negotiated Truth— we found ourselves part of a rapid series of presentations with scarcely time for questions and no time at all for discussion. On two consecutive days we had fourteen papers, each of 20 minutes to half-an-hour, with the odd question thrown in at the end. The audience was large, and there was never any extended formal discussion at any point in the total of three days' work; if we wanted to move 'towards' a new position we had to do it during the coffee breaks.

Now of course much of the value of the Round Table lies in the published proceedings, and participants will no doubt be polishing their papers before publication. In fact, though, the issue of an applied linguistics rationale was rarely addressed, except peripherally. We did have a number of useful reports of research projects on matters relating to teacher preparation, a few papers specifically addressed key issues such as the role of research and training to do research in teacher preparation, and a few discussed the kinds of models necessary as a basis for teacher education or training. Most papers,

however, were interesting accounts of various experiences in teacher
preparation which rarely moved beyond specifics to discussable principles.
This was a pity, for participants had much to learn from each other, and
the product of a full, debating interaction could have been very fruitful
for the profession at large —teacher trainers <u>and</u> applied linguists.

Perhaps these comments indicate that the whole notion of a rationale
for teacher preparation is premature, that we need more discussion and
ground-clearing to negotiate a common language. Certainly some kind of
more flexible follow-up is desirable, though it will no doubt have to be
done with smaller groups and on a more local basis. In the opinion of
one participant at least, we were thrown the ball, but we are still
fumbling it.

<div align="right">C.B.</div>

ii)   Peter <u>STREVENS</u>:

I am diffident about commenting on the sensitive and basically sympathetic
review by Chris Brumfit of the 1983 Georgetown University Round Table on
Languages and Linguistics. Nevertheless I should like to add some details
to Chris's picture.

From my standpoint, the major value of G.U.R.T. '83 lay in the acceptance
by Georgetown University, against most expectations, of teacher training as a
topic for a Round Table. It is not only in Britain that one may encounter in
some quarters a kind of intellectual snobbery against matters 'educational',
let alone about 'teaching', while in the United States particularly the term
<u>applied linguistics</u> is rejected by many theoretical linguists. The first
stage, which Jim Alatis achieved through his consummate skills in negotiation,
blandishment and organisation, was to get it accepted by those at Georgetown
University that there are indeed important intellectual considerations,
matters of theory and principle and rationale, in the preparation of teachers
of foreign languages. In short, it was a real coup to get the theme agreed
in the first place.

Next, it was to me remarkable how much representation was possible of views
and ideas from outside the United States. Of course the Round Tables always
have international representation among their participants —who, by the way,
are always invited: unlike TESOL, you do not offer a paper and hope to be
selected, but are in effect commissioned by the organisers— but a glance at
the Round Table themes and programmes of the past decade suggests that the
Round Tables have been overwhelmingly events within the American traditions
of linguistic activities. This time there was a strong representation of
European attitudes and philosophies, again largely due to Jim Alatis's open-
ness of mind. (With hindsight I am somewhat ashamed that we did not bring
in more scholars from developing countries, but even just to import ideas
from Germany, France, Austria, Britain and Canada, and to juxtapose them
with the U.S. traditions and models, seemed a worthwhile goal, which in the
event was achieved.)

Thirdly, I personally found much benefit in this opportunity for close
comparison and contrast of different philosophies, theories, goals, aims,
administrative systems, etc.

Thereafter of course I agree entirely with Chris Brumfit that the event
was overcrowded, perhaps incoherent, intellectually unstructured, lacking in

agreed outcome, frustrating in its lack of opportunity for discussion.
That being said, I feel that G.U.R.T. '83 was remarkable for being a
first occasion for the tabling of a wide range of principled ideas about
theories of language learning and teaching: now let us hope for the second,
and the third....   P.S.

* *
 * Christopher gave a paper on 'The interpretation of theory and practice';
Peter, Co-chairman with James Alatis and H.H. (David) Stern, gave a paper on
'Teacher training and changes in society'. Other BAAL members present at
GURT '83 were: Christopher Candlin ('Principles and problems for INSET in
implementing a communicative curriculum'); Patrick Early ('Teacher training
in the field —Some observations on in-service teacher-training in overseas
settings'); Richard Handscombe ('The leadership component in the professional
development of ESL teachers'); Michael Long (Univ. of Hawaii at Manoa:
'Training the Second Language teacher as classroom researcher'); Sam Spicer,
who chaired a session consisting of Candlin, Edelhoff (Hesse, Germany), and
Early; and CILT, in the person of John Trim ('Organising European cooperation
in the preparation of Second Language teachers').

---

4. 8th International Linguistic Symposium at Trier University, with
    George Lakoff: Cognitive Linguistics (Trier, West Germany, 21-24 March 1983).

Richard ALEXANDER writes:

This was the eighth symposium to be organized by L.A.U.T. (the Linguistic
Agency at the University of Trier) under the able leadership of Professor
René Dirven of the English Department of the University of Trier. These
symposia are intended to give European linguists the opportunity to hear
distinguished scholars lecture on their work. Charles Fillmore was the
first to come, in 1978, and he has been followed by John Searle, William
Labov, Edward Keenan, Michael Halliday, Eve and Herbert Clarke and David
Crystal. The format consists of two or three days of lectures by the
distinguished scholar accompanied by discussion from the floor.
   George Lakoff used the occasion to present the various facets of his
theory of cognitive linguistics. This is an interdisciplinary alternative
to generative linguistics. For two and a half days George Lakoff lectured
in an extremely coherent and always entertaining fashion, despite the set-
back of almost losing his voice completely on the second day (after the
wine-tasting session, of which more anon). For one who, like myself, had
been fascinated by Irregularity in Syntax (1965) and tantalized by 'Linguis-
tic Gestalts' (in Papers from the Thirteenth Regional Meeting of the Chicago
Linguistic Society, 1977), this was the opportunity to get up to date and
hear the latest developments 'straight from the horse's mouth'.
   There is no space to deal exhaustively with the broad sweep of Lakoff's
work, but a brief summary of the six sessions he talked at will perhaps
more than hint at the delights and promises of cognitive linguistics.

Session 1: Categories and Cognitive Models   This lecture reviewed current
research on human categorization being done in the United States. The
lecture brought out the indispensable role in Lakoff's theory played by
Eleanor Rosch's prototypes, basic levels and idealized cognitive models.
(For those interested in following this up the Linguistic Agency at the

University of Trier prepublishes articles at cost price and has available
a paper by Lakoff entitled 'Categories and Cognitive Models', which is
part of a forthcoming book. The address to write to is L.A.U.T.,
D-5500 Trier, Fed. Rep. of Germany.)

Session 2: Metaphorical Thought was devoted to a summary presentation
of Lakoff's contention that linguistic metaphors are the consequences
of metaphorical thought. Again, the main findings are already in print
in Lakoff and Johnson's best-seller, Metaphors We Live By (London & Chicago,
Chicago University Press, 1980). It is heartening to see linguists turning
to the analysis of metaphor again. (A later offering by Johnson and Lakoff,
'Metaphor and Communication', is likewise available from L.A.U.T.)

Session 3: Language and Mental Imagery This lecture presented a selection
from the copious research being done at Berkeley on the 'idealized cognitive
models' (ICMs) or images underlying both the prepositional system and idio-
matic phenomena in English.

Session 4: Elements of the Sound Symbolism System Lakoff here attempted
to incorporate the fairly well-attested facts of phonological iconicity,
in particular what he terms 'experiential clusters', i.e. initial and final
consonant clusters with their semantic relationships, into his overall
cognitive scheme. While the data and the claims for them are not particu-
larly original (cf. Robert Lord's work on 'homonemes'), Lakoff's endeavour
to weave sound symbolism into his theory was fascinating.

Session 5: Prototypes in Syntax Lakoff began this session by taking
generative syntax to task for excluding, almost by definition, 98% of the
constructions of most languages from its field of study; Chomsky has
reduced the empirical domain of syntax to cover what he styles 'core
grammar'. Against this, cognitive grammar is a return to the detailed
study of complex syntax, making use of what has been learned about cognition
in the past decade. Lakoff then looked in detail at three types of THERE
sentences and their various subtypes:-

DEICTIC (D)	THERE'S Harry in the yard.
Perceptual	There's the doorbell.
Discourse	There's a nice point.
Change of Existence	There goes the last of the leftovers.
Presentational	THERE is buried the father of our country.
OCCURRENCE (O)	There's a man in the yard.
Change:	There ensued a riot.
Strange:	There's a man been shot.
Presentational:	There entered the room a tall man with electric green hair.
EXISTENCE (E)	There's carbon in a diamond.
Substance	There's a lot to what he says.
List	There's the car, the house, the dogs ....
Presentational	There once lived in Transylvania an old lady with three sons.
Ontological	There is a Santa Clause.
Goal	There are papers to grade.

⋆

Session 6: Social and Artistic Issues The final session was explicitly
applied linguistics and brought out Lakoff's strong belief that linguistic
findings have relevance for the real world. In particular he discussed the
problems of making people aware of the sometimes pernicious metaphors they
employ, often unwittingly, to structure their perceptions and actions. This

was scarily brought out by a textual analysis of the discourse of American
men discussing women and in particular their (i.e. the men's) views on rape.
In their talk the potent metaphor of SEXUALITY IS A PHYSICAL FORCE was shown
to be omnipresent.

The difficulties of providing alternative metaphors are recognized by
Lakoff. He thinks linguists should not abdicate their responsibility
towards non-linguists; they should make their knowledge about how lang-
uage works and is used —in all its facets, both cognitive and social—
available to a wider public. (There speaks a genuine applied linguist!)
It comes as no surprise to hear that Lakoff has been collaborating with
Dwight Bolinger in recent years.

A special feature of the symposium was the devotion of a whole day to
15 papers given by other participants on a range of topics, some of which
addressed the issues of cognitive grammar face on, others of which took up
applied linguistic issues such as the understanding of metaphors and proverbs
by L2 learners. The fact that 40 of the 80 participants stayed on for the
fourth day is an indication of how interested people are in cognitive
linguistics.

The organisers thought the Symposium the most successful to date and I
certainly found it the most intellectually stimulating and enjoyable one
I have visited hitherto. There are, as yet, no definite plans for the
next symposium; it may take place next year. Dell Hymes has been invited,
but it is not yet clear whether he will be able to come.

Finally, a word about the informal side of the programme. The efficiency
of the International Linguistic Symposia has become a byword; the sociability
of the people gathered there no less. What more salubrious surroundings can
one imagine than a wine-tasting session in the evening, when white wine from
the Moselle valley flowed in plenty and cognitive linguistics really had the
chance to demonstrate that it is the human face of linguistics?

Richard Alexander

formerly of the
University of Bremen
West Germany

.
* A list of the papers published by L.A.U.T. can be obtained from the
address given by Richard under Session 1.

5. Colloquium on Psycholinguistics and Language Pathology organised by
    the Sub-department of Speech, University of Newcastle-upon-Tyne (Newcastle,
    19-20 November 1982).

Ron BERESFORD writes:

Numbers were deliberately restricted in order to facilitate discussion,
and booking preference was given to those attending both days. This
produced numbers sufficient to break even, plus some profit, but meant
those wishing to attend for one day were initially turned down. As it
happened, one-day attendance was later accepted, but too late for some
intending applicants previously excluded —the present writer for one.

Reports from several attenders indicate that it was a very satisfactory
meeting, although expensive if long-distance travel was necessary. Discus-
sion was lively and fruitful.

A list of speakers and their papers follows. Speakers' addresses
can be supplied on application to the Sub-department of Speech.
Abstracts were available at the meeting, and these can be augmented by
offprints where speakers have agreed.

<u>Processing of written language</u> Max Coltheart (Birkbeck): Current
psycholinguistic work on acquired dyslexias and dysgraphias; Tim Shallice
(MRC Appl. Psych. Unit, Cambridge): Does acquired dyslexia have relevance
for models of normal reading? Karalyn Patterson & Frances M. Hatfield
(MRC APU Cambridge): Disorders of spelling; Leslie Henderson: Discussion.
<u>Language comprehension</u> Anne Cutler (Sussex): Auditory comprehension: the
role of prosody; Elaine Funnell (Reading): Sensory semantics: one key to
language processes and a basis for therapy; Rosemary Stevenson and Melanie
Vitkovich (Durham): Syntactic and pragmatic constraints on reference assign-
ment; Lorraine Tyler (Max Planck, Nijmegen/APU Camb.): Real-time processes
in spoken language understanding; Pat Rabbitt: Discussion. <u>Language Produc-
tion</u>: Peter Howell (UCL): Do stutterers have problems using auditory
feedback? Brian Butterworth (UCL): Control processes in sentence construc-
tion: asphasic and normal speech compared; Geoffrey Beattie (Sheffield):
How useful are pauses and hesitations as indices of verbal planning?
Andrew Ellis and Diane Miller (Lancaster): Neologistic jargon aphasia and
normal language production; David Howard: Discussion. <u>Developmental
Aspects</u>: Barbara Dodd (Newcastle): Deviant phonological development: some
perceptual and productive characteristics; Kay Mogford (Newcastle): The
development of communication in young deaf children; Maggie Snowling (Nat.
Hosp. Coll. of Sp. Scs./UCL): Language difficulties in autistic children:
evidence from reading tasks; Dorothy Bishop: Discussion.

6. 11th Gregynog Anglo-French Conference: Writing. (Gregynog Hall, Newtown,
Powys, Mid-Wales, 11-13 March '83) Convenor: <u>Colin Evans</u>, French Dept.,
University College, Cardiff.

Gregynog (— ⸌ —) is the spacious, sequestered, atmospheric Conference
Centre of the University of Wales, equidistant from North and South Wales.
Don't be afraid of approaching it from England, as several of the thirty
or so participants did on this occasion. The annual Anglo-French Conferences
are a (hitherto) literary series pivoted on the French Dept at Cardiff, which
collaborates with its fellow English Dept and also sustains international
ties with France. <u>Colin Evans</u> tells me the topics of the Conferences have
always been "innovatory and controversial", but their form has only recently
come to match this. The topic this year was 'Writing', <u>tout court</u>. Of only
three plenary sessions, only one was a standard-model paper+discussion session.
For the rest we split into groups, for talking; and the groups, quite often,
split into individuals, for Writing. Much useful time and talk was spent on
the problems of academic writing both at staff and student level, a nucleus
of Cardiff undergraduates acting as catalysts. For the voice of the confer-
ence, see Colin in <u>THES</u> 20.5.83 and in the current issue of <u>Quinquereme</u> (ed.
Bill Brooks, Modern Languages Dept., University of Bath).
   Since standard-model conferences can be divided into paper+discussion and,
alas, paper+paper conferences (see Georgetown reports in this issue), it may
be worth thinking about non-standard formats within the flexibility afforded
by BAAL Seminars. (We've not had one on Writing.) Next year, in the wake of
Leverhulme, the topic at Gregynog will be 'What is the primary task of a
University?', and the form will draw upon 'new paradigm research'. There
will be no experts. But I don't see why there shouldn't be some interested
applied linguists.

<div align="right">John Mountford</div>

7. NEWS FROM CILT
   (Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research)

   contributed by Helen Lunt, Senior Research Information Officer

   CILT and BAAL have agreed that CILT will publish a collection of papers from BAAL's Annual Meeting 1982, around the theme of the Meeting, which was 'Learning and teaching languages for communication'. Ten papers (by Bloor, Dunning, Freedman, Holmes, Lees, Littlewood, Mitchell, Page, Parkinson and Trim - for titles see page ii of Newsletter no. 16) have now been edited by the Chairman, who has also contributed an Introduction, and CILT aims to publish the book this summer. If all goes well it will be available before, and probably at, this year's Annual Meeting. Details will be in the next Newsletter.

   Paul Meara, who was joint convenor of the BAAL Seminar on 'Words: teaching and learning vocabulary in a foreign language' (Leeds, 1980), has compiled a Specialised Bibliography, Vocabulary in a second language, which CILT has now published. It includes an introduction to the content of the bibliography, 280 items (articles and books) with abstracts, a supplementary bibliography without abstracts, and a very useful glossary, as well as subject and language indexes. Many of the items recorded are 'applied' in character and deal explicitly with the learning of vocabulary in foreign languages. Others deal with the verbal abilities of bilingual speakers, typically dealing with very specific models of a limited range of behaviour types, and making claims which are backed up by empirical evidence.

   The bibliography, like other CILT publications, is obtainable from Baker Book Services Ltd, Little Mead, Alfold Road, Cranleigh, Surrey GU6 8NU. Order code SB3, price £4.95 + 10% for p&p (UK), or 15% for p&p (overseas). (A5 paperback, 96pp.)

   The Language and Culture Guide series, in its revised and expanded form, will include 28 Guides to resources for the study of 30 languages that are not very widely taught in Britain. Specialists in these languages have contributed to the Guides and advised the Centre about their content. Five titles have now been published: Modern Greek, Polish, Portuguese, Romanian and Turkish. The Guides for Czech and Slovak and Serbo-Croat are scheduled for May; Finnish, Hungarian and Bulgarian are well advanced, with Modern Hebrew, Japanese, Swedish, Danish and Norwegian not far behind. An order form with details of the standing order/discount scheme for the Guides is available from CILT, 20 Carlton House Terrace, London SW1Y 5AP (tel 01-839 2626). Details are also in the CILT Publications Catalogue.

   Research Information. Sarah Death has taken up the post of Research Information Officer, which became vacant on the promotion of June Geach to the new post of Linguistic Minorities Information Officer (dealing with English as a second language and with mother tongues other than English). Sarah Death is working principally on the research register and on research enquiries. Her first degree was in German and Swedish and she has done research on Swedish literature, but in the Research Information section she handles information on research into any language, and into the learning/teaching of any language.

<u>The Language Teaching Library</u>, maintained jointly by CILT and the
British Council, is now <u>closed temporarily</u> for extensive alterations
including re-flooring and other building work. This work will take
until <u>about</u> the end of May.

The precise date of re-opening cannot yet be determined and it is
therefore advisable for anyone wishing to visit the Library to enquire
by telephone before coming. An announcement about the date of
re-opening will appear in the <u>Times Educational Supplement</u> and <u>Times
Higher Education Supplement.</u>

21.4.83   H.N.L.

8.   <u>NCLE (National Congress on Languages in Education)</u>

Early in May the Newsletter received Bob Powell's first report, since he
took on the job of coordinating its publicity, on the NCLE and its activities.
It deals (in 7 pages A4) with: The NCLE Programme (overview); Languages of
Minority Communities (W/P; discussion document); 16+ Criteria (W/P);
Language Awareness (W/P; Conference, Jan.'83); Language and Languages 16-19.
   The important Minorities discussion document appeared in full in the last
Newsletter (N/L17 pp12-15), together with an account of the NCLE and of its
Language Awareness activity (pp5-11) generously supplied by Gillian Donmall.
To complete the picture of current activity we reproduce below Bob Powell's
sections on '16+ Criteria' and '16-19'. A list of Constituent Organisations
of NCLE will be found at the end.
   Bob Powell is Lecturer in Education at the University of Bath, and a
member of NCLE's Standing Committee 1982-84. As he points out, CILT provides
the services of a secretariat for NCLE, and all enquiries and correspondence
should be addressed to Alan Moys (Secretary to the Standing Committee,
NCLE) at CILT, 20 Carlton House Terrace London SW1Y 5AP (Tel: 01-839-2626).

i) <u>16+ Criteria</u>

   The other major working party during the 1980-1982 cycle concentrated on
   proposing <u>Criteria for new 16+ examinations in modern languages</u>. This
   exercise was initiated in January 1981 as a means of ensuring an indepen-
   dent contribution to the topical debate on behalf of the constituent
   organisations and to promote widespread discussion of the important
   issues involved. As well as producing their own model examination with
   precise communicative objectives, syllabus and suggestions for assess-
   ment procedures, members of the working party investigated
   teachers' attitudes to the new proposals in a small scale enquiry. In
   a prefatory statement to their own proposals, they strongly urged those
   bodies given responsibility for drafting national criteria to take
   account of the developments in alternative schemes of assessment, notably
   those based on graded objectives. Among the central working principles
   and recommendations of the working party were the following:-
   <u>Target population</u>   The present GCE/CSE examinations in Modern Languages
   do not attract a balanced entry across the 60% of the ability range
   envisaged by existing arrangements. High priority, therefore, must be
   given to the establishment of realistic targets and examinations suitable
   for the full 60% envisaged in the new examinatiots. This task can only
   be met through a differentiated examination in which components or tasks
   can be taken at different levels of complexity by different candidates.
   It is important to ensure that this differentiation does not simply
   perpetuate the inherited GCE/CSE divide in a new form.

Aims and objectives   The aims should be expressed in terms sufficiently precise to provide a framework against which syllabus and examination objectives may be checked, and examination papers and marking schemes evaluated. The syllabus objectives should then show in concrete detail how the more general educational aims are to be reached. A mere classification into the so-called 'four skills' or lists of structures and vocabulary is not sufficient.

Competence   The form of language competence which should be central to the course and the examination is that of language as a communicative tool. There should not be excessive preoccupation with formal accuracy as is common at present, and simple and effective expression should be adequately rewarded. The increased use of positive marking is recommended.

Tasks   The school course, and therefore examinations, should foster the skills and knowledge necessary to meet such practical aims as 'enabling the pupil to communicate in face-to-face situations with speakers of another language...', 'to search for, discover and understand information relevant to his/her needs and interests through the medium of another language' and 'to mediate between monolingual members of the two language communities concerned'.

Language   The language presented in examinations should be drawn from authentic and appropriate foreign language sources. Its range of content and form should be wider than the majority of existing 16+ examinations which draw too heavily on narrative and on written language presented in spoken form.

Syllabus definition   Teachers and candidates should be provided with a detailed syllabus which would specify: (a) the tasks the candidate should be capable of performing; b) the vocabulary and structures which would be required for active use in the performance of the tasks listed; (c) the situations, topics, contexts and themes within which the candidate should be able to operate. Such a list should take account of social change.

i) Language and languages 16-19

As a result of concern and opinion expressed at the 1982 Assembly, the Standing Committee decided to create a new working party to investigate the 'language diet' of the 16-19 range. The working title Language and Languages 16-19 has been adopted and the scope of the enquiry has now been defined and agreed. The intention is to survey both traditional and innovative schemes in all sectors of education. The wide range of backgrounds and experience of the working party members should guarantee a comprehensive review of current practice and provide ideas to stimulate a lively debate among these responsible for, involved in and concerned with the educational provision for young people in this age range. The working party will operate in its first phase by the discussion of draft papers submitted by members in committee. Individual members have already selected their topics within the framework outlined by the title and will be reporting back in the early months of 1983.

*   *   *   *   *   *   *

Bob Powell concludes his report as follows:-

The question of funding for the current working parties' activities, as indeed for the whole operation of NCLE, is a constant preoccupation of the Standing Committee. NCLE is an independent body. Members of the Standing Committee and working parties pursue their work confident that their deliberations, enquiries and proposals are considered by the associations to whom

they report to be of real value and significance. NCLE provides a
unique forum for debate on the major areas of concern in language and
foreign language education.

_
 * The Chairman of the Standing Committee of NCLE is <u>Euan Reid</u>, who
reviews <u>Black English and the Education of Black children</u> (the <u>King</u> case)
in Section IV of this issue.

iii) <u>Constituent Organisations of NCLE</u>

A list of Constituent Organisations of NCLE, as at February 1983, is
available from CILT/Alan Moys. Thirty-five organisations are listed
alphabetically complete with Secretaries and their addresses.

_
 * In the following classified version of the list, I have classified
each organisation once —I hope without misrepresenting any. Three
regional organisations outside England are picked out by underlining.

LANGUAGE ORGANISATIONS

<u>Modern Languages collectively</u>

British Association for Language Teaching	BALT
Graded Objectives in Modern Languages	GOML
Institute of Linguists	—
Joint Council of Language Associations	JCLA
Modern Language Association	MLA
Modern Language Association of <u>Northern Ireland</u>	MLANI
National Association of Language Advisers	NALA
National Council for Modern Languages in Higher and Further Education	NCML
<u>Scottish</u> Association for Language Teaching	SALT
Standing Conference of Heads of Modern Languages in Polytechnics and other Colleges	SCHML

Cl.Grk/Latin	Joint Ass. of Classical Teachers	JACT
Du.	Ass. of Dutch Language Teachers	ADULT
Esper.	Esperanto Teachers Ass.	ETA
Fr.	Ass. of University Professors of French	AUPF
	Society for French Studies	SFS
Germ.	Ass. of Teachers of German	ATG
	Conference of University Teachers of German in Great Britain & Ireland	CUTG
Ital.	Ass. of Teachers of Italian	ATI
	Society for Italian Studies	SIS
Russ./Slav.	Ass. of Teachers of Russian	ATR
	British Universities Ass. of Slavists	BUAS
Span./Port.	Ass. of Hispanists of Great Britain & Ireland	—
	Ass. of Teachers of Spanish & Portuguese	ATSP

<u>English...</u>

Mother tongue	National Ass. of Advisers in English	NAAE
	National Ass. for the Teaching of English	NATE
Other tongue	Ass. of Recognised English Language Schools	ARELS
	National Ass. for the Teaching of English as a Second Language to Adults	NATESLA

Other tongue   <u>Scottish</u> Ass. for the Teaching of English as a
(cont.)   Second Language   SATESL

                   Special English Language Materials for
                      Overseas University Students   SELMOUS

<u>... and L1 Maintenance</u>

                 National Council for Mother Tongue Teaching   NCMTT

OTHER ORGANISATIONS

<u>Education</u>

National Association for Multiracial Education   NAME
National Association of Teachers in Further & Higher Education*   NATFHE

<u>Linguistics</u>

British Association for Applied Linguistics   BAAL
Linguistics Association of Great Britain   LAGB

<u>Publishing</u>

Educational Publishers Council   EPC

*This should be perhaps a <u>section</u> of NATFHE? —Ed.

The following passage should follow the list of Lakoff's THERE sentences on page 16:-

From the discussion of these 15 or so constructions Lakoff drew several conclusions, amongst which the following are perhaps the most interesting: there are many systematic relations among the constructions that cannot be stated transformationally; the constructions form a natural category with three prototypical subcategories D, O and E; there is a network of 'family resemblances' (cf. Wittgenstein) linking the constructions; metaphors can play a role in the relationships between constructions.

III   ARTICLES

1.   <u>Pat WRIGHT</u>:   Technical communication: English for
              Very Special Purposes

2.   <u>Phyllis GOVE</u>:   Plan for Action in Applied Linguistics:
              a Re-Active response to David Crystal's call for Action.

---

1.   <u>Pat WRIGHT</u>

TECHNICAL COMMUNICATION:
ENGLISH FOR VERY SPECIAL PURPOSES

<u>Background</u>

The 1970s saw an increasing number of pressure groups advocating an
improvement in the way organisations, particularly government organisa-
tions, communicated with the public. The complaint was not about secrecy
but about gobbledegook. In the United Kingdom the founders of the Plain
English Campaign, Chrissie Maher and Martin Cutts, won press coverage as
they vociferously awarded prizes of tripe to deserving institutions. The
USA saw an introduction of Plain English laws in many States and the
formation of centres of expertise such as the Document Design Center in
Washington, started in 1978, and the Communications Design Center (CDC)
at Carnegie-Mellon University, started in 1979.

One interesting cross-cultural comparison concerns the involvement of
linguists in the forefront of this movement. The manager of the Document
Design Center, Robin Battison, is a linguist, so too is the Director of
the Center, Janice Redish. The first Director of the CDC was Erwin Stein-
berg from the Department of English, although the present Director is
Dick Hayes from the Psychology Department. In contrast the professional
background of most of the front runners in the United Kingdom is in graphic
design: e.g. Martin Cutts of the Plain English Campaign; Robert Waller,
Editor of <u>Information Design Journal</u>; Michael Twyman and colleagues in
the Department of Typography and Graphic Communication at the University
of Reading, whose expertise has been tapped by government departments such

as the Inland Revenue. BAAL members are welcome to speculate on the reasons for this trans-Atlantic divergence.

The 70s also saw an increasing amount of public information presented electronically, especially via computer-controlled displays. The broadcasting companies have provided teletext systems (Cefax and Oracle) which offer relatively simple text structures: essentially contents lists from which the reader goes to the page required via a numerical keypad. British Telecom have provided a viewdata system (Prestel) in which a much richer data base is elaborated and this is accessed by the reader working through many layers of decision options. Several reports are now available of some of the problems that people encounter when trying to use this sort of computer-based information system (Sutherland, 1980; Thompson, 1981; Maynes, 1982).

Computer-based information systems have drawn attention to several aspects of technical communication that are sometimes overlooked. For example they have shown how many more activities than just 'reading' are an integral part of using technical information. Readers have to find the relevant information, grasp the writer's meaning and possibly reinterpret that meaning in terms of some subsequent action that they must take —such as looking elsewhere for something more relevant! These problem-solving and decision-making processes will often apply with paper-printed reference materials (the 'yellow pages' are but one example). However, familiarity can lead us to take these additional activities for granted until we realise just how important a stumbling-block they can become in some kinds of documentation. Moreover, reading material from CRT screens has made it increasingly clear that not just the linguistic style but also the visual display of the information can significantly impair or enhance the communication. Broadening the notion of how people interact with technical information, so that it extends beyond just 'reading', has implications both for the kinds of skills that readers need if they are to be functionally literate (Wright, 1981a) and the kinds of skills that writers need if they are to communicate successfully (Wright, 1981b).

Current activities in technical communication

a) EMPLOYMENT   Following the Rayner review of administrative forms in government (Rayner, 1982) several departments have revised the way that they are producing information for the public, particularly forms. DHSS have recruited people with specialist skills in linguistics, typography

and behavioural research. In the USA there has been much public
discussion of design procedures, often stressing the need for predesign
evaluation of audience characteristics and document functions as well as
post-design, formative evaluation of the text itself (e.g. Duffy, 1981;
Redish, Felker, and Rose, 1981). Since none of the possible procedures
for evaluating technical information is perfect (Wright, 1983), it requires
ingenuity and resourcefulness to devise ways of testing forms, manuals,
reference materials, so that the trouble-spots are located in a way that
suggests how to correct them (just knowing that people have problems
understanding the second paragraph on page 3 may not be sufficiently help-
ful).

On other occasions the preference is for 'design by consultancy', using
either government organisations such as HMSO and the Central Office of
Information (COI), or consultants outside government. Recent experience
suggests that the incorporation of evaluation procedures into the design
process can make this very time-consuming. The Textual Communication
Research Group at the Open University recently spent the equivalent of
three man-years revising a particularly difficult form for DHSS. More-
over the finished product received adverse comment from both the press
and the Plain English Campaign (see issue 10 of <u>Plain English</u> under the
heading 'What's long, purple, and asks 160 questions?'). Clearly success-
ful design is not simply a matter of having good intentions and trying
hard.

To facilitate the spread of information about form design, the Manage-
ment and Personnel Office (formerly the Civil Service Department), who
have responsibility for implementing the recommendations of the Rayner
report, have funded a 'Forms Information Centre' within the Department
of Typography and Graphic Communication at Reading University and a
'Forms Advisory Service' within the Plain English campaign at Salford.
It is therefore to be expected that as awareness grows of the complexi-
ties of achieving successful technical communications, so the job
opportunities for people with relevant expertise should also expand.

b) RESEARCH   A number of organisations are currently funding research
on technical communication, particularly in the field of man-machine
interaction (e.g. the Prestel reports referred to earlier). The British
Library Research and Development Department is also heavily involved in

this area. It funds research at the University of Bath into on-line
catalogues (Philip Bryant); at the University of Reading into problems
concerning the typographic limitations that arise in different communica-
tion media —contrast messages which are handwritten/typed/printed/displayed
on a CRT, or cathode ray tube (Pat Norish); at the University of Lough-
borough into problems relating to the design of materials such as
scholarly journals when presented on VDUs, or visual display units (Brian
Shackel). Have you ever envisaged just how difficult it is to referee a
paper on a VDU? You cannot scribble on it, you cannot juxtapose pages for
simultaneous comparison of the argument (e.g. the results and discussion
sections of experimental reports); indeed you may not even know how long
the paper is until you have read it. These are just a few of the problems
that will be explored by those involved in the British Library's 'Elec-
tronic Journal' experiment.

Another research domain which is receiving a great deal of support in
the United States is focusing on computer support of the activity of
writing technical materials. Bell Telephone Laboratories have developed
a documentation support system known as the Writers Workbench (e.g. Frase,
Keenan and Dever, 1980). Currently there is a lot of work being done by
psychologists on the cognitive problems of writing (see for example the
texts by Gregg and Steinberg, 1980; Frederiksen and Dominic, 1981;
Nystrand, 1982). Many of the problems which writers face have no counter-
part in oral communication. For example Galbraith (1980) has reported the
difficulties which one inexperienced writer had when trying to revise what
he had written. The difficulty lay in the conflict between understanding
what was written on the page and simultaneously evaluating this against
what had been the communicative intent.

c) THEORY   Relatively little contemporary theory has been concerned
with the specific problems of technical information. Some researchers
exploring thematic structure have used non-fiction materials, but most
researchers concerned with presentation factors have done so outside any
theoretical framework. This makes the research findings difficult to
apply since the generality of results is unclear. There is an urgent need
to develop a framework for characterising the way people interact with
technical documents, and the way this interaction is affected by linguistic
and presentation factors. Such a framework would help to clarify what
needs to be taught to those who read and those who write technical
materials. Starting from a notion of information "usability" (Wright,

1980) there has been an increasing elaboration of the cognitive resources
that both readers and writers draw upon when using a variety of technical
materials (Wright, 1984). Whether this framework proves helpful to those
solving practical communication problems remains to be seen. At least it
may provoke others into doing something more satisfactory.

The development of theory concerned with the use of English for such a
very special purpose as technical communication is an area where BAAL
involvement might be expected. Yet it is not clear that many members
have shown an interest in this area. One simple indication of the level
of interest can easily be had by just checking among your friends how
many of them regularly read the two leading journals in the field, namely
Visible Language published in the United States and Information Design
Journal published in the United Kingdom. Visible Language has had special
issues on writing (1980, vol XIV, No. 4), and Information Design Journal
has had a special issue on the communications of organisations who address
the public (1981, vol 2, Nos. 3 and 4). There have also been a number
of recent conferences whose proceedings have been published (e.g. Kolers,
Wrolstad and Bouma, 1980).

d) FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS   The new information technologies (e.g. video
discs accessed by microcomputers) raise new issues about technical
communication. For example there are many choices to be made about the
modality of communication: for a car manual, do you show a person
actually carrying out the maintenance routine, do you visually list the
procedural steps, do you auditorily present the information one step at
a time? And if you don't know, who do you ask? In the United States
many high technology organisations are recruiting psychologists to
develop their human factors sections. Has Applied Linguistics a contribu-
tion to make here too? Or is the commitment to 'language' rather than
'communication' going to prove a limiting factor?

Patricia Wright

Medical Research Council
   Applied Psychology Unit
Cambridge.

References

Duffy, T.M. (1981) 'Organising and utilizing document design options'
   Information Design Journal 2, 256-266.
Frase, L.T., Keenan, S.A. & Dever, J.J. 'Human performance in computer-

aided writing and documentation' in P.A. Kolers, M.E. Wrolstad and
H. Bouma (Eds) <u>Processing of Visible Language 2</u> (New York: Plenum
Press, 1980).

Frederiksen, C.H. & Dominic, J.F. (1981) <u>Writing: the nature, development
and teaching of written communication</u>: Volume 2 <u>Writing: process develop-
ment and communication</u> (Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates).

Galbraith, D. (1980) 'The effect of conflicting goals on writing: a case
study' <u>Visible Language</u> 14, 364-375.

Gregg, L.W. & Steinberg, E.R. (Eds) (1980) <u>Cognitive Processes in
Writing</u> (Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates).

Kolers, P.A., Wrolstad, M.E.and Bouma,H. (1980) (Eds) <u>Processing of
Visible Language 2</u> (New York: Plenum Press).

Maynes, E.S. (1982) <u>Prestel in use: a consumer view</u> (London: National
Consumer Council).

Nystrand, M. (1981) (Ed.) <u>What writers know: the language, process and
structure of written discourse</u> (London: Academic Press Inc.).

Rayner, D. (1982) <u>Review of administrative forms: report to the Prime
Minister</u> (London: Management and Personnel Office, Whitehall).

Redish, J.C., Felker, D.B. & Rose, A.M. (1981) 'Evaluating the effects of
document design principles' <u>Information Design Journal</u> 2, 236-243.

Sutherland, S. (1980) <u>Prestel and the User: a survey of psychological
and ergonomic research</u> (London: Central Office of Information).

Thompson, V. (1981) <u>Prestel and education: a report of a one year trial</u>
(London: Council for Educational Technology).

Wright, P. (1980) 'Usability: the criterion for designing written informa-
tion' in P.A. Kolers, M.E. Wrolstad & H. Bouma (Eds) <u>Processing of
Visible Language 2</u> (New York: Plenum Press).

Wright, P. (1981a) 'Tables in text: the subskills needed for reading
formatted information' in L.J. Chapman (Ed.) <u>The Reader and the text</u>
(London: Heinemann Educational Books Ltd).

Wright, P. (1981b) 'Five skills technical writers need' <u>IEEE Transactions
on Professional Communication</u> 24, 10-16.

Wright, P. (1983) 'Is evaluation a myth? Assessing text assessment
procedures' in D. Jonassen (Ed.) <u>The Technology of text: principles for
structuring, designing and displaying text</u> vol 2. (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.:
Educational Technology Publications).

Wright, P. (1984) <u>Document design: psychological research and theory</u>
(Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press). <u>In preparation.</u>

---

2. <u>Phyllis GOVE</u>

Plan for Action in Applied Linguistics:
A Re-active response to David Crystal's call for Action

As a researcher in language use in vocational engineering courses
(16-18 year-old native-, ESL- and SESD-speakers —Standard English as
a Second Dialect) currently developing materials with engineering
lecturers, I couldn't agree with Crystal's "re-active stance in AL"
more (BAAL N/L17 Spr83). After investing so much time, energy and
emotion into observations of engineering lessons in classrooms and
workshops it's exciting to get the 'pay-off' by collaborating on
materials design as an 'interventionist' between engineering lecturers
and students.

The engineer has a firm understanding of the product to be sold to the
student, and the student is learning <u>how</u> to buy that product, going
through the learning process. Having seen the wide variety of learning
strategies that students can and do employ, and the sometimes narrow
range of teaching strategies used, it is now possible to become
'prescriptive'. Prescriptivism in this case entails suggesting the
use of a greater variety of learning/teaching strategies, which I have
termed 'navigation techniques', in encouraging students to take a more
active responsibility for their own learning. These strategies are
based on observations of how students actually react in tackling
problem-solving: my principled basis for prescriptivism. These
techniques include, among many others, peer group discussion, student
reference to the best student 'explainer' in the group, joint working
on problems or tasks through mutually shared mistakes, 'undercover
reference strategies' which range from reading over notes or diagrams
to finding out more about a field through hobby project work or magazines
and trade information.

In designing integrated assignments in engineering with a view to
enhancing the students' language skills the net result is a subtle change
in attitude towards the teachers' and students' roles in the learning
process. The teacher, by decreasing the students' dependence on him/her
as the ultimate learning resource, mainly through spoken communication,
becomes one of a wide array of learning resources. The student, through
a greater 'freedom' or 'responsibility' to interact with a wider variety

of learning resources, can potentially move towards the status of the autonomous learner.

At first as an on-looker and now as a re-actor I too am moving towards the 'autonomous learner' status. However, it has been necessary for me to get my hands dirty, cutting through the 'head or hands' dichotomy, and to spend a lot of time in places where engineering learning takes place to find out what's going on. The 'head or hands' dichotomy is paralleled by Shuy's 'pro-active' ("Let's tell 'em from the managerial position how they should act on the shop floor") and Crystal's 're-active' ("I've worked my way up from the shop floor so I know what it's like —let's get on with the job") positions.

Going through a learning process similar to that of the 80 or more engineering students I've been observing has made me aware of how we've changed throughout the year. It is a process of developing self-confidence through problem-solving and making mistakes and eventually getting 'bits' right and going back to have another 'go'. The process goes on; it is our duty to 're-act' by putting well-principled prescriptivism into action through collaboration with the professionals.

Phyllis Santamaria Gove

School of Education
University of Exeter

* *
*   My apologies to David Crystal for inadvertently suppressing, on the cover of N/L17, the title of his article which appeared inside — 'Action, reaction and inaction in Applied Linguistics'. I am sure he is as delighted as I am at the sympathetic vibrations his words have set up: my thanks to Phyllis for making such good <u>use</u> of the Newsletter!   —F.d.

IV   REVIEWS

1.   Nuttall: Teaching reading skills in a foreign language   (Tomlinson)

2.   Saunders: Bilingual children   (Hoffmann)

3.   (CILT publication): Communication skills in Modern Languages   (Crawshaw)

4.   Cheshire: Variation in an English dialect   (Milroy)

5.   Honey: The language trap   { (i Crystal)
                                                          { (ii Hudson)

6.   Smitherman (ed.):   Black English and the education of Black children (Reid)

---

1.   Christine NUTTALL   Teaching reading skills in a foreign language
     Practical Language Teaching no. 9   (London: Heinemann Educational
     Books, 1982)   xiii + 233 pages   ISBN 0-435-28973X   paperback £4.95

Reviewed by Brian TOMLINSON

My notes on this book surprised me. They constitute a long list of negative
reactions; yet my overall response was one of admiration, even of envy.
The explanation of this paradox is probably that my early intuition of the
quality of the book led me to being hypersensitive about its many small
deficiencies. It is a good book which could have been very good indeed.

   The aim of the book is to be usefully informative to teachers and others
about the process of teaching people to read in a second or foreign language
and also to "interest those who wish to look further into the theory of reading".
These are very ambitious aims which unfortunately cannot completely be achieved
as the author omits many aspects of learning to read in a foreign language.
She readily admits that she has said nothing about teaching mechanical skills,
nothing about responding to irony and nothing about what are referred to as
literary skills (e.g. responding to style, symbolism and textual structure);
in other words, she has written a book about teaching intermediate students
to read.

   The book is long (233 pages) and includes the following chapters:-

           1   What is reading?
           2   Reading for what purpose?
           3   Selecting a text.
           4   Increasing and varying reading speed
           5   Utilizing non-text information.
           6   Word-attack skills.
           7   Text-attack skills (1): Signification and cohesion.
           8   Text-attack skills (2): Discourse.
           9   Questioning.
           10   Other forms of exploitation.
           11   An intensive reading lesson.
           12   An extensive reading programme.

It also has an appendix of reading texts which are referred to in teaching examples in various chapters, an appendix of extracts from published reading courses, an appendix of British publishers of graded readers (very useful for teachers overseas), an appendix of vocabulary levels for major series of readers (not very meaningful), and a useful but rather idiosyncratic bibliography (e.g. no reference to Developing Reading Skills).

Much of the book is well thought out and well written. However, it is strikingly uneven in quality. Some of the twelve chapters are excellent: others are not; and very few seem to have any cohesive link. None of the chapters really adds anything to the store of knowledge or ideas about teaching reading: some of them become confusingly academic and bombard the reader with inadequately explained jargon (e.g. a distinction between cohesion and coherence and a discussion of readability counts in the early chapters); some contain rather naive uninformative simplifications; some make sweeping statements without adequate justification (e.g. the teacher should not read aloud to the class; "phonics is not of much use to the F.L. reader"); some make unnecessary and rather ostentatious reference to experts (e.g. do we need to be referred to Bright and McGregor for the revelation that "most students are not aware that it is possible to understand new words without being told what they mean"); some use linguistic terms confusingly (e.g. sometimes "to deduce" = "to infer" and sometimes it does not); some contain unhelpful, unrealistic suggestions (e.g. Nation-like ideas on syntactical analysis as a reading aid) and a few introduce the teacher to important aspects of teaching reading without giving him sufficient practical help to gain anything from the knowledge acquired (e.g. faster reading).

In addition, the style is rather dull and impersonal, the density of information is occasionally bewildering, the author lists lots of ideas for practice activities but none for active teaching; and she ducks such important issues as the transfer of reading skills from L1 to L2 and the effectiveness of overt teaching/learning of discrete reading skills.

My review is becoming negative like my notes. Let me now say that this book does offer more of value to the teacher than any comparable book that I know of. It actively involves the reader through the use of questions and "experiments", it is usually very clear and concise (especially in its explanations of the complex), it defines most of the terms that are used, it is full of good common sense (a rare quality) and above all it is very, very practical. It briefly outlines theories and findings and then applies them imaginatively and usually realistically to the classroom, it includes sections on aspects of reading not usually covered in books of this kind (e.g. the conventions of graphics), it gives informative examples of nearly every point it makes and it offers a wealth of ideas for classroom use. Above all it makes the teacher think and it helps the teacher to create

For the non-teacher this book might offer little but a superficial introduction to theories and ideas about reading, but for the teacher it is rich in potential value. I would particularly recommend it to participants on both pre-service and in-service teacher training courses, to Directors of Studies for use in in-service training and to experienced teachers looking for knowledge, stimulus and ideas.

Brian J. Tomlinson

Brian Tomlinson is Assistant Director of Studies at Bell College, Saffron Walden.

**
* The series, Practical Language Teaching, is edited by <u>Marion Geddes</u> & <u>Gill Sturtridge</u>. See N/L14 for a review by <u>Chris Brumfit</u> of the first five titles.

2.   George SAUNDERS <u>Bilingual Children: Guidance for the family</u>, Multilingual
     Matters 3 (Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters Ltd., 1982) 278 pages.
     ISBN 0-905028-11-2 paperback £5.40 (Hardb. £13.50).

Reviewed by <u>Charlotte HOFFMANN</u>

George Saunders, an Australian, is a lecturer in Community Languages at the
Milperra College of Advanced Education, Sydney. He studied German both in
Australia and in Germany, and he also learnt a number of other languages
out of curiosity and for his own pleasure. He seems to be a man who has an
interest in other languages, peoples and cultures, far beyond what would
normally be required by his profession. He and his wife decided to raise
their children bilingually and to follow the "one parent one language"
approach consistently, the father speaking German only, the mother English.
They believe in the intrinsic value of knowing more than one language and
they thought it possible that, in view of the father's profession, the
family might at some time in the future be visiting or living temporarily
in Germany.

Both parents wanted to take up the challenge of maintaining a language
other than English in the Australian setting, and the father was also
interested in the problems faced by parents who, by choice or necessity,
use a language which is not their native one to communicate with their
children. Furthermore, he felt a need for a regular conversation partner
willing to talk to him only in German. These reasons are quite unusual.
They also struck me as being somewhat utilitarian, which made me approach
the book with some reservation: if one decides to bring up a child in a
language that is not one's mother tongue because one wants to find out
more about the problems involved and in order to have someone to practise
this language with, could there not be some risks for the child? For
psychological as well as linguistic reasons, should parents not use their
native language with their children?

The cover of the book deserves a brief mention. It is a delightful
picture drawn by the author's son Thomas, and it depicts him (the boy)
playing with a number of toy soldiers. He is holding a soldier in each
hand; the soldiers wear different headgear. The bubble over the one in
the boy's right hand reads "Schiess!", whereas the bubble over the other
soldier says "Shoot!".

The stated aim of the author is twofold: to describe his own experience
(and success) in raising his sons Thomas and Frank bilingually, and to
offer information, advice and encouragement to parents who are considering,
or actually in the process of, doing the same thing. It is with this last
aim in mind that he addresses himself explicitly to the non-specialist
reader.

One quickly becomes aware that George Saunders is enthusiastic and feels
fully committed to the task he set himself. By mentioning the widespread
occurrence of bilingualism in the modern world and by looking at the
possibilities of bilingualism in the home in an optimistic yet realistic
way, he aims to show that, whilst difficulties may arise, they are by no
means unsurmountable, i.e. that parents can achieve a reasonable standard
of bilingualism in their children, even if they live in a predominantly
monolingual environment.

The main theme of the book is a detailed description of various aspects of the children's simultaneous acquisition of the two languages over a period of eight years. But Saunders also reveals complete familiarity with the relevant literature on the subject, and he draws extensively on the research findings of other people, thus putting his own observations into context. The reader is provided with a comprehensive, honest and largely subjective picture.

Saunders based his work on 400 hours of recorded material. Unfortunately, he does not give any information on the procedures and strategies adopted in his tape recordings. Yet the analysis of such a large corpus must have been a considerable task, as anyone working in child language will confirm. The book is carefully structured and the list of contents enables the reader to find quickly the particular section he may wish to consult. The glossary at the beginning of the book explains technical terms in plain language and will prove useful to the general reader. The discussion of types of bilingualism in the first chapter may, on the other hand, be rather demanding for the uninitiated, as are perhaps other parts of the book. Much space is taken up by quotations of the children. Throughout the book the author shows great skill in the use of these quotations: every point made is illustrated by at least two examples from the children's speech, and these examples are always presented with situational and/or contextual explanations. The work of those 400 hours of recordings has yielded admirable results.

*   *   *

Without doubt George Saunders' book is a valuable contribution to the literature on child bilingualism and, I think, quite unique because it covers a wide range of aspects of his children's linguistic development. He describes bilingualism in general terms, the specific bilingual family setting, linguistic strategies employed, communication patterns (there are also separate sections on communication with animals and with toys!), language switching, influences from outside the family and the children's own view of their bilingualism; and he also includes a chapter on biliteracy and one on "aids to the development of bilingualism", both containing practical advice.

The chapter on "Measuring proficiency in both languages" is the longest as well as the most technical section of the book; for the specialist it is also of course the most interesting. It contains test results, analysis of and comments on the boys' proficiency in various linguistic and communicative skills, their degree of transference and their accuracy. The book here acquires a more scientific tone, and samples of the children's speech are put in perspective to give an overall assessment of their linguistic performance. I was quite surprised to see the extent to which his findings matched my own and how similar these boys' performance is to that of my own children, who have learnt German for different reasons and under quite different circumstances. I was, I must admit, also quite relieved to see that Thomas and Frank are not good on gender and case in German either ...

Long before reading the concluding chapters it becomes clear that the Saunders were successful in their 'experiment' (the author's label!). The two boys have become balanced bilinguals, possessing roughly equal skills in their two languages. They showed, on the whole, no preference for using English with their father, and at the time the book went into print viewed their own bilingualism positively. (My experience with my children is similar, and the fact that three languages are involved makes no difference.) In an often refreshing and sometimes amusing way the reader gets to know the

family and their way of life quite intimately, and one cannot but feel pleasure and admiration for their linguistic and personal achievement. My initial scepticism was thus allayed fairly soon: Saunders is so positive, yet frank, in admitting problems and drawbacks that it is difficult to resist his enthusiasm and conviction, particularly in the face of his evident success. But it is also clear that the Saunders' situation is not a common one. He was able to put into his task a tremendous amount of effort, aided by his experience and knowledge as a linguist and a language teacher. Apart from spending a good deal of time with his children, he placed great emphasis, care and inventiveness on language-based activities such as explaining, translating, story-telling, games, role-play, quizzes and, later on, reading and writing exercises. Indeed, at times the level of German used by the father, and consequently the children, is quite sophisticated. For examples, at age 5.6 Thomas was talking about "Umweltverschmutzung" ('environmental pollution'), at 5.11 he commented on someone's speech, "Sie spricht komisch. Mit einem Akzent" ('She has a funny way of speaking. With an accent'); and when he was 7.3 the father set him a writing exercise which included 'Was ist ein Synonym für SCHROFF?" ('Can you give a synonym of PRECIPITOUS?'). Most bilingual families, to say the least, will not be in a position to match the Saunders' linguistic ingenuity or their skills, simply because non-specialists are much less aware of the issues involved in language development; nor will they attach so much importance to them.

The subtitle is "guidance for the family". The book does give a lot of advice (quite explicitly in the chapters on problems, biliteracy and aids), although the author warns the reader not to take his model as the only and best one available as circumstances will vary from one family to another. This also means that the reader has to draw his own conclusions. For this reason, and because of the fairly extensive treatment of the more academic aspects of the subject matter, I feel that the subtitle is slightly misleading.

Charlotte Hoffmann

Charlotte teaches German and Linguistics at Salford University.

3. Communication skills in Modern Languages at school and in Higher Education
Papers from a conference convened by CILT at the University of St. Andrews, Sept. 1981 (London: CILT, 1982) 128 pages ISBN 0 903466 44 9 (A5 paperb.) £3.95 (CILT Order Code: RP 19; p & p extra).

Reviewed by Robert CRAWSHAW

This pamphlet, like the conference at St. Andrews which gave rise to it, is a welcome addition to the literature on communicative approaches and the discussion which surrounds them. It extends the debate from the pre-sixteen stage to the different areas of further and higher education. One of the most stimulating and refreshing aspects of the conference, organised by CILT in September 1981, was the breadth of experience, background and opinion which was brought to bear on the essential questions of policy and teaching approach facing Modern Languages in Britain today.

All the current debating points were aired: the falling school population which makes doubly serious the trend away from foreign language learning at 13 plus and, more significantly at 15-16 plus, the need for a reappraisal of learning objectives emphasised by the graded tests movement, the consequences implied by alternative approaches for the 16-19-year old syllabus and beyond.

All these central issues were admirably synthesised in Professor Sam Taylor's opening address, whose balanced analysis set the tone for the conference as a whole. While stressing the vital relationship between <u>vocational relevance</u> and <u>communication skills</u>, he also drew attention to the importance of modesty, open-mindedness and pragmatism on the part of committees responsible for devising new syllabi and examinations. As he said:

> The use of communication skills is not a distraction from accurate authentic language learning, but perhaps the most effective way of achieving it when coupled with other necessary means (...). No communication can take place beyond the most elementary level without use of grammatical structure (...). There are many problems awaiting solution and even awaiting definition if there is to be a progressive communicative curriculum and a workable assessment scheme, especially if such a scheme is to be open to any external form of moderation.

The subsequent papers included in this informative pamphlet illustrate the responses of diverse institutions to the challenge outlined by Sam Taylor. They show that, contrary to popular belief, there are active cells in universities throughout the British Isles which are energetically responding to language students' communicative needs, and also that the long overdue restructuring of the A-level syllabus is under way, albeit slowly. The work being carried out in colleges of further and higher education further illustrates that no easily identifiable sectors of the system at any level are strangers to learner-orientated techniques or to the realities of reappraising language teaching objectives and approaches, in the light of their students' immediate goals.

The principal task facing the reformers of foreign language syllabi and language teaching methodology in this country is to move from a period of strident polemic to one of clear-sighted, and hopefully more unified, reconstruction, in an atmosphere of selfless, honest and academically informed discussion.

This pamphlet is a valuable contribution to such a debate and will serve as a helpful accessory in the ongoing travails of syllabus design and positive language teaching.

Robert Crawshaw

Department of French Studies
University of Lancaster

4. Jenny CHESHIRE Variation in an English dialect, Cambridge Studies in
    Linguistics (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982) 142 pages
    SBN 0 521 23802 1 (hardb.) £16.00

    Reviewed by Lesley MILROY

    We have here an account of the non-standard English of the town of Reading,
    as spoken by a number of working-class adolescent boys and girls. Although
    the author emphasises that this is an account of the language of one social
    class, she works within the general paradigm of Labov, whose 1968 study of
    Harlem adolescents this work generally resembles. The resemblance is appa-
    rent both in a preoccupation with the manner in which patterns of linguistic
    variation may be correlated with aspects of vernacular culture, and in the
    attention to specifically linguistic constraints on those patterns of varia-
    tion. A notable feature of the work is its concentration on morphology and
    syntax, rather than phonology. Such studies, using quantitative methods,
    are still unusual. Still following the Labovian tradition, the author
    attempts to specify details of linguistic change in progress by comparing
    the language of adolescent and elderly speakers. For reasons which will
    become clear, I would suggest that this is one of the less successful under-
    takings in the book.

    The first of the three major sections of the work deals with methodology,
    the second with linguistic constraints affecting the patterning of the
    variables studied, and the third with social constraints of various kinds.
    It is best to discuss the work as it is organised, under these three major
    headings.

                        *   *   *   *   *

    Methodology The author's fieldwork methods are governed by the need to over-
    come the 'observer's paradox' so as to obtain large volumes of naturally
    occurring, spontaneous speech. Additionally, the study of syntactic variation
    presents special problems, for two reasons. First, very large amounts of data
    are needed, more than for phonological analysis, since tokens of a syntactic
    variable in the necessary range of linguistic environments do not crop up as
    frequently as phonological tokens. Second, since 'shortages' may be apparent
    only after analysis is under way, a researcher needs to have developed a
    relationship with the informants which enables her to go back and collect more
    data at a later date. Thus, a cordial long-term relationship with informants
    needs to be built up.

    Participant observation techniques provided the answer; the author attached
    herself to adolescent groups who hung about various play-centres. The further
    points are made that adolescents are excellent long-term informants in that
    they are likely to have more free time than adults, and to be less inhibited
    about developing a free-and-easy relationship with a researcher over an
    extended period. All these points are sensible, practical, and useful to
    prospective researchers.

    Altogether, three groups of speakers were recorded at two play grounds,
    giving a total of 13 boys (one group of 10 and one of 3) and 11 girls. As
    the author notes, the small size of one of the boys' groups gives rise to
    difficulty in between-group comparison. 1 shall shortly pursue the general
    issue of grouping informants a little further.

Although there are clearly practical advantages in restricting the study to the speech of adolescents, the main disadvantage is that the study lacks explanatory power since observed patterns of variation cannot be linked with longer term patterns of linguistic change. Cheshire attempts to surmount this problem by using an 'apparent time' comparison between her own data and the speech patterns of some elderly people as they were studied in a separate research project. However, as we shall see, the lack of comparability between the two data bases, in terms of both amount and type of data, leads in practice to difficulties of interpretation.

The linguistic variables chosen for analysis are defined as those morphological and syntactic features which occur regularly during the 18 hours of playground speech analysed, but do not occur in standard English (pp. 26-7). Cheshire makes the interesting (and novel) claim that this is a comprehensive list of the non-standard features of the dialect. Altogether, fourteen features are listed, ranging from various types of tense and negation marking in verbs, through types of nominal and adverbial construction.

Linguistic Variation   A number of interesting points emerge from Cheshire's analysis of purely linguistic constraints on variation. Some of these may be surprising to those unfamiliar with the analysis of non-standard English, as they do not have any clear analogues in the standard dialect. The restriction on negative concord reported on pp. 65-6 (a double negative cannot occur followed by the determiner a) is an example.

Cheshire's general interests and procedure may be demonstrated by looking at her handling of the non-standard use of the -s inflection in the verb paradigm — that is, in environments other than the 3rd person singular. The first clear point is that the verbs have and do pattern quite differently from the other (regular) verbs of English. The non-standard form is much more likely to occur with the latter type of verb. Moreover, the non-standard suffixed form of have occurs only where have is a full verb, or where it precedes an infinitive. Where it functions as an auxiliary, the non-standard pattern does not occur at all. Similar differences in the patterning of variants occurs for the verb do, depending on syntactic function (main verb, auxiliary or do support). Thus, both have and do verb forms (with or without -s) are dependent on different factors in Reading English and Standard English. In Reading English, they depend on syntactic function, as well as on the subject of the verb.

When the regular verbs are analysed (that is, all verbs except have and do) equally complex constraints on the structure of non-standard inflections emerge. Interestingly, if a present tense verb is followed by a complement in which the tense of the verb is marked in the surface structure, the non-standard form of the present tense is extremely unlikely to occur. Thus, compare 1) and 2):

1) I knows how to stick the boot in

2) You know if anything breaks on that pushchair.   (p. 40)

Older speakers, however, do not appear to observe these constraints to the same extent. They are rather more likely than younger speakers to use the suffixed (i.e. non-standard) form of the verb even when a tense-marked complement follows. Cheshire's interpretation of this age-related difference is that a change is taking place away from an earlier, uniformly suffixed paradigm to the standard English system. This change is said to be proceeding in an orderly way, environment by environment, in much the same way as phonological change appears to operate (p. 42). Even given that such an interpretation is, at best, educated guess work (based on relatively few tokens by the time 1027 occurrences of regular verbs have been split into a range of environment types),

I am not sure that this is indeed the most plausible interpretation.
For a start, most of the general evidence which we have so far suggests
that non-standard syntactic patterns persist over long periods (some
low-status Belfast features have been around since the Middle Scots
period). Why should we assume that in Reading there is a steady move
to Standard English? One alternative conclusion may be that the younger
speakers are generally specialising their use of the non-standard main
verbs to environments where tense-marked complements do not occur. In
the absence, however, of firmer knowledge of the number of tokens
involved in these more detailed analyses, it is difficult to assess the
validity of any interpretation. It is only fair to add that the author
herself at various points acknowledges the problem of scarcity of
particular types of token which generally besets quantitative studies
of syntactic variation.

Generally speaking, the section dealing with linguistic constraints on
variation is the strongest in the book. It is a useful source of information,
and some parts of it (such as the discussions of negation and of present tense
forms) are of high quality. But the discussions of linguistic change are
inconclusive and frequently seem to be forcing the data up to and beyond its
limits.

Social Variation   Cheshire begins this section with a discussion of group
versus individual norms of language use. It is pointed out that while both
need to be considered in a study of variation, group norms are interesting
mainly for their capacity to indicate broad patterns of variation. Certainly,
the group norms which have emerged so clearly from the large urban surveys of
the last fifteen years or so do give such an indication. But the notion of
grouping speakers as Cheshire does in a small-scale single-class study like
this one, is much more problematic.

Certainly, sex of speaker emerges as an important variable and it is plainly
reasonable to consider speakers in male and female groups. Peer group status
is, however, less successful as a predictor of variation when the speakers
are divided into three categories which are intended to reflect the strength
of their ties to the peer group. The reasons for this we can only guess at;
one may be simply that the peer-group status variable as it is conceived is
not relevant (the groups appear not to be as closed and rigidly structured as
those studied by Labov). Another may be that a group-based analysis is not
appropriate; for example, on page 91 (Table 39) we find that ten speakers
are divided into three groups and the resultant group scores compared. An
analytic method (such as rank order correlation) which did not involve group-
ing speakers, but simply measured the relationship between the two variables,
the linguistic and the extra-linguistic, might have been preferable here.
There seems little reason to divide a group of 10 into three sub-groups,
especially when the criteria for making the division are hazy. Nor, given
the dubious analytic procedures here does it seem appropriate to explain the
lack of correspondence between the Labov findings and Cheshire's own findings
in terms of the less flexible structure of peer groups in New York City.
This is using a sledgehammer to crack a nut. Moreover, the author seems to
be arguing that a close relationship between language and social structure
inhibits a close relationship between language and peer group status. It is
hard to see how this can be so when Labov found both types of relationship
in New York City.

Other extra-linguistic variables are of equally dubious validity. For
example, a vernacular culture index is constructed on the basis of a number
of attributes (such as toughness), However, scores are often assigned on

the basis of very loose and inexplicit criteria (for example, audience reactions such as laughter are taken into account in the author's inter- pretation of speakers' self-report). Generally speaking, I think it is fair to say that this section on social variation is very much weaker than the section on linguistic variation. The problems seem to arise partly as a consequence of the method adopted by Cheshire of grouping speakers, and partly as a consequence of the rather unmotivated social measures which tend too much to be based on content of self —or other— report. By and large, structural measures such as the sociometric ones used by Labov in his Harlem studies are much more satisfactory.

*   *   *   *   *

In summary, any negative criticisms which I have of this book are levelled first at various aspects of the methodology relating to the handling of extra-linguistic variables, and second at those parts which attempt to deal with linguistic change in progress. It is hard to do this satisfactorily within the confines of what is essentially a one-age, one-class study. It might have been better to leave out any attempt at examining change and concentrate on that which the author does best; for the section on linguis- tic constraints on variation is extremely valuable, and some parts of it are excellent.

The book as a whole is an important comprehensive source of data on the morphology and syntax of a non-standard system; it is quite plain from this work that quantitative methods are well adapted to such a description. As the author points out, we still know very little about the linguistic organi- sation of non-standard dialects, despite the fact that the problems of non- standard speakers have been for some time now an important educational issue. Thus, the descriptive linguistic aspect of the book seems to me to be its strength. It seems clear that until we appreciate, in the kind of detail set out here, the extent to which non-standard dialects differ from Standard English, we cannot properly understand —let alone resolve— the problems which non-standard speakers have in handling the formal spoken and written registers of their mother tongue.

Lesley Milroy

Mrs. Milroy, formerly of the Northern Ireland Polytechnic, is now in the Dept. of General Linguistics, University of Manchester.

5.   John HONEY   The Language Trap: race, class, and the 'standard English' issue in British schools, Kay-Shuttleworth Papers on Education No. 3 (Kenton, Middlesex: National Council for Educational Standards, 1983) pp. iv + 38 ISBN 0 9506883 20 £1.95

* *
 * Sometimes the Newsletter receives reviews before it receives review copies. For The Language Trap I was delighted to be offered one by David Crystal, who is named in the pamphlet, and one by Dick Hudson, who isn't. Professor Honey, who is Head of the School of Education at Leicester Polytechnic, has kindly offered to reply to them in the next issue.
   The pamphlet is obtainable from the Secretary, National Council for Educa- tional Standards, 1 Chapman Crescent, Kenton, Middx. HA3 OTG (£2.00, postage included).

Reviewed (i) by <u>David CRYSTAL</u>

This is the third in a series of pamphlets published by the National Council for Educational Standards, named the Kay-Shuttleworth Papers on Education, after the nineteenth century educationist. Rhodes Boyson, introducing the series, hopes that these papers will provide a 'written statue' to the man. I have not seen the first two papers in the series, but, from what I have heard and read of Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth, he deserves a far better memorial than what we are given in Number 3.

Until recently, I had seen only the press accounts of John Honey's pamphlet, which attracted some comment from linguists, because of the bizarre picture being painted. Honey's standard reply was to complain that these critics had not read his pamphlet: for instance, in his <u>Guardian</u> letter replying to some comments of Dick Hudson, he modestly said, 'Published summaries obviously cannot do justice to the complexities of the case', and he felt sure that Hudson would agree that his views were 'reasonable, if only he will read the pamphlet'. I don't know what Hudson's current opinion is, but for my part, having read it, I must say 1 can find little in it that is reasonable. The published summaries weren't far out, really.

This pamphlet contains such a remarkable mixture of selective quotation, inaccurate evaluation, contradiction and perverse ratiocination that I really do begrudge the time it is taking to write this review. But I feel I have to, if only to provide a corrective to the grotesque account of my thinking, which it contains. And it may actually save me time, in the end. I have given several lectures to groups of teachers, in recent weeks, and the pamphlet has been cited several times, thus ruining what might otherwise have been a constructive workshop discussion. The very cause which Honey is championing, and which I too espouse, is thus at risk from the existence of this pamphlet, and the sooner its irrelevance can be made clear, the sooner we can all get on with the job.

To keep the discussion under control, 1 intend to restrict it largely to my own views. I think this is fair enough. I am, after all, at the top of Honey's hit-list of linguists (and collocated with Ken Livingstone, moreover, to add insult to injury), and cited at various places as one of the leaders of the 'conspiracy' Honey is intent on revealing. ('Conspiracy' is Honey's word, used in this pamphlet along with a range of other judicious items which well indicate the level of the 'reasoning' involved —items such as 'ritual incantation', 'acolytes', 'fantasies', 'fabrications'. The <u>Guardian</u> report was in fact somewhat more objective -though not so the <u>Times</u>!) My views, amongst others', are said to be 'unscientific', 'uncritical' and 'dangerously misleading' (29). What is a chap to do? I wasn't expecting to be credited with all this power, and I don't especially want to pick up the verbal cudgels on behalf of Lyons, Trudgill, Labov, and all the others implicated in the plot. The other linguists cited are all big boys and girls, and I am sure they can look after themselves, if they want to. 1 reckon that all I need to do is point out how fundamentally Honey has <u>me</u> wrong, in the course of which, readers will be able to judge the level of Honey's expertise for themselves. (I won't, incidentally, give a paraphrase of Honey's position, at all points. The pamphlet can be read quite quickly, and I can't imagine that anyone would want to read this review who hadn't read the pamphlet first.)

*　　*　　*　　*　　*

Let me begin with a general characterisation of the positions involved.
What I am supposed to believe in, according to Honey, is such things as
the following:-

- for schools to foster one variety of English is contrary to the
  findings of the science of linguistics (3);

- to deny children the opportunity to learn to handle standard English,
  because of pseudo-scientific judgements about all varieties of language
  being 'equal' (24-5);

and my views are supposed to

- underlie the attack on the teaching of standard English in schools (17).

What I actually believe in can be illustrated, conveniently, from my book on
the subject, which Honey does not refer to: <u>Child language, learning and
linguistics</u> (Arnold, 1976), especially Chapter 3. For example:-

> We must by all means welcome expressiveness in children's use of
> spoken or written language, and encourage the use of those nonstandard
> forms that come naturally and powerfully to the child. On the other
> hand, spontaneous, informal expressiveness is not the only considera-
> tion, and the role of formal styles within dialects must not be
> minimised, especially in relation to the standard language. (p.71)

> The children being taught now are going to have to grow up into a
> society where the formal standard language, in its various varieties,
> retains considerable prestige. Its practitioners still, in several
> walks of life, call the tune. And if the role of the teacher, at
> whatever level, is to prepare the child for normal participation in
> society, then he will be benefiting the child by providing him with
> as much command of the standard form of the language as is possible. (p.71)

A little earlier, I also remark:-

> The attitude of linguists has sometimes been caricatured as a view
> that 'Anything goes' in language use, or that 'grammar doesn't matter'.
> Nothing could be further from the truth. (p.70)

How can Honey possibly have arrived at such a misconstrual of a position? Was
it simply ignorance of the literature? Or was there some kind of ulterior
motive? Or both? I would love to know.

It should perhaps be mentioned, at this point, that the foundation of
Honey's view that a 'school of linguistic thought' exists, rests on his hit-
list of quotations, which I head -the main linguistic ones being taken from
a series of popular introductions to the subject. The three sentences he takes
from me, for instance, come from a simplified little book I wrote for Sixth-
formers some years ago (<u>What is Linguistics?</u>). But this does not stop him from
criticising this, and the other popular accounts by Lyons and Trudgill, for
being 'incautious', and for failing to offer 'proofs' for their 'rulings' and
'proclamations' (5).

Really, Honey! Pick on books your own size! They do exist. Take the topic
which has probably attracted more sophisticated discussion in linguistics than
any other -the language/thought issue. Honey refers to his list of quotations
as 'clumsy' in their handling of this issue (in a paragraph which is itself not

a paragon of stylistic excellence), and it must be admitted that, in address-
ing my Sixth-form audience, I was not as detailed as I might have been.
But why then ignore the careful and considered views of, say, John Lyons
(who also graces Honey's list), whose discussion of the Whorf hypothesis,
and related matters, in his Semantics, anticipates Honey's blandly-expressed
objections? Or the many psycholinguistic discussions of this issue, which
have appeared in recent years? Why Honey does not refer to the primary
technical sources in linguistics, I can only guess. He refers copiously to
popularisations and secondary accounts of the subject. For instance, at one
point he picks on Chomsky, but he doesn't do him the courtesy of referring
directly to anything he has written -all we get is a reference to a TV inter-
view with John Searle (7). In fact, a great deal of Honey's case rests on
ideas he seems to have picked up from reviews in such academic sources as
the TLS, TES, THES, Radio 4, the Sunday Times, the Observer, and New Society.
I read these papers too, but I do not usually feel the need to give footnote
references to them.

* * * * *

There are two main strands to Honey's argument. Firstly, linguistics is
supposed to claim that all (varieties of) language are equally good. And
secondly, it therefore follows that for anyone to emphasise standard English
in preference to the pupil's home dialect is unjustifiable, and harms the
child's self-esteem. To take the first point. Honey harps on this phrase
'equally good' —though it is a phrase used only by some of the people towards
the bottom of his hit-list, and not by the linguists at the top of his list.
It is in fact a phrase I would never dream of using —and indeed I have only
ever heard it used by non-specialists— but it is central to Honey's case.
What he does is to exploit the ambiguity of the term to his own advantage,
by taking it out of context. 'Good' can relate to two states of affairs:

(i)   comparably efficient, adequate, or whatever, from a linguistic
       point of view;

(ii)   comparably efficient, adequate, or whatever, from a sociological
       point of view.

What Honey does, quite simply, is assume that linguists are making a socio-
logical judgement, when they intend only a linguistic one. There is nothing
inherently contradictory about the following two statements:-

       All (varieties of) languages are equal, from a linguistic viewpoint;
       some are more equal than others, from a sociological viewpoint.

There is evidence in Honey's own account that he accepts this distinction,
so why he should ignore it when criticising others is a mystery. For instance,
he accepts that all languages 'are likely to have a regular and consistent
grammatical structure', and 'specific ones should not be simply written off
as debased' (17), and later, having given a bizarre transcription of non-
standard London speech, he says 'there is clearly no doubt of the communica-
tive adequacy of the "dialect" version ... among speakers of that self-same
"dialect"' (23).

Perhaps by choosing Sixth-form books to criticise, Honey misses the subtleties
of the linguistic position. In particular, he ignores the synchronic perspective

within which such statements are made. For instance, he concludes that linguists who hold the view that all languages are equally adequate for their speakers' needs would have to say that the speakers of the less 'advanced' languages do not need commodities such as medicine. But this absurd position is of Honey's own devising, due to his taking a synchronic statement and applying it to the diachronic domain, when contact situations develop. His whole argument on p.11 actually relates to what happens in contact situations. And yet, at other times, he seems well aware of the linguist's position. For instance, on p.17 he allows that 'the adequacy of all languages and dialects to their speakers is only demonstrable in terms of a static and limited conception of those speakers' needs'. Which is, of course, exactly what a linguist might say, though not so dismissively.

Let us consider further Honey's beliefs on this point, as expressed in his summary evaluation of over 70 years work in anthropological linguistics: 'there is, in fact, absolutely no evidence that languages keep pace with the social development of their users' (6). One could riposte: there is no evidence that they do not. Or say: go look in IJAL, AnL, and elsewhere. But what is the point of accumulating details when Honey contradicts himself immediately: 'Certainly they [languages] may stay abreast of the general needs of their speakers to discuss current aspects of their environment' (6). Ah, this little word, general, italicised by Honey, but nowhere defined. It is, as I heard a Frenchman say last week, 'le cop-out'! Honey tries to excuse his contradiction by citing two types of exception. He says there is a time-lag before new concepts are given names and incorporated into the vocabulary of the language. An astute observation. Certainly true. He refers to the post-sputnik era at one point (7), which makes me recall that it must have taken a good 12 hours for the word sputnik to have incorporated itself into the vocabulary of the world's languages, when its launch was announced on 4 October 1957. But one cannot really discuss this class of 'exception', for Honey gives not a single example —nor of his other class of 'exception' either (of certain individuals lacking vocabulary). For someone who keeps clamouring for 'hard evidence', this is a bit much.

Honey's misinterpretation of the linguist's position goes on and on. At the end of his criticism of the 'theory of functional optimism', as he calls it (3), he says: 'So it is simply not true that all languages and dialects are equally "good"' (11-12), referring again to the teachers' characterisation of the linguistic arguments, and continues: 'At best it is an open question' (12). I do believe he really thinks he is the first person to spot this. Again, I have not the time to go back through the history of linguistics to find the many references which antedate Honey. Let me simply quote from myself again: in the context of a discussion of language functions, I say:-

> For what are functions, in the final analysis? How many are
> there? How great are the differences between one function and
> the other? ... The regrettable answer is that no one knows.
> No one has yet worked out a comprehensive classification of
> language varieties ... (1976, p,76).

and go on in this vein at some length. In the light of this kind of thing, it will be evident that Honey's claim that 'few (linguists) have stopped to ask the necessary awkward questions' (6) is no more than wishful thinking. Indeed, it is on the basis of my attitude above that I have been attacked as an anti-functionalist, and set up as someone opposed to several of the people whom Honey believes to belong to the same 'school' (though in fact my aim is to

achieve an integration of functional and formal approaches). I have spent
several pages, in various books and articles, pondering these problems, and
whole sections of my work on assessing the (standard and non-standard)
English of language-handicapped children are devoted to questions of modelling
psycholinguistic complexity. And I am among the least of the chosen ones in
psycholinguistics. Honey therefore again displays only his ignorance when
he writes his footnote 19: 'The functional significance of different kinds
of grammatical complexity is a poorly explored area among the linguistic
theorists discussed here' —though it must be noted that he has read Bodmer
on the point.

*   *   *   *   *

By now, it should be clear what Honey's technique is. He attributes extreme
and absurd views to linguists, and then demolishes the absurdity, thus
thinking that he has made progress. He then cites reasonable views, but
fails to provide the quotations, from these same linguists, to show that they
have thought of them first. There is indeed a school of thought in this
pamphlet, but it is not the one Honey thinks is there: it is, rather, a
school of imaginary linguistics. And it becomes particularly obnoxious in
the second strand of the argument, referred to above, when the question of
the teaching of standard English is addressed.

First, some examples of statements which Honey appears to think I, amongst
others, would disagree with:-

- 'the whole of our educational system ... presupposes the ability
  to handle standard English' (19);

- the social conventions, whereby Royal Society Fellows use standard
  English, is 'a sociolinguistic fact' (20);

- 'we can make a start (sic) on reasserting the importance to all pupils
  ... of achieving a ready facility in standard English' (28);

- 'to foster the use of non-standard varieties ..., at the expense of
  standard English' (my ital.), is not to benefit the disadvantaged
  speaker;   this would put him 'at an unfair disadvantage' (20) ...
  'in any situation where authority, respectability or credibility are
  at issue' (21);

- 'the adequacy for [dialect] communication outside the limited community
  of speakers of this non-standard variety ... is strictly limited; and
  the consequence of promoting the use of such language varieties in our
  school system, at the expense of standard English ... must also dis-
  advantage them outside it' (23-4) (my ital.).

Buzz, buzz, as Hamlet said to Polonius. But note that phrase, 'at the expense
of standard English'. Honey really seems to believe that many schools are not
just 'fostering' non-standard varieties (true), but that they are doing so
at the expense of standard English (by no means true). This is what he sees
as his 'language trap' —persuading children 'that their particular non-
standard variety of English is in no way inferior, nor less efficient for
purposes of communication, but simply different' (22). This, he says, 'is
to play a cruel trick' (22). I wish he would cite some 'hard evidence'. For
my part, I have given talks, workshops, courses, and the like to groups of
teachers at all levels over the past 12 years, and I do not recall any case

where a teacher was actually working to a policy which attacked standard English, while fostering non-standard communication. I allow there may be the odd case —there are extremists in all fields— but I do not suppose the odd case to be justification for the massive piece of scaremongering which Honey has dreamed up in this pamphlet.

The reality of the situation, as I have repeatedly tried to argue in my own work, is this. Linguists are not against standard English. Rather, they are against intolerance of a child's (or adult's) home dialect. Honey thinks that to be <u>for</u> the latter is to be <u>against</u> the former. In fact, we are <u>for</u> both —or, to be precise, we are <u>for</u> both in the context of an <u>applied</u> sociolinguistic study (in a 'pure' sociolinguistic study, of course, the notion of <u>for</u> vs. <u>against</u> is irrelevant). Honey's own position on this issue is ambivalent. He apparently allows that we are entitled to attack social and aesthetic prejudice (22), though he seems to suggest that because it is a 'formidable' task, it should not be attempted. (Formidable it is, but as it took only 100 years or so to establish the form of English prescriptivism in the first place, I would hope that it might take only 100 or so to see it go.) Honey has been impressed by the failure of the Chinese government to alter its citizens' taste in matters of feminine beauty, and seems to think that linguistic taste in Britain is similarly unalterable. But it is difficult to be sure, for he immediately allows that 'gradual change' is taking place these days (I would hope, thanks largely to the work of twentieth century linguists). This is exactly what I and others want, of course —gradual change, and not the 'quantum leap' which is in Honey's mind (23).

In moving towards his own 'solution', Honey hits out at the widely-held sociolinguistic view of 'bidialectalism', implying en route that this 'compromise' does not satisfy us either (i.e. does not satisfy those who want 'the whole edifice [of standard English] to come tumbling down')(30). He quotes Trudgill's 'Who is to say what is "acceptable"?', and comments, 'Since society has already answered that question in ways which Dr. Trudgill and others are apparently unable to recognise ...' (31). But, as should now be clear, it is not that we cannot recognise these issues: it is simply that Honey cannot recognise his own lack of awareness of what has already been said on the matter. Moreover, there is indeed a really difficult question here, which Trudgill for one recognises, and which cannot be airily dismissed. It is being thoroughly discussed, at present, in various books on language and social psychology.

Honey's own proposal is for 'bilectalism', which he claims is different from bidialectalism, because it does not make any assumptions about 'equal goodness', etc. (31). But as the equal goodness issue is a myth, his proposal reduces to the bidialectalism one. There is nothing new in this pamphlet at all.

Or is there? Tucked away on p.31 is the only hint we are given of Honey's underlying attitude. He wants the underprivileged to 'achieve a ready facility in standard English, even at the expense of their development in their original non-standard variety. Even at the expense, I am tempted to add, of their self-esteem ...' (31). So there it is. Just a little step away from the 'straightforward suppression' (30) of the traditional approaches to non-standard language. It is sad, that someone who calls himself, amongst other things, a sociolinguist, could say this. Equally sad, that he could say it a few lines after acknowledging, in a footnote, his personal debt to the marvellous Barbara Strang.

*   *   *   *   *

So what else is there to say? Perhaps three further comments. First, about Labov, who is panned here for providing 'a minimum of hard evidence' in his seminal 1969 article. I have some reservations about Labov's approach, as it happens, and I would not wish to associate myself with the extreme views of some of those influenced by him. But let us be fair. It is true that Labov's paper these days looks somewhat extreme. But it was written 15 years ago. It was the first of its kind, and, as so often when new directions come into a subject, it presented a more black-and-white picture than we have learned to see since. Personally, I think Labov's conclusion about BEV being superior was indeed going too far (15). The contrast between 'precision' and 'empty pretension' cannot be generalised, as Honey says. These days, I think we can all see this —but it is thanks to Labov that we can see it. Labov did more than anyone else to establish a climate in which scientific investigation of non-standard English could proceed. Before Labov, no one gave non-standard varieties the attention they deserved. Now they do. Honey takes a 15-year-old paper out of its historical context, evaluates it in terms of today's climate of opinion, and then has the gall to dub it 'a travesty of scientific method' (15). He ignores the fact that all the issues he raises about this field of research —issues of representativeness, semantic interpretation, context, interview conditions, and so on— have been raised since, and dealt with responsibly, in such journals as Language in Society. There are now several studies of the factors governing acceptability (22). But you can't win, with this man. When linguists do start on the more detailed studies of BEV, Honey criticises them anyway, saying, 'It is unfortunate that not all linguists agree on what these rules are' (16).

Secondly, a comment about innateness, and related matters. Honey is very muddled about Chomsky, and his supposed influence on the members of the hit-list. He seems to think that the 'powerful group of academics', 'supporters of extreme egalitarian and "progressive" notions in the social sciences' (viz. yours truly, among others) have 'swallowed' Chomsky's innateness theory (8). He cites Sampson, as a noble exception, a linguist who 'dare(s) to challenge the Chomskyan position' —but why didn't he cite, say, Crystal? Compare:-

Honey: 'Chomsky offers no firm empirical evidence for his theory
          of the innate basis of all human linguistic behaviour' (8);

Crystal: 'there is a long way to go before such ideas ... become
          convincing. The precise nature of any innate principle
          needs to be much more precisely defined, and it is difficult
          to see how this might be done ... ', etc. etc. (1976, p.36)

The 'equally good' issue raises its head again at this point, of course, in its psycholinguistic form. Here is Honey's comment:-

        '...we have not been given any evidence that all languages
        or dialects have a grammatical structure of equal complexity' (17).

Of course not, as anyone knows who has investigated the vast literature on linguistic complexity. It may indeed be the case that some (varieties of) languages are 'less well equipped as vehicles of certain kinds of intellectual activity than others' (9), that 'the use of different types of language can entail differential intellectual consequences and this could surely affect educational progress' (12). All of this is indeed possible, and I know of no linguist who w uld deny the possibility. Providing evidence on

the point is the tricky thing, in view of the methodological problems which take up so much space in current psycholinguistic journals. But wait! Honey says he <u>has</u> evidence on the matter: 'there is mounting evidence that certain types of complexity of language may reflect corresponding complexity of thought' (17). One waits, expectantly. There is a footnote —possibly to contain a host of psycholinguistic references? No. We are given a reference to a book on scientific English by one Lee Kok Cheong, published by Singapore University Press in 1978, to which is added, 'This important book has not been given the attention it deserves'. I look forward to reading it, there-fore, but I think we will need a little more by way of hard evidence before Honey's view becomes plausible.

Lastly, Honey makes a lot of his requirement of 'hard evidence', and this has impressed his series editors to the extent that they give special typo-graphical prominence to the point in an introductory summary (iii):   the pamphlet 'shows how these theories have no basis whatever in proven fact'. But, just in case the status of Honey's own 'evidence' hasn't emerged clearly in the above pages, here are a few more observations, taken at random, which we are presumably to accept as factual:-

- 'the prejudices against non-standard [English] [are becoming] stronger' (23) (someone should warn the Australian, Liverpudlian, Scots and other humourists, before their TV programmes get too successful);

- 'most children take these [sc. the embarrassments and new social situa-tions which they encounter as they move away from their underprivileged origins] in their stride' (31) (someone should tell the school remedial service that there's nothing to be worried about);

- 'there are almost no "pure" dialect speakers left in Britain' (18) (someone should tell the Leeds Dialect Survey they're wasting their time);

- 'the inability of our schools to turn out pupils with satisfactory standards of English' (3) (so what <u>is</u> the stuff that most of my students speak and write called, then?);

- 'many teachers claim that [the sociolinguist (sic) Basil Bernstein's] proposed analysis [of elaborated vs. restricted] helps' (19) (these I would really like to meet, to discover why; for my experience is that the original distinction proposed by Bernstein hindered rather than helped —which I suppose is why it was replaced in due course by some-thing better);

- 'we have seen how a great industry has grown up, dedicated to disparaging standard English' (28), a 'powerful school of linguistic thought' (5).

In fact, of course, there is no industry, no school here at all, except in Honey's imagination. What we have is a spectrum of opinions, ranging from an extreme radical position to a fairly conservative one. In relation to the standard English question, I like to think I am somewhere right of centre. In relation to questions of linguistic theory, I differ from the other linguists in his list in so many ways, and they amongst each other, that I doubt whether the metaphor of a continuum of views is even appropriate.

*   *   *   *   *

Honey The Language Trap cont.

Towards the end of the pamphlet, Honey professes to see a paradox in the world: 'how can we seek to promote awareness among our pupils of how language works when the "experts" in linguistics to whom they turn for guidance show themselves to be, on specific issues, so unscientific, so uncritical, and so dangerously misleading' (29). He then cites me, Lord preserve us. The real paradox is how Honey has managed to persuade the Kay-Shuttleworth editors that his paper was worth publishing, and how he has managed in recent weeks to attract so much publicity, when it is in fact his own work which is unscientific and misleading. The NCES ought to look to its own standards. The shame of it is that, by adopting such an extreme line, and setting a polemic tone for the discussion which must ensue, he has now obscured a whole set of real issues. There are indeed extremists in the field of sociolinguistics whose views need to be set in perspective; there are ambiguities and vaguenesses and naive educational philosophies. Honey will be used to this, for he is a professor of education. There is real work to be done, on the question of how standard and non-standard English is to be integrated within the curriculum, and a lot of people, including those on his hit-list, are doing it. I would like to have been doing it this week, now largely taken up by this commentary. But what is particularly sad about this whole business is that many of the motiva- tions which have led Honey to write his pamphlet, I too share. I have been as busy as anyone in working on syllabuses for teacher training (3;29), or in providing text-books for use in schools on the way language works (29), or in writing teaching materials (all in standard English, be it noted) for use at both primary and secondary levels. All of this is well-known, for anyone who wishes to see. And I am by no means the only one. So at the end of this exercise, I remain profoundly confused as to Honey's real motiva- tions, as to why he should be so ready to see black where there is white — or at least, various shades of grey. Perhaps one day he will write at a scholarly level on the matter.

David Crystal
University of Reading

Reviewed (ii) by Richard HUDSON

This pamphlet is written in a style designed to raise hackles, and no doubt this is precisely what it will do. Moreover, it contains passages which will appeal enormously to those people who still persist in the bad old beliefs that linguists and their allies (especially their allies) have been fighting hard against for the last half century, and it will be exploited to the full by those who believe there is really only one correct way to speak. Indeed, the first I heard of the pamphlet was when it was quoted in the five-minute news summary on BBC Radio 3 ('A professor of education has said that it is wrong to encourage the use of non-standard English ....', or words to that effect); and the Daily Telegraph and Guardian both carried summaries of it which picked out precisely these negative remarks about non-standard English. So it would have been much better, most of us will probably agree, if the pamphlet had never been published at all, since it is likely to damage what- ever chances there are at present of progress being achieved in this area of our education system.

And yet, there are some good points, which most of us would probably accept, so I should like to start by picking out some of these, before looking at the

bits I don't like. What Professor Honey advocates is a policy he calls
'bilectalism', which is really extremely hard to distinguish from other
people's bidialectalism' (p.31), although he denies that it's the same
thing. Thus, he 'assumes that most children are capable of coping with a
number of different linguistic styles, especially spoken styles, and it is
the aim of such teaching to extend their repertoire so that they can handle
at least two —standard English, and the variety used at home and among
friends (though home and friends may in turn involve two different kinds)'
(pp. 31-32). Hear, hear, we all say. And in order to achieve this aim,
he says, our English teachers need much better training in relation to
language than they currently receive —he refers (p.2) to 'the grotesque
mismatch between the qualifications of those we pay to teach the subject
"English" in our schools, and the actual knowledge and skills which those
teachers are supposed to impart'. Hear, hear, again.

Moreover, I have some sympathy with Honey's criticism of the bland asser-
tion that linguists habitually make about all languages and dialects being
'linguistically equal', though not socially equal. As he says, we actually
have precious little evidence for this claim, except for the general impres-
sion we all have that languages are pretty similar as far as complexity is
concerned. (For example, one never sees a description of a language which
claims that it is relatively simple.) In a sense, I'm sure that we're
right, and that it would be somewhat of a waste of SSRC money and manpower
to work out a way of quantifying complexity in the way that would lead to
quantitative proof of the claim. However, I'm not sure that we've always
been as clear as we could have been about precisely what that sense is
—in other words, about precisely what we mean when we say that all languages
are equal. Do we mean that they all contain the same amount of vocabulary?
Clearly not. Do we mean that they're all equally complex in their morpho-
logical rules? Again, no, because some languages have no morphological rules
at all, and you can't get simpler than that. But are we then claiming that
neither vocabulary nor morphology are 'really' part of language? It's true
that some linguists manage to paint themselves into that particular position,
but surely it's not one that most of us would want to defend? So is it just
a matter of rules of syntax and phonology? If so, can we be sure that we
know where syntax ends and vocabulary begins (e.g. when you learn to use
notwithstanding as a postposition, are you learning a new bit of vocabulary,
or a bit of syntax?)? I think it is time we had another look at some of
these issues, and Honey has every right to point out the weakness of our
evidence.

<p align="center">*   *   *   *   *</p>

Having said all this, however, I still wish the pamphlet hadn't been publi-
shed, because it is a prize example of demagoguery —telling the uninitiated
what you know they want to hear, and letting them think you've got respectable
arguments to show that they, with their 'common sense' (alias prejudices and
ignorance), were right all along, and the experts got it wrong. It's not as
simple as that, and all Honey achieves is to muddy the waters a good deal.

First, he claims that we can show that 'some languages (or, to some extent,
some varieties of one language) might be less well equipped as vehicles of
certain kinds of intellectual activity than others, with consequent intellec-
tual disadvantage to those people who can only handle effectively that one
language or dialect, and not any other, less limiting, form' (p.9). He
quotes Whorf on Hopi, to show that Hopi is inadequate for talking about speed

—but without also mentioning Whorf's suggestion that the Hopi would have the edge on us when it came to understanding Einstein's theory of relativity! Moreover, he assumes throughout that a language is a monolithic entity —either you know it, and all of it at that, or you don't— without making the obvious point that two people might both speak the same language or variety (e.g. standard English), but have different vocabularies, so that one of them would get much more help from their language than the other. He criticises Labov for not comparing like with like in his two interviews, but he commits the same error himself (p.5) when he compares a member of a primitive, non-literate society, with a literate person with (say) the OED at their elbow.

To come to the main point, he claims that non-standard varieties of English are inferior to standard English with respect to the size and range of their vocabularies. Fair enough —if we assume that standard English = the OED plus (say) the Grammar of Contemporary English. But that's again not a fair comparison. What we should do is to compare a child brought up in a standard-English speaking home with one brought up in a non-standard home, and see if they necessarily have different-sized vocabularies. We don't know the answer, but it may well be that there is no significant difference between such pairs of children. Both children are in the same position, if that is so, and for both children the school (and other parts of society, presumably) needs to provide the same help, namely in helping them to extent their linguistic resources by exploiting the riches of OED (and standard syntax, when this goes beyond that of non-standard). In other words, the only kind of 'inadequacy' that matters, from an intellectual point of view (i.e. from Honey's point of view), is the kind that involves gaps in the communicative repertoire; and such gaps can be filled from the same pool of resources, namely standard English, whether they exist in a standard or a non-standard variety. Honey confuses the argument no end by arguing that non-standard forms are inferior because they are part of a system that has gaps which are filled in standard English.

Honey's position on the value of competing forms is ambiguous throughout, and not just in the section I have quoted. It appears most obviously when he discusses accent. Within two pages (23, 24) he manages to face both ways at once. First he claims (without evidence) that a Cockney accent raises serious problems if the hearer is unaccustomed to it, so the use of a Cockney accent (or more generally any local accent) prevents its speaker from reaching a national audience. And then he praises Arthur Scargill as a successful national communicator, without mentioning his local accent!

It's not at all clear to me why Honey wrote this pamphlet, considering how unclear his message turns out to be. But I, for one, wish he hadn't!

<div style="text-align:right">Richard Hudson
University College London</div>

₊ See also Section V, Note on
    LAGB Educational Linguistics.

6. Geneva SMITHERMAN (ed.) Black English and the education of Black children and youth: Proceedings of the National Invitational Symposium on the King Decision (Detroit, Michigan: Center for Black Studies, Wayne State University, 1981) 441 pages ISBN 0-939242 paperback.

Reviewed by Euan REID

This publication arises from a two-day conference held in Detroit, Michigan, in February 1980, following the July 1979 court hearing generally referred to

as the 'Black English' case.   In the book under review the preferred label
is the 'King' case, after the Martin Luther King Junior Elementary School
children in whose name a complaint was brought against the Ann Arbor School
District Board.   The case was eventually heard under the terms of that part
of the 1974 Equal Educational Opportunity Act which states that:

> 'No State shall deny equal educational opportunity to an
> individual on account of his or her race, color, sex or national
> origin, by ...
>
> ...(f) the failure by an educational agency to take appropriate
> action to overcome language barriers that impede equal partici-
> pation by its students in its instructional programs.'

The court had earlier dismissed claims made relating to cultural, social and
economic deprivation, and narrowed the focus to the 'language barriers'
mentioned in the Act.

The children concerned were young, poor Black children from a public
housing development situated in a relatively prosperous middle class area
of Ann Arbor, next to the University of Michigan's North Campus.   The King
School had about 80% 'White' pupils 13% 'Black', 7% 'Asian, Latino & other'
(categories used in the judge's memorandum), and appears to have been well-
resourced and staffed by caring, liberal-minded teachers and auxiliaries.
However, the Black children were disproportionately failing to learn to read,
being assigned to special education, being obliged to repeat grades, all in
spite of special help in school of a generally 'remedial' kind.

The case that was put on their behalf, and supported by an impressive
array of expert testimony from distinguished linguists and educationists
including J.L. Dillard, William Labov, Richard Bailey and the editor of the
book, Geneva Smitherman herself, amounted to an indictment of the teachers
and of the other professionals employed by the school board.   They were in
effect being accused of failing to act on the considerable body of published
research evidence about the structure and functions of Black English, its
relationship to Standard American English, and its relevance to the process
of learning to read Standard English.   One of the crucial, and damning,
points in the testimony of the teachers from the King school was their
insistence that they did not distinguish between the Black English speakers
and the other pupils in their approach to the teaching of reading.   It
turned out that this failure to recognise and act on cultural and linguistic
differences was held to be as damaging as the more obvious kinds of negative
discrimination.   The court ruled that the school and the school board were
negligent in not making the appropriate distinctions and in not taking steps
to overcome the language barriers referred to in the 1974 Act.   It further-
more required the Board within thirty days of the judgment to submit a plan:

> '...defining the exact steps to be taken (1) to help the teachers
> of the plaintiff children at King School to identify children
> speaking "Black English" and the language spoken as a home or
> community language, and (2) to use that knowledge in teaching
> such students how to read standard English.'

The case aroused enormous interest in the US Press, not only among educa-
tional specialists (an Appendix on press coverage has 30 pages of entries
covering July 1977-December 1980 alone).   It was apparently quite frequently
misreported —and not only by white journalists— as being an attempt by the
courts to force the teaching of Black English upon unwilling and innocent
victims, who would as a result continue to be limited to a ghetto position,

educationally, socially and economically. It will be clear from what has
been set out above that it was nothing of the kind.

<p style="text-align:center">*   *   *   *   *</p>

The publication under review makes it possible to reconstruct these facts
about the case, although the reader has to work hard to tunnel through a
mound of sometimes empty rhetoric and ill-expressed comment, relevant and
irrelevant to the topic of the case under discussion. I would recommend
starting with the first Appendix, which sets out Judge Joiner's 'Memorandum
Opinion and Order' in cool, lucid terms. And if you want some high quality
rhetoric, try James Baldwin's 'Keynote Address', or, better still, his
New York Times article 'If Black English Isn't a Language, Then Tell Me,
What Is?', reproduced in another Appendix.

Of the Symposium papers as presented in this book, the most substantial
and carefully revised seems to me to be Richard Bailey's 'Education and the
Law: the King Case in Ann Arbor'. Too many of the rest read like minimally
revised transcripts of spoken presentations given on what was clearly a
politically highly charged occasion; and the transcripts of most of the
preliminary and concluding ceremonials could surely also have been dispensed
with. The 'Task Force Reports and Recommendations' are on the whole the
kind of unco-ordinated commonplaces to be expected from groups of people
meeting for a few hours at a conference, under pressure to report back to
a final plenary; something more considered would have been welcome.

Nevertheless, this is an impressively committed, mostly Black view of the
case and of the issue. The King ruling indicates strikingly how the courts
in the US can contribute to linguistic enlightenment, in a way impossible
to conceive of in the UK. We have as yet neither the legislation, nor the
lawyers; nor does the body of published linguistic and applied linguistic
research on Black English in Britain (Edwards and Sutcliffe notwithstanding)
even begin to approach the equivalent work in the US. We do, however,
have many teachers with similar views on non-standard language varieties
to those held by the King teachers, and we have a press and media not
noticeably better informed on linguistic issues. Plenty of work for Applied
Linguistics yet!

<p style="text-align:right">Euan Reid</p>

Euan is now Director of Community Languages & Education Project, University
of London Institute of Education. See Section V, Notes.

.

V   NOTICES & NOTES

A   NOTICES

1. European Science Foundation Summer School in Linguistics   The second
    ESF Summer School will be on psycholinguistics and will be held in
    Belgium in 1985, and not next year as originally envisaged. (For the
    first Summer School, on sociolinguistics, held at the University of
    Sussex in 1982 under the direction of Professor Lyons, see N/L17 pp.16-19).

2. 10th International Systemic Workshop   This will be held at Ancaster Hall,
    University of Nottingham, from Tues. 6 to Thurs. 8 September 1983. The
    theme of the conference will be the contribution that Systemic Linguistics
    can make to the analysis of texts, both spoken and written. It is planned
    to circulate, via the next issue of Network (see N/L17 p.41), a set of
    about six short texts and it is hoped that wherever possible givers of
    papers will make use of one or more of these texts for their illustrative
    material. As usual, about half the conference will be devoted to the
    conference's theme, while the other half will be more generally based.
    Offers of papers as soon as possible to Margaret Berry, Department of
    English Studies, or Chris Butler, Department of Linguistics, University
    of Nottingham, Nottingham, NG7 2RD, England.

3. Linguistic Minorities Project   The fourth and last progress report was
    issued in January '83 (4pp. A4 available from LMP, Univ. of London Inst.
    of Education, 18 Woburn Square, London WC1H ONS). It outlines the four
    survey instruments the Project has developed since it began in 1979:
    the Schools Language Survey, the Secondary Pupils Survey, the Mother
    Tongue Teaching Directory survey, and the Adult Language Use Survey.
    The main areas used were Bradford, Coventry, Haringey (London), and
    Peterborough. Details are given of reports and materials produced by
    the Project, and two concluding items are announced: a report to be
    submitted to the Department of Education and Science, and a volume of
    the Project's work called The Other Languages of England to be published
    in the Language, Education and Society series of Routledge& Kegan Paul.
    Other volumes are envisaged, one for a teacher audience and one on the
    theoretical and applied issues underlying the active dissemination of the
    LINC project (Language Information Network Co-ordinator). LINC itself
    continues and will issue another mailing later this year or early in 1984.
    LMP came to an end in April and has been succeeded by ...

4. ... the Community Languages and Education project (CLE). This is funded
    by the SSRC and is planned to run from 1983 to 1985. The second-stage
    analysis of the Adult Language Use Survey will form the basis of its work,
    and it is intended to explore also the inter-relationships of the four
    main LMP data-sets. At least three small case studies are planned: on
    Bengali Language Skills and Employment Opportunities, on Polish Saturday
    Schools, and on Turkish at Home and at School. Euan Reid will be Director
    of this project and Anna Morawska will also be full-time. Greg Smith will
    work three-fifths time. Verity Saifullah Khan, who was Director of LMP,

will act as chairperson of the CLE project and will continue to co-ordinate LINC with this and related initiatives at the Institute of Education. Marilyn Martin-Jones left LMP in December 1982 to take up a post as Lecturer in Linguistics at Lancaster University. Further information from the address given in Item 3 (Tel: 01-636-1500 Ext. 266/645).

5. The Open University: Language and Communications Programme Area The newly formed School of Education (bringing together the Educational Studies Faculty and INSET department) is setting up a new programme area to develop courses on Language and Communications. The school has produced some successful courses over the years such as PE232 Language Development (part of the Reading Diploma) and E263 Language in Use and now hopes to co-ordinate and expand the O.U. contributions to the language and communications area. For more information contact Pam Czerniewska, School of Education, The Open University, Walton Hall, Milton Keynes, MK7 6AA.

6. ELT Documents Since the early 1970s The British Council has been publishing ELT DOCUMENTS as a journal of information, criticism and analysis of developments in English language teaching throughout the world. From 1983 the journal will be published by Pergamon Press and edited by Christopher Brumfit, of the University of London Institute of Education. It will continue to maintain a close link with The British Council, and —as in the past— issues will be largely thematic. The journal will not duplicate the activities of others, but will concentrate on unified themes of central interest to serious teachers and practitioners in the field. The two major aims will be:-

1. To publish any material from the ELT world at large which will assist teachers and advisors (particularly but not exclusively those overseas) to keep up-to-date with international thinking and current practice.

2. To publish materials from the field, whether in Britain or overseas, which deserve a wide audience, and particularly material which either derives from or relates to the range of ELT activities undertaken by the British Council. The emphasis will be on thinking which has a direct relevance to practical decision-making, and reports of practical activities which contribute to our understanding of the nature of language teaching and learning.

The responsibility for the contents of each issue will rest with the Editor, in consultation with the Pergamon Institute of English and The British Council. It is hoped to include selected papers from conferences on important issues, papers which have been submitted by individuals and also specially commissioned papers. Organisers and participants in conferences which fall within the general aims outlined above are invited, in the first instance, to write to the Editor at The Pergamon Institute of English. Possible contributions will also be welcomed. Suitable contributions from classroom practitioners will be particularly appreciated.

It is hoped that ELT documents will not only facilitate extended comment and discussion on fundamental issues between metropolitan centres of research and analysis and teachers working in relatively isolated conditions, but will also enable teachers, writers, advisors, teacher trainers and others to communicate directly with each other about common problems and solutions. Consequently there will be particular emphasis on the social,

economic and educational contexts of English teaching, and a demand that contributions combine rigour with realism and relevance.
*** The Pergamon Institute of English (PIE) was established in 1978 with <u>Vaughan James</u> as its Director (Headington Hill Hall, Oxford OX3 OBW; Tel: (0865) 64881).

7. <u>Reading in a Foreign Language</u> This new journal is published by The Language Studies Unit (Modern Languages Dept.) University of Aston in Birmingham. The Editors are Ray Williams and Alexander Urquhart. The international editorial board includes <u>John Sinclair</u> and <u>Henry Widdowson</u>. The Journal will appear twice a year and will publish articles concerning both the theory and practice of learning to read and teaching reading in a foreign or second language; its thrust will be in the field of Languages for Specific Purposes, including reading for academic and professional study, content field readability, etc. Issue 1(1), March 1983, contains, amongst other things, 'Text as a vehicle for information: the classroom use of written texts in teaching reading in a foreign language' (<u>Tim Johns</u> & Florence Davies), 'Learning how to cope with reading in English for academic purposes in 26 hours' (Armando Baltra), 'Teaching the recognition of cohesive ties in reading a foreign language' (Ray Williams), a report on the International Symposium on LSP (Eindhoven, August 1982), and book reviews by <u>Meriel Bloor</u>, <u>Eddie Williams</u> & <u>Don Porter</u>, <u>Bob Jordan</u>, and Ray Williams. Further information, subscriptions (£6 per annum, UK and Europe; £9 outside Europe, airmail), manuscripts, and advertising enquiries, to the Editors (Aston University's address: Birmingham B4 7ET; tel: 021-359-3611).

B. <u>NOTES</u>

8. <u>BAAL/LAGB Joint Committee on Linguistics in Education (CLIE)</u>.
*** At its most recent meeting (24.6.83), it was suggested that regular reports of CLIE's activity should appear in the Newsletter,and I look forward to this beginning in the Autumn issue. Information about CLIE will be found in N/L15 Summer '82. Since then the Joint Committee has met three times, and discussed among other things, possibilities for A-level papers in Linguistics and in English Language (one such possibility, in English Language, is already being experimented with by the Joint Matriculation Board). Further information from <u>Mike Riddle</u> (Middlesex Poly), Chairman, or <u>Bill Littlewood</u> (Univ. Coll. of Swansea), Secretary.

9. <u>LAGB: Educational Linguistics Section</u> *** The next meeting of the Linguistics Association is at Henderson Hall, University of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, from Wed. 21 to Fri. 23 Sept. The establishment of a section on Educational Linguistics is recorded in the account of LAGB's Spring Meeting in this issue. Dick HUDSON, who initiated this venture, reports a very encouraging response to his call for papers on the topic 'Linguistic Equality'. The two-hour session at Newcastle will contain three 20-minute papers:-

Jim Milroy (Sheffield)	'On possible differences of a linguistic kind between standard and non-standard varieties of language'
Margaret Deuchar (Sussex)	'Relative clauses and linguistic equality'
Dick Leith (Birmingham)	'Orality, literacy and linguistic equality'.

The rest of the time will be discussion — in which you can book with Dick a 3-minute slot if you wish to present a particular point.

About 100 members of BAAL are also members of LAGB (and vice versa!); those who aren't might like to note that LAGB is very welcoming towards guests at its meetings.

10. **News from Exeter**   The following notes are based on information kindly supplied by <u>Reinhard HARTMANN</u>.

<u>Linguistics at Exeter</u>   Another busy year. The Language Centre at Exeter is the base for linguistics in the Faculty of Arts. Since 1973 it has produced 5 PhDs and 21 MAs in linguistics. <u>Gregory James</u>, lecturer in Applied Linguistics and EFL specialist, is leaving for a senior post in Hong Kong. The Centre has been allowed to replace his post for two years.

<u>Lexicography at Exeter</u>   The programme is complete (50 speakers) for the LEXeter 1983 conference (9-12 September; see N/L16 p.54). The first lexicographical event at Exeter organised for BAAL by Reinhard was the Seminar on Lexicography of 1978, the proceeds of which funded the book of seminar papers <u>Dictionaries and their users</u> (ed. R.R.K. Hartmann, 1979). Reinhard has offered a paper on the relationship between LEXeter and Applied Linguistics for the Annual Meeting in Leicester.

Details of publications, including <u>Dictionaries and their users</u>, and of the Exeter Tapes (400 titles), and the extremely useful brochure of the Centre are available from the University of Exeter Language Centre, Exeter EX4 4QH (tel: 0392-77911 Ext.715).

<u>Members' activities</u>

11. <u>Christopher BRUMFIT</u> *₊* It has been a busy year also for the Chairman of BAAL. 1983 has seen a doctorate, with a thesis on 'The basis of a communicative methodology in language teaching', the publication of two books (with <u>John Roberts</u>, <u>An Introduction to language and language teaching</u>, Batsford; with Mary Finocchiaro, <u>The functional-notional curriculum: from theory to practice</u>, OUP New York), and visits, in March, to the Georgetown Round Table (see Section II.3 of this issue), and the TESOL Convention in Toronto, and, in April, to the British Council ELT Conference in Bologna (also present, <u>Henry Widdowson</u>, <u>Mark Lowe</u>) and to RELC, Singapore (also present, <u>Chris Candlin</u>, <u>John Munby</u>).

₊ This seems a convenient hook to hang Christopher's past career on (so to speak): Read English at Oxford, Dip.Ed. at Makerere, Uganda, and taught English Language & Literature in secondary school in Tanzania before moving to the University of Dar es Salaam (following the discovery of linguistics via Halliday, McIntosh & Strevens!). Later to Essex for the M.A.; work in mother tongue and multi-cultural teaching at City of Birmingham College of Education; and since 1974 at the University of London Institute of Education.

Earlier books: (with <u>Keith Johnson</u>) ed., <u>The communicative approach to language teaching</u>, OUP 1979; <u>Problems and principles in English teaching</u>, Pergamon 1980; ed., <u>English for international communication</u>, Pergamon 1982. Last year Chris spent three months at OISE, Toronto, and also visited, professionally, Belgium, China, France, Greece, USA, Venezuela, and Zimbabwe.

Chris and his wife <u>Ann</u> (they have one son, Simon) both took their MAs at Essex under <u>Peter Strevens</u> — like many other members of BAAL! They

joined BAAL in 1972, and in 1974 Chris, with <u>Mike Stubbs</u>, organised the BAAL Seminar at Birmingham on 'The analysis of spoken discourse'. Before his election as Chairman, he was a Committee member from 1974, Assistant Secretary 1976/77, and first Editor of the Newsletter from 1976 to 1981. Outside BAAL, Chris was Secretary of the Midlands Association for Linguistic Studies (MALS) 1973/74, has been a member of NATE and a committee member of IATEFL, and has been a member of LAGB as long as he has been a member of BAAL. (See also item 6 above.)

.
 *   I hope this chairmanly example will help the Newsletter to receive more information from members for the benefit of other members! -Ed.

12.   <u>Robin FAWCETT</u> will be paying a British Council-sponsored visit to Australia this Summer, starting at Murdoch University, Perth, where Michael O'Toole ('Paddy' when he was at Essex) is now Professor of Communication Studies, and moving on to Melbourne for a teachers' workshop. He will attend the annual meeting of the Applied Linguistics Association of Australia, to give the keynote address on 'Language as a resource', followed by the Australian Linguistics Association meeting. After that there will be visits to Dr. Dick Walker's language research unit at Brisbane College of Advanced Education and the University of Queensland, and to the University of Sydney, where Michael Halliday has the Chair of Linguistics, and to Macquarie University, where Michael's wife Ruqaiya Hasan teaches. He is delighted to have had invitations to visit the University of Newcastle (New South Wales), and Auckland in New Zealand, and is looking forward to meeting as many linguists and applied linguists as possible during his visit.

13.   Welcome to <u>Anna TROSBORG</u> (Dept. of English, University of Aarhus, 8000 Aarhus C, Denmark), who attended the last Annual Meeting, in Newcastle, and gave a paper entitled 'Cooperation in native-nonnative speaker communication' (see N/L16 p.25). Anna appears to be our third BAAL member in Denmark, the others, in the May '82 list, being Miss <u>A.P.K. Ryan</u>, of the same department at Aarhus, and <u>Robert Phillipson</u>.

14.   <u>Pit CORDER</u> A founder member and former Chairman of BAAL, <u>Pit Corder</u> is retiring this year, after 19 years in Edinburgh, where he became Head of the Department of Applied Linguistics in 1964, in succession to Ian Catford. Pit had previously worked with the British Council, and in the English Department of the University of Leeds with Peter Strevens. Following the amalgamation of Applied Linguistics, Phonetics, and Linguistics into the Department of Linguistics in 1969, he was promoted to a personal Chair of Applied Linguistics in 1970. Pit was the main influence on <u>The Edinburgh Course in Applied Linguistics</u> (OUP, 4 vols. 1973-77), besides writing, among other things, the Penguin <u>Introduction to Applied Linguistics</u> and, with OUP, <u>Error Analysis and Interlanguage</u>. He has been President of AILA, for two terms of office, and was also the first Chairman of the Standing Committee of the NCLE.

   Pit retires this summer, and he and his wife will take up residence in the Lake District where they have had a second home for many years. Our best wishes go with them!