Speaking to Learn: Using Business Cases in EFL Classes

by Susan Conrad

This article provides background and the theoretical justification for a presentation to take place at the January AETK meeting. Susan Conrad teaches at the English Training Center in Seoul.

If we want our students to become more competent English speakers, how important is it that they have opportunities for realistic, substantive communication in class? How important is it that they speak not to practice a certain sentence structure or to imitate a model, but to discuss their own ideas in order to reach a conclusion?

The answer "very important" is supported by three diverse areas of interest in TESOL: communicative language teaching, conversational analysis, and the teaching of grammar. Most of us have become well acquainted with the justification of communicative teaching, of paying more attention to meaning, to

the form-meaning relationship, to the way language is used as a tool for communication—in general, promoting learning through meaningful use of language (for a summary, see Richards & Rodgers, 1986). In addition, we have seen firsthand that students don't become fluent through meaningless repetition and memorization. What they can easily do in drills, they often cannot use quickly and appropriately in more realistic situations. Different kinds of tasks which will improve students' communicative ability are needed.

The second justification for substantive discussions in class comes from the field of conversational analysis. Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson (1978) first described the complexity of turn-taking in conversations. Since then we have amassed more and more knowledge of what a person needs to know to function in a conversation (for a summary, see Wardhaugh, 1985). How do you get a

■ INSIDE:

Spring Conference
Call for Papers

The 1989 AETK Spring Conference will be held the last weekend of May. Persons interested in giving a presentation should send a proposal by March 15, 1989 to Marie Fellbaum, c/o Yonsei University Foreign Language Institute, 134 Shinchon-dong, Suhdaemoon-ku, Seoul 120-749.

Topics may include: research in second language acquisition, teacher education and training, classroom techniques and methods in all skill areas, or any other area related to foreign language teaching in Korea.

Presentation proposals must include a title, a 150 word abstract, and the name and current mailing address of the presenter.　　　□

Looking Back

As we look ahead to 1989, it is appropriate to also look back and remember the past. Most present members of AETK joined after 1985 and did not receive the Association's earlier newsletters, so this issue includes several articles from AETK newsletters published during the years 1982-1985.

The first AETK newsletter was called *Teaching English in Korea* and began with Barbara Mintz as editor in January 1982. There were five issues in Volume 1 (1982), three in Volume 2 (1983), and one in Volume 3 (1984). The name was changed to *AETK News* when the present editor began in 1985, but the system of numbering was continued. There were five issues in Volume 4 (1985-1986) and five in Volume 5 (1986-1987).

The present newsletter, *AETK Bulletin*, began in September 1987. At that point the system of using volume and issue numbers was dropped in favor of the simpler practice of numbering each issue consecutively.

From September 1987 until April 1988, *AETK Bulletin* (Numbers 1-7) appeared more or less monthly as a short news sheet, then became a bimonthly newsletter in its present format beginning with Number 8, issued in July 1988.　　　□

AETK

The Association of English Teachers in Korea is a professional association of language teachers formed in November 1981 to promote scholarship, strengthen instruction, foster research, disseminate information and facilitate cross-cultural understanding among persons concerned with foreign-language teaching and learning in Korea. Meetings are held monthly except during the summer, and the Association occasionally sponsors other events of interest to language teachers. Membership is open to all persons who support the goals of the Association. AETK is an affiliate of TESOL (Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages).

President:
Paul Cavanaugh, Yonsei University Foreign Language Institute
Vice President:
Marie Fellbaum, Yonsei University Foreign Language Institute
Secretary-Treasurer:
(Position vacant)
Member-at-Large 1987-1989:
Eric Strickland, Yonsei University Foreign Language Institute
Member-at-Large 1988-1990:
William Burns, Sogang University
Past President:
George Matthews, University of Maryland, Asian Division
Publications Committee Chair:
Eric Strickland, Yonsei University Foreign Language Institute
Newsletter Editor:
Dwight Strawn, Yonsei University English Department

AETK Bulletin, the Association's newsletter, is published as a service to AETK members and may be obtained by joining the Association and paying the annual membership dues (W10,000).

The Publications Committee welcomes articles in English for *AETK Bulletin* concerning all aspects of foreign language teaching and learning, especially those with relevance to Korea. All material should be typed, double-spaced, and should follow the APA style as used in the *TESOL Quarterly* (see a recent issue of *TESOL Quarterly* for examples).

Send all announcements and articles to be considered for publication to: AETK Bulletin, c/o Eric Strickland, Yonsei University Foreign Language Institute, 134 Shinchon-dong, Suhdaemoon-ku, Seoul 120-749.

Deadlines for the receipt of material are as follows:

November 15	for the January issue
January 15	for the March issue
March 15	for the May issue
May 15	for the July issue
July 15	for the September issue
September 15	for the November issue

AETK CALENDAR

A Schedule of Forthcoming Events Sponsored by the Association of English Teachers in Korea

January   **Saturday, January 21, 1989, 2:30 PM.** January AETK meeting at the Yonsei University Foreign Language Institute. Susan Conrad (English Training Center) will give a presentation entitled "Speaking to Learn: Using Business Cases in EFL Classes." (See related article on page 1 of this issue.)

February   **Saturday, February 18, 1989, 2:30 PM.** February AETK meeting at the Yonsei University Foreign Language Institute. Glenda Thresher (Central Texas College) will speak on "Some Communicative Activities for the ESL Classroom." (Note: The February meeting will not be held on Wednesday, February 15, as announced in the November *AETK Bulletin*, but will be on Saturday, Feburary 18.)

March   Plans to be announced.

April   Plans to be announced.

May   1989 AETK Spring Conference and Annual Business Meeting. Details to be announced.

For further information about AETK programs, contact Marie Fellbaum, c/o Yonsei University Foreign Language Institute, 134 Shinchon-dong, Suhdaemoon-ku, Seoul 120-749.

AETK Council Position Open
Secretary-Treasurer Resigns

Susan Gaer, AETK Secretary-Treasurer elected in May 1988, resigned in November because of a change in plans which meant that she would be returning to the United States.

Gaer's resignation left a key post in the AETK Council vacant, and the Council is looking for someone who can complete her term and serve as the AETK Secretary-Treasurer until the next Annual Meeting in May 1989.

Any AETK member who is interested in filling this position for the remainder of Ms. Gaer's term should contact AETK President Paul Cavanaugh, c/o Yonsei University Foreign Language Institute, 134 Shinchon-dong, Suhdaemoon-ku, Seoul 120-749. TEL: 392-0131, ext. 2784.

While the position of Secretary-Treasurer is vacant, all membership applications and dues payments should be sent to AETK President Paul Cavanaugh at the above address.

Curriculum Development at Sogang University

by William T. Burns

William Burns, who teaches at Sogang University, was the speaker at the November 1988 AETK meeting held on November 12 in conjunction with the AETK Book Fair. The following article is a summary of his presentation.

Sogang University is revamping its General English Program. A university-wide restructuring of requirements last spring prompted the English faculty to undertake an evaluation and redefinition of the General English curriculum which had remained virtually unchanged since the drastic enrollment increases in 1981.

In fact, there had been mounting pressure from both faculty and students in recent years for a response to the changed emphases in language teaching theory worldwide, as well as for a response to the demands of students for more participation in the management of their learning. Many felt that the current program was based on an increasingly outmoded communicative methodology irrelevant to the newly "democratized" campus.

Professor Lee Hong Bae, the program director, last spring asked the faculty members to join one of several research committees whose findings would provide the basis for a new curriculum. The research areas included student perceptions of language needs, non-English faculty perceptions, trends in major Korean universities, and international trends in English language teaching.

Although the relatively short period available precluded overly rigorous research, the teachers were able to accumulate mountains of often surprising data. To a remarkable extent, results from the various committees led to similar conclusions.

The most significant results were those from the committees on student perceptions and "world trends."

Students in general were less critical of the current program than had been expected. They indicated support for the Sogang tradition of using English as the medium of instruction for all General English courses. The faculty's foreboding that students might opt for grammar-translation methodology proved unfounded. Students were also more positive than expected toward Sogang's widespread use of video in class. Students voiced strong desire for more content in the courses, especially content related to their areas of specialization. They asked for more emphasis on reading and writing skills and for a more integrated curriculum. Many students

considered the six required two-credit courses unrelated and unfocused. A number of students expressed increased interest in topics related to foreign culture, an aspect of ELT that many teachers have played down in recent years.

The research on language teaching methodology indicated an international trend toward greater specification of purpose. Of particular interest for university programs is the development of "English for Academic Purposes," especially in Europe and North America. Also the cognitive element of language learning is receiving increased attention. The CALP (Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency) goal as suggested by James Cummins in 1979 has now been refined into CALLA (The Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach) recently described by Chamot & O'Malley (1987). "Cognitive" in these acronyms refers, not so much to the rule learning of those methodologies in the 1970s heavily influenced by Chomsky's earlier work, but more to content learning as the matrix for language learning. Bernard Mohan's *Language and Content* (1986) has generally been seen as a landmark text on the topic. Also "integration" has been promoted in reference not merely to language and content, but also to the so-called four skills. Thus the general pattern of contemporary language teaching appears to be that students identify some content area which they research through reading and listening, discuss to sharpen their understanding, and finally report about in written or oral composition.

On the basis of the research it was relatively easy for the faculty to work out new course descriptions for a reduced number of courses with increased content and better integration of skills. More problematic has been the selection of materials. Early on it became evident that there are no materials which provide the oral/aural practice that Korean university students need integrated with materials designed for reading skills development at a suitable intellectual level. It was obvious that most of the materials would have to be developed by the faculty. Since it was more practical to develop reading materials than video programs, the faculty decided to choose professionally produced video programs (in the case of the basic course, a series of documentaries distributed by the BBC) and then produce various materials supporting the growth of reading skills, reading comprehension, discussion, and composition.

The faculty have generally found

this materials production quite challenging since the methodology is so new. It has been necessary to make a two-pronged effort: first in theoretical research, especially on content-based instruction and on basic reading skills, and secondly in classroom research with prototypes of the new materials. This phase of the project, which is just getting underway, will probably require two or three years of rather intensive production followed by further evaluation.

REFERENCES

Chamot, A., & O'Malley, J. (1987). The cognitive academic language learning approach: A bridge to the mainstream. *TESOL Quarterly, 21,* 227-249.

Cummins, J. (1979). Cognitive/academic language proficiency, linguistic interdependence, the optimal age question, and some other matters. *Working Papers on Bilingualism, 19,* 197-205.

Mohan, B. (1986). *Language and content.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley. □

Kangnam Group Meets at ETC

A group of AETK members in the Kangnam area of Seoul met on November 26 at the English Training Center in Yoksam-dong for a presentation by Susan Gaer and Susan Oak (both of ETC) on the use of video in language teaching.

This is the first reported gathering of AETK members for a separate meeting in their own area, and it suggests that perhaps the time has come for the Association to revamp its structure to include provisions for local chapters and/or special interest groups with their own schedules of meetings and activities. □

December AETK Meeting

John Nance, British Council representative in Seoul, was the speaker at the December AETK meeting held on December 7 at the Yonsei University Foreign Language Institute.

In his presentation, Mr. Nance explained the role of the British Council as an autonomous agency supporting English language teaching around the world and described the Council's facilities and resources available for that effort in Korea. □

Korean Students' Acquisition of English: Personal, Cultural and Linguistic Variables

by Edward F. Klein

Let me begin with a true story. My first son, who is a voracious eater, was gulping down his cereal one morning not so long ago. I said to him, "Patrick, you eat like a pig! Kkul-kkul." *Kkul-kkul* is the onomatopoeic form used to imitate the sounds of pigs in the Korean language.

"Daddy, what's that mean?"

Being the inveterate language teacher, I seized upon the occasion to give a mini-language lesson. "*Kkul-kkul* is what a pig says in Korean," I said didactically. I continued, "Furthermore, ducks say *coin-coin* in French and dogs say *mong-mong* in Korean." With this last piece of linguistic information, however, I had pushed my luck too far. Though my children had never had the experience of hearing any Korean pigs or French ducks, by which they could have either confirmed or refuted my early morning linguistic tid-bits, the alleged Korean dog sounds caught the attention of my eight-year-old daughter.

"Oh, Daddy, you're wrong about the dog. I heard a Korean dog barking at the house next door yesterday, and that Korean dog went *bow-wow* just like any American dog I've ever heard!"

Of course my wife and I were reduced to deep belly laughter, but upon a little reflection, I realized that it was I who was the student in this mini-lesson, for it was a poignant reminder that there is more to language learning and teaching than the simple relating of information from a knower to a non-knower. My daughter's rejection of the idea that a Korean dog could "sound" different than an American dog brought to light again how important it is for the language teacher to realize the learner's cognitive frame of reference, the language background, and even the student's personal affective domain, for in refuting daddy's allegation that Korean dogs and American dogs barked differently, my daughter showed no small amount of emotional involvement.

For about a decade now, applied linguistics and language teaching pedagogy have been placing an increasing amount of emphasis on the need to consider a wide range of variables in the complementary processes of language teaching and learning. As language teaching professionals develop their approaches, methods, techniques, and theory of language acquisition, it is often pointed out that we must consider the linguistic, cultural, and personal aspects of the language learning process. In the following few paragraphs, I would like to review briefly how the general trends in our field have shifted over the years, especially in light of the linguistic, cultural, and personal variables, and, more specifically, how this relates to language teaching in Korea.

The so-called grammar-translation method of language teaching has always had as its goal a reading knowledge of the target language. It was expected that students would display their knowledge of the target language by translating it into the mother tongue. One particularly unhappy aspect of this approach was that it was usually based on a written grammar that closely followed the Greek and Latin models of old. This resulted in some strange descriptions of English bent to match classical grammar formats (e.g., declining English nouns when actually only the possessive case in English is ever different!). In many ways, the grammar-translation method matched well several aspects of traditional Korean education. The memorization of rules and vocabulary and recitation aloud of readings remind us of students poring over Chinese characters and ancient classical writings. The total acceptance of a written grammar, no matter how inaccurate it was, reflected the importance placed on unquestioning acceptance of authority. The English grammar-translation classroom was emotionally quite safe since the student was hardly ever asked or encouraged to venture into real use of the target language. A student could safely stay in the mother tongue, translating into Korean or asking questions about English in Korean. This is a phenomenon not unique to Korea. The same was true in my U.S. high school Latin and Greek classes.

In summary, the grammar-translation method paid heed almost exclusively to linguistic variables of the target language, and those only as presented in a grammar based on a classical format that dated back to Dionysius Thrax in the second century B.C. There were few cultural aspects dealt with during the classes. Any personal variables in the process of language learning were mostly ignored. All of the students were expected to learn in about the same way: "Be prepared to translate from page x to page y." The student had to make little commitment to thinking or feeling in the new language.

After World War II, behavioral psychology and structural linguistics met in the language classroom and the audio-lingual method developed. Considerable change came about in the role of linguistics in language teaching. Contrastive analyses were carried out on many pairs of languages so that we language teachers could know where to expect problems in the pronunciation, morphology, and syntax of the language learner's production. For example, the fact that English has a two-way contrast in bilabial plosives based on voicing (/p/ vs. /b/) but Korean has a three-way contrast in bilabial plosives based primarily on the onset of voicing the vowel after the release of the consonant (/p/ vs. /p'/ vs. /pp/) was enough for the linguists to predict that the English speaker would have trouble differentiating among and producing the Korean bilabial plosives. These points, therefore, needed to be carefully pointed out and practiced in the classroom. Instead of grammars based on classical models, descriptive grammars of languages were worked out, and teaching materials were developed mostly for drilling sentence patterns. The patterns were manipulated in the drills by a variety of methods, such as substitution, deletion, expansion, and transformation.

In audio-lingualism a great deal more attention was paid to cultural aspects of the target language. This was probably because speaking and understanding were being emphasized more; and, in fact, there was a statistically more probable chance that the language learner would someday have the opportunity to face a native speaker of the target language. That is, travel possibilities were burgeoning. A notable publication of the time by one of the pillars of audio-lingualism was Robert Lado's *Linguistics Across Cultures.*

Language classes using an audio-lingual approach certainly had different assumptions about learning theory. Because of the influence of behavioral psychology, language learning was said to be habit formation (not the memorization of grammar rules), yet audio-lingualism was similar to grammar translation in that there was little room for considering differences among learners. There were also a number of other important aspects in the personal affective domain. For example, great

TESOL: Our Evolving Profession

by Shirley Wright

Reprinted from TESOL Newsletter, *Vol. XXII, No. 5 (October 1988). Shirley Wright, who teaches at George Washington University, is a member of the TESOL Executive Board.*

The sixth, revised Directory of Professional Preparation Programs in TESOL in the U.S. 1981-84 has as it Foreword an insightful article by TESOL's first president, Harold B. Allen, entitled "You and the Profession." In it Allen sketched the "continuing rapid transformation of an occupation and an emerging discipline into a new profession." Allen, of course, referred to the teaching of ESOL.

Allen contends that this professionalization process began in 1940 with the founding of the English Language Institute at the University of Michigan and 'the recognition that the teaching of ESOL is a discipline requiring preparation different from that of teachers of English to native speakers"; in other words, a recognition that simply being a native speaker does not make you an effective teacher of ESOL. Allen dates the emergence of professional status for the teaching of ESOL as 1966, the year that TESOL, the professional organization, was founded. If you are into astrology, a trendy topic in recent times, 1966 places TESOL in the year of the horse under the Chinese calendar system, and under the sign of Pisces, but close to the Aries cusp, if we accept as TESOL's birthdate the March 18-19 date when the TESOL constitution was ratified.

In Allen's brief account of TESOL's transformation into a profession, he draws on research carried out by social scientists analyzing the sociology of the profession. These studies characterize professions as often evolving out of disciplines, which over time have spun out of occupations. Another identifying attribute, Allen points out, is "having association with an already established profession." His relevant example here is the parental-offspring relationship in the early days between the teaching of English to native speakers and the teaching of English to speakers of other languages. In fact, TESOL, the professional organization, is the offspring of five parent organizations,

one of which was the National Council of Teachers of English. In any case, the point I wish to emphasize here is that professionalization is an evolutionary process. Moreover, although TESOL has shown tremendous growth over the past two decades and although, as a profession, TESOL has come a long way, we are still very young.

In my view, the youthfulness of TESOL is a double-edged sword. On the minus side, it means that we must suffer through the growing pains that appear to go with an evolving profession: lack of professional recognition, low status, poor pay. On the plus side, it means that, as members of the profession, we have it within our power to contribute to the shaping of our profession: defining goals and developing and implementing strategies for attaining these goals.

So far what has been accomplished? The decade of the '70s saw rapid growth in the teaching of ESOL and the theme throughout this period centered on pedagogic issues, such as defining qualifications and developing training programs for practitioners in teaching ESOL. If there were discussions about professional standards, or employment issues, the voices were not loud enough or frequent enough to be noticed. In contrast, the current decade of the '80s has been strongly committed to issues of professional standards and employment concerns. Let's quickly review some of the highlights.

The spring of 1979 marked the appearance of an article by Lorraine Goldman in the *WATESOL Newsletter*, lamenting the sorry state of the TESOL professional vis-à-vis employment opportunities and wondering whether she should give up, and whether anyone cared. In the fall of that year, the *WATESOL Newsletter* carried a response to Lorraine's lament written by Ira Bogotch. In essence, Ira said, "Yes, Lorraine, the TESOL profession is in a sorry state, but don't leave: stay and change it, work to make it better." In this same article, Ira called on WATESOL to organize a Town Meeting on "Employment Concerns in ESOL." WATESOL complied. The following year, 1980, WATESOL took its employment issues show on the road to the TESOL Convention in San Francisco, and the result was the formation of the TESOL Ad Hoc Committee on Employ-

ment Issues, chaired by Carol J. Kreidler. The following year this committee issued a written report making recommendations for effecting positive change in the employment arena. The committee on Employment Issues subsequently became part of a new committee, the TESOL Committee on Professional Standards. Under the continuing leadership of Carol J. Kreidler, and following the lead of NAFSA, which had already gone through the process of developing NAFSA Principles for International Educational Exchange (1983), the Committee on Professional Standards began the enormous task of developing standards for the profession. They were completed and endorsed in 1985. Like the NAFSA Principles, the TESOL Standards form the basis of a program of self-study or self-regulation.

The activities here described have been a necessary step and of critical importance to the evolution of our profession. It is, however, still too soon to gauge the extent of the effect the self-study program will have on the profession as a whole. I firmly believe the benefits will be great. They may, however, be slow in coming because the self-study process itself is slow, and the seemingly simple task of getting every program launched into a self-study, in reality, represents a mind-boggling undertaking. Stay tuned.

Now, as the decade of the '80s begins to decline, I have pulled out my astrological charts, polished my crystal ball, and checked the tea leaves to see what the future holds.

What I see as we approach the final decade of the 20th century is that the best is yet to come! I see the TESOL and NAFSA Programs of Self-Study gradually gathering momentum and really taking off, and I predict that programs that make a genuine, serious commitment and effort to go through the NAFSA and TESOL programs of self-study will benefit greatly from the experience and will in turn contribute to enhancing the strong professional image that we must project in our quest to increase the awareness of TESOL as a profession among decision makers outside of our group. In addition, I predict for TESOL a gradual shift, from the looking inward and communicating among ourselves that has characterized the 1980s toward a looking outward in the 1990s,

Our Evolving Profession
(Continued from p. 5)

is just as critical and as important a step in defining and shaping our professional evolution as has been the development of professional standards and the program for self study in the 1980s. Apparently, I am not alone in sharing this view.

At the TESOL Convention in Chicago last March, Linda Tobash of LaGuardia Community College reported on the results of a survey on employment issues conducted last year.

Linda reported that "professionalism" topped the list of most frequently cited problems. Respondents indicated that they believe that we, as a profession, must take greater initiative in making decision makers and others outside of our field aware of "who it is we are and what it is we do." In Linda's survey respondents who identified professionalism as the top problem called for the following actions:

1. Push professionalism and professional recognition.
2. Convince universities that we (ESOL) are a department and not a short term program.
3. Show that we are an academic discipline and not remdial; not just anyone can teach ESOL; e.g., Architect to TESOL professional: "Do you think I could teach English in Malaysia?" TESOL professional to architect: "Do you think I could design houses in Sarawak?"
4. Get TESOL concerns to the general public.
5. Safeguard the rights of all professionals.
6. Publicize the need for trained staff; stop the trend of hiring untrained and underqualified both to teach and/or to develop materials. (This was seen as being most detrimental to the entire profession since staff who are untrained cannot represent us professionally.)

They (the respondents) believe that "until TESOL is viewed by one and all as a profession, with unique characteristics, made up of members having comparable worth to peers and colleagues, many issues relating to salary, securities, and benefits cannot be resolved." I believe they are right on!

Linda's respondents also called for action in other categories, such as working for ESOL Certification in each and every state in the US. Currently, 34 out of 50 states recognize the necessity of special training for the teaching of ESOL. There are still 14 states outstanding: Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, California, Maine, Maryland, Mississippi, Michigan, Missouri, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Vermont, and West Virginia. Although state certification adversely affects K-12 programs most directly, state certification also has to have serious impact on post secondary programs in state institutions of higher learning because it indicates refusal of that state to recognize the legitimacy of ESL as a discipline requiring teachers with specialized training. In my opinion, a state university-based ESOL program located in a state that has endorsed ESOL certification will have better luck making a case for professional recognition. The message: We should all be pushing for 100% state certification of ESOL teachers (all 50 states) by the year 2000.

In conclusion, just as the '70s appeared to emphasize pedagogical developments in the teaching of ESOL and the decade of the '80s has had us turning our collective attention inward to issues of employment, professional standards, and self-study, I believe that in the decade ahead our mission is to take the necessary measures to ensure that outsiders (decision makers, peers, and colleagues) come to recognize and to accept the teaching of English to speakers of other languages as a profession in its own right. We can accept

nothing less if we hope to comple the evolutionary process of professional ization.

Hence, my number one professional goal for TESOL is the achievement of external recognition for TESOL as a legitimate, bonafide, academic profession, made up of professional members, whose specialized knowledge and training equip them to work as teachers, teacher trainers, administrators, materials writers, or researchers in the teaching of English to speakers of other languages. My deadline is reasonable: ASAP or at the latest, by the year 2000. Everyone is invited to join this crusade. We will all benefit, our students included.

REFERENCES

Allen, H.B. (1982). You and your profession. In *Directory of professional programs in TESOL in the US 1981-84.* Edited by Charles H. Blatchford. Washington, DC: TESOL.

Bogotch, I. (1979). Before you quit. *WATESOL Newsletter,* August 1979. Reprinted in *TESOL Newsletter. 13* (December 1979), 23.

Goldman, L. (1979). Employment scene: Do we fiddle while Rome burns? *WATESOL Newsletter.* June 1979. Reprinted in *TESOL Newsletter. 13* (December 1979), 23.

NAFSA. (1983). *Principles for international education exchange.* Washington, DC: National Association for Foreign Student Affairs.

TESOL. (1985). *Statement of core standards for language and professional preparation programs.* Washington, DC: TESOL.

Tobash, L. (1988). Report on 1987 survey of employment conditions. Presentation at the Working Session of the Committee on Professional Standards, TESOL Convention. Chicago, Illinois, March 1988. □

WRITING

Writing Scoring Guide
by Robert MacPherson

Reprinted from Teaching English in Korea, 1 *(3), May 1982. When this article first appeared, Robert MacPherson was teaching at Sungkyunkwan University. The assumptions behind the scoring guide are that the basic principles of paragraph organization (definitions of unity, development, and coherence) have been taught and that the student essays will be a maximum of two single-spaced handwritten pages. Each student receives a copy of the guide so that all students will know how the grades for their essays were derived.*

To the student: Your essay will be graded according to two criteria: (1) Organization & Content and (2) Grammar, Vocabulary & Spelling. You will receive one numerical score for each. To derive your grade, add the two scores and multiply the result by 4.

    For example:

    15 (for Organization & Content) + 10 (for Grammar, Vocabulary & Spelling) = 25, and $25 \times 4 = 100$ (A+).

I. Organization & Content

15 - Good clear, balanced structure (beginning, body, ending) with interesting, creative treatment of the assigned topic. Unity is provided by relevant supporting detail and smooth transitions. Composition is clear and informative.

13 - Satisfactory structure. Treatment of topic is clear but routine. No indication of additional sources for development. More supporting detail is needed for topic.

11 - Adequate essay structure. Treatment of topic is somewhat general and/or vague. Topic sentences are sometimes not supported. Transitions are sometimes weak.

9 - Weak structure. Basic composition parts (beginning, body, ending) are evident but lack balance. Topic needs clarification. Transitions weak. More development (supporting detail) needed. Weak unity.

7 - Defective structure. One or more composition parts missing. Unity is lacking in attempt to address one topic. Total composition appears vague or incoherent.

5 - Little structure beyond individual sentences. Topic unclear. Paper rambles from generality to generality. If specific facts are presented, their relationship to the topic is unclear. Paper lacks unity and development.

II. Grammar, Vocabulary & Spelling

10 - Moderately complex grammar with occasional errors that do not obscure meaning. Variety of sentence types (simple, compound, complex). Accurate use of appropriate vocabulary. Correct spelling and punctuation.

8 - Occasional grammar errors that may cause some obscurity. Variety of sentence types. Occasional misuse of vocabulary that does not cause obscurity. Correct spelling. Some punctuation errors.

6 - Tendency to depend on one sentence type and simple vocabulary. Frequent grammatical errors that obscure meaning. Misuse of articles and prepositions. Some spelling and punctuation mistakes.

4 - Frequent grammar errors in verb tense, subject-verb agreement, and/or pronoun reference. Frequent errors in spelling and punctuation. Incomplete sentences.

2 - No sentence is accurate. Very basic vocabulary. No apparent control of basic grammar. Rampant errors in spelling and punctuation. □

Do you have something to say about:

- teaching composition and writing?
- teaching reading?
- teaching pronunciation?
- what to do in a conversation class?
- language testing?
- research on language learning and language teaching?
- using computers in language teaching?
- resources for language teaching available in Korea?
- programs or projects that AETK should undertake?
- professional, social or ethical issues related to language teaching?
- any other aspect of language teaching of interest to AETK members?

If you can answer "yes" to any one of the above questions, then put your ideas on paper and send them to *AETK Bulletin* so they can be shared with other members of AETK. See page 2 for information about where to send material and the publication deadlines for each issue.

Report on the November AETK Book Fair

The AETK Book Fair held in November was the first event of its kind for the Association of English Teachers in Korea. Publishing companies represented at the Fair included Foreign Language Ltd., Oxford, Si Sa Yong-a Sa, Prentice-Hall, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich of Japan, Lingua House, and Chongno Book Center. The British Council also provided literature about their resources and programs.

Those in attendance at the two sites (English Training Center in Yoksam-dong and Yonsei University in Shinchon) expressed a desire for the Book Fair to be repeated next year since it provided an opportunity for AETK members to purchase materials at a discount and to examine new materials, some of which are not yet available in Korea.   □

Council Proposes Publication of Membership Directory

The AETK Council is considering the publication of a Membership Directory for the Association. To be included in the proposed Directory, complete the form at the bottom of this page and send it to Paul Cavanaugh by January 31.

Since some members may not wish to have their names listed, the Directory will include only the names of those who return the form.

Please note that only currently active members will be included in the Directory. If you want your name to be listed and your membership in AETK has expired, you should send both the form below and the Membership Application on page 16 with your dues payment.   □

Speaking to Learn
(Continued from p. 1)

turn? How do you hold the floor as you think of a word you want? How do you change the topic? The significance for ESOL teachers is clear. Being able to use appropriate conversational strategies is just as important as being able to use appropriate structures in a sentence. And just as students need to practice English grammar, they need to practice conversational skills in English.

Finally, renewed interest in how to teach grammar has led to increased emphasis on opportunities for communication. Swain (1983) noted students' needs for "comprehensible output" as well as comprehensible input. Swain explains that students need to grapple with encoding their own ideas in the target language if they are to test hypotheses, analyze the language, and eventually acquire it. Rutherford (1987) applies this idea specifically to teaching and learning grammar. Rather than supporting the traditional view that students should learn structures and then display their skill by speaking, he argues that students also *learn from speaking*. When they are compelled to encode meaning as precisely as possible, they direct their attention to the grammatical resources they have. They determine what grammar they can use to express their ideas, and they also become aware of what they still need. As Rutherford puts it, "the demonstration of the skill enables the learner to learn" (p. 175).

Whether we are trying to create a communicative class and increase fluency, trying to help students practice conversational control, or trying to increase grammatical awareness, opportunities for discussions are important. But the question remains: How can we create opportunities for meaningful discussions? It isn't enough simply to walk into a class and ask students to discuss something meaningful! The purpose of the presentation "Speaking to Learn: Using Business Cases in EFL Classes" is to introduce you to one technique which has proven effective with Korean students.

A business case supplies students with information about a company (real or imaginary) which has a problem. It provides them with enough information to discuss the problem intelligently, even if they have no business background. Using the information and their own opinions, students must reach a decision about what must be done. Pre- and post-"business meeting" activities can focus on a variety of language skills.

Business cases are appropriate for intermediate and advanced students. While they may be of particular interest to business people, they have interested students in all fields.

The presentation will cover:
1. *Procedure* for running a business case in your class.
2. *Materials.* Where and how to get already-prepared business cases, how to adapt materials to make them more effective, and how to gather materials to design an original case.
3. *Adjustments* that can be made for different proficiency levels, for practicing specific skills (e.g., summarizing, listening and note taking, chairing meetings), and for particular groups (students planning to study in the U.S., business people who meet Americans, etc.).

REFERENCES

Richards, J.C., & Rodgers, T.S. (1986). *Approaches and methods in language teaching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rutherford, W.E. (1987). *Second language grammar: Learning and teaching.* London: Longman.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E., & Jefferson, G. (1978). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language, 50,* 694-735.

Swain, M. (1983). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Wardhaugh, R. (1985). *How conversation works.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell   □

To be included in the proposed AETK Membership directory, complete this form and send it by January 31 to AETK c/o Paul Cavanaugh, Yonsei University Foreign Language Institute, 134 Shinchon-dong, Suhdaemoon-ku, Seoul 120-749. *(Please print in block letters.)*

Name_____

Address_____

City _____ Province _____ Postal Code_____

Tel. (Work) _____ Tel (Home)_____

Institution _____

PRONUNCIATION

A Communicative Approach to Teaching Pronunciation

by Margaret I. Elliott

Reprinted from AETK News, 4 *(3),* *September 1985. Margaret Elliott teaches at Han Nam University.*

When should pronunciation be taught? Can pronunciation be taught? If so, how? And, finally, what is the communicative approach?

To answer the first question, I will quote Krashen and Terrell (*The Natural Approach*, The Alemany Press, San Francisco, 1983). They have found that formal teaching has a limited effect on pronunciation performance, and that phonological competence develops in step with all the other language skills. The best way a language teacher can help is, "simply provide an environment where acquisition of phonology can take place....and where students can feel comfortable, and where they will be more prone to perform their competence.' Krashen and Terrell conclude by advising teachers not to worry about perfection in students' pronunciation in the early stages, but rather to concentrate on providing a good model with large amounts of comprehensible input.

Another well-known figure in the field, Marianne Celce-Murcia, in the ESL Department at the University of California at Berkeley, admitted, in the introduction to her presentation at the 1983 TESOL Conference, that after many years teaching pronunciation skills, using the traditional methods (for example, listen and repeat; minimal pairs), she had reached the conclusion that these methods were ineffective in changing students' pronunciation except during the exercises. She described several activities that focus on meaning, and bring better results.

The answer to the final introductory question can be found in John Harvey's article "A Communicational Approach, Games II" (in Robert W. Blair, Ed., *Innovative Approaches to Language Teaching*, Rowley, Mass., Newbury House, 1982). According to Harvey, the communicative approach to language learning is "learning language by doing". The speaker and hearer are linked together by "feedforward". That is, they share intentions and expectations when they communicate. They also need "feedback". There must be reference to the source of information, so they can check if the result of what was said or done reflects the information given. If this is not done, Harvey continues, communication will break down.

Harvey continues the description of the communication model by giving three features that are inherent in communication: reference, intention and uncertainty. The first, reference, means that for communication to develop, there must be a situation described with enough information to permit agreement, disagreement (i.e., feedback) between speaker and hearer.

The second feature, intention, recognizes that for communication to take place, there must be some purpose. Harvey admits that it is difficult in the classroom to have a real purpose for communicating, and we often have to be satisfied with less than real-life intention. Perhaps the completion of an assigned goal, in the interest of language learning, will lend authenticity to a contrived purpose, built into a classroom activity.

Finally, the uncertainty feature. If communication is the resolving of uncertainty, then there must be some uncertainty to resolve! Harvey explains that one way in which this feature can be built into an activity is by sharing the total information among the participants, so that each knows only part. Everybody has to talk with everyone else to gain access to all the information.

Now we will look at several activities that follow the guidelines of Krashen and Terrell, and Celce-Murcia, and include the features of the communicative approach, as set out by Harvey.

The English words for the colors offer a rich source of contrastive phonemes, for example /r/ and /l/ appear frequently. Celce-Murcia likes to give out a small box of crayons to each group of five students, and have them practice the color names again and again by asking questions (e.g., What is your favorite color? Guess what color I love. What does the color blue make you think of?).

Also, using crayons or colored geometric shapes, students can work in pairs, taking turns to be the "construction engineer". One student designs a model using colored shapes, and gives instructions to another student as to how to construct a similar model. The two are separated by a screen, so following the instructions successfully must depend on listening comprehension. (Draw a yellow circle; put a red square inside the yellow circle; put a green triangle on the left side of the yellow circle;....).

English names are another good source of vowel and consonant contrasts. The family is always an interesting topic, and a communication activity (CA) based on a family tree provides lively discussion. Select names that have the sounds you want your students to practice.

The next time you plan a CA using a shared information map, change some of the street names to include the contrasting phonemes that your students need to practice (First/Fourth; Line/Vine).

Another CA that can be used in this way is restaurant role-play. The menu can include phonetic contrasts (e.g., liver/veal, spinach/peas, tea/milk).

In summary, teaching pronunciation communicatively follows this pattern:

1. Identify the sounds that interfere with effective communication for your students.

2. Select activities that include, at least to some degree, the three features of the communicative approach. Modify the vocabulary to give many natural occurrences of the problem sounds.

3. Develop a repertoire of CA's to give maximum opportunity for practice in a variety of contexts.

Students are surprised when they realize for the first time that their pronunciation of, for example, racket/rocket interferes with the exchange of information needed to resolve a problem or (in a map activity) if a student cannot find a building located on First Street because what the student's partner said sounded like Fourth Street instead. Becoming aware of such problems makes students more sensitive to the sound contrasts. Self motivation is more effective than anything the teacher can do. ☐

LANGUAGE TESTING

A New Look at Testing (and Teaching)

by Bruce Ballard

Teaching second language learners is a practice that takes up much of the time of students, teachers and administrators. In their effort to sort out and rank students, test makers and givers have created a "culture of comparison" (Ryan, 1979, p. 2), an evaluation system that rates learners on how well they can conform to a preconceived idea of a select, correct output of language. With so much concern for output of language and final results, testers overlook finding out important aspects of their students that would help them to be of more service to their students' learning.

In the fall of 1980, I conducted a research project on testing which gave me an opening into some ways one can learn more about one's students (and have them learn more about themselves) than previously available through standard testing procedures. The project consisted of having two ESL students participate in a variety of traditional language assessment activities and comparing their results with (1) my own observations of the students performing a non-language related task and (2) a tape-recorded selection of the students' natural English speech.

The two participants in the project were Gerardo and Alvaro, students in an intermediate ESL class I was teaching at New York University's American Language Institute. Both of them were from Latin America, had studied English in public school, and had been in the United States for less than six months. They came to my apartment one afternoon after class where I collected data on them with the following instruments:

1. a conventional, 20-item multiple choice test designed to test grammar. The items were taken from a guidebook for writing ESL tests (Heaton, 1975, pp. 23-27), and asked the testees to choose correct answers for four questions in each of the following areas: tenses, linkers (e.g., "we've had good weather

since I arrived"), prepositions and adverbial particles, adjectives and adverbs, and infinitive / ing forms.

2. a cloze test consisting of a 185-word passage where after the first sentence every fifth word was deleted.

3. a written composition where the participants were asked to write about their background as English students.

4. a jigsaw puzzle made by cutting a 2-page magazine advertisement into 22 differently shaped pieces. Although each student received a different advertisement to put together, the number and shapes of the pieces were identical, and most of the space in both consisted of large color photographs. In addition, the reverse side of the pages also contained color advertisements so that the students would be confronted with a second similar puzzle if they turned the pieces over. Alvaro and Gerardo each received his puzzle in a stack with all the pieces facing up.

5. a tape-recorded conversation which I later transcribed and analyzed. This was obtained by recording the questions and comments they made about the other testing activities they were doing. The tape recorder was left on for most of the session, and they seemed to forget about it, for they were surprised when it finally clicked off.

After the students had gone, I wrote down my observations of how they had accomplished the puzzle task and then looked at their performance on the other activities. The results are these:

1. Multiple Choice Test. On this test, the students received similar scores. Alvaro chose the right answer for ten of the questions, Gerardo for nine. Their scores for each sub-area were also similar. These figures show how many questions out of four they answered correctly:

	Ger	Alv
tenses	3	3
linkers	1	1
prepositions/participles	1	2
adjectives/adverbs	2	1
infinitives/ing forms	2	3

2. Cloze Test. The results of the cloze test showed differences between the two. I scored the items as being "right" (they had supplied the correct word or an acceptable substitute), "could be right" (if a minor error were corrected), and "wrong." There were 36 blanks, and the

results for each student were:

Gerardo	Alvaro
13 right	6 right
5 could be	6 could be
18 wrong	24 wrong

An additional piece of information gained from this test was the number of blanks which had no response written in, showing, I think, a lack of guessing. Alvaro left 23 of his blanks empty; Gerardo only four.

3. Written composition. For this test, the two scored rather similarly. First I rated their writing subjectively, then with a scoring technique found in another guide to language testing (Oller, 1979, p. 387), whereby an essay score can be derived from this formula:

Essay score = the number of error-free words in the student's paper minus the number of errors in the paper, all of which is divided by the number of words in a version re-written by the teacher.

At the subjective level, I found the two to be of similar achievement in their use of English in that both essays contained mistakes in idioms and phrases, had many run-on sentences, and were fairly clear in meaning. In fact, both compositions seemed to have been written in Spanish with English words (e.g., "I have 33 years old."). A difference was that Gerardo's conjugation of verbs was always correct, but Alvaro made such errors with verbs.

The objective essay scores were .45 for Alvaro and .48 for Gerardo. These scores fell between those another tester assigned to an advanced ESL student (.70) and an intermediate one (.30) at Southern Illinois University (Oller 1979, pp. 388-389).

4. Jigsaw Puzzle. My observations from this exercise showed major differences between Alvaro and Gerardo. Though both immediately knew what to do with the pieces they had been given and both later admitted they had done this kind of puzzle often at home, their styles of putting them together were different.

Gerardo worked with one of the first pieces he took off the top of his pile and built his puzzle mostly by extending outwards from this piece. His method was to take a new piece off the pile, see if it fit anywhere with what he had in front of him, and discard it if he couldn't use it. He never turned any of the pieces over and was quick to discard pieces he couldn't use right away. He finished the top border of the puzzle first and completed the entire puzzle much sooner than Alvaro.

Alvaro began by laying out all of the pieces all over his end of the table so that none of them overlapped. While doing this. he turned many pieces over two or three times. After they were separated, he began to put them together, but he missed many visual clues that could have helped him. For example, he seemed not to notice that he was working on a border and tried to fit lines of writing in one piece next to the straight edge of a border piece. He put lines of writing in one piece at a perpendicular angle to lines of writing in another piece. Even after he had almost completed a large section of the picture which consisted of a solid blue sky, he took loose pieces which contained the same sky blue color and turned them over. The last two pieces he had to fit into his puzzle were also part of this sky section and in addition had a two-line headline running through them. Again, he took a long time to finally fit them together, as he laid them down with the writing vertical or upside down. He commented towards the end that this seemed to be a test of speed, and he appeared nervous when he saw that Gerardo had already finished.

5. Tape Recording. An analysis of the mistakes they made while speaking also showed the two to be quite similar. For example. the major sources of errors for both of them were in their use of articles, prepositions, modals and verbs. Nonetheless, for the most part they were able to communicate their thoughts and to respond to questions.

The results of these five assessment activities are intriguing in terms of the original intent of this project which was to compare the data gleaned from traditional assessment techniques with the students' spontaneous speech and with their performance on a non-language-related task. Basically, the students look quite similar from the perspective of the multiple choice test, the writing sample, and the section of recorded speech. However, they appear quite different when one looks at how they did with the puzzle and the cloze test. Here, Gerardo seems to have a better strategy

for putting together either a puzzle or a language, whereas Alvaro appears to not allow himself to make many guesses (on the cloze) and lets himself miss many helpful clues when doing the puzzle (something which may also occur when he works on English).

From the standpoint of an educator, these differences in the results have a deep significance. Were I to look only at Alvaro and Gerardo's results on the multiple choice test, the writing sample, or the tape-recorded speech sample, I would assume they were similar students. I could then look at what parts of the English language they still didn't know and proceed, in a traditional manner, to present the language to them. This would be done in a clear way but also in a way which reflects the philosophy behind much of testing: it would tend to emphasize aspects of the language and the correctness of a student's output rather than how a student is functioning internally.

The awareness I gained from the cloze test and the puzzle task, though, told me something far more important about Alvaro and Gerardo. I saw that one had strategies for tackling challenges which enabled him to work efficiently, make guesses, and allow himself to profit from his mistakes. The other had strategies which slowed him down. He also did not allow himself to guess but did allow himself to become anxious by comparing himself with another. With this in mind, I would be more watchful of how this second student worked with new material in the classroom and would

try to help him become aware of different ways of working. I would also try to do something about his anxieties.

One possibility for accomplishing this would be to give both students some kind of problem in the language to work on (such as learning a poem by heart, learning a song, or working on some aspect of spelling) after which we could discuss what they did to solve the problem. In this way both could become more conscious of their language-learning capabilities, and my concern would be with them as learners rather than on the language per se.

Thus, it seems to be in everyone's interest to give tests that are designed to describe students rather than classify them. In addition, I rediscovered that I don't need to wait until the end of the year, semester or month to ascertain how the students are doing. If I work on a day-to-day basis on how they are functioning with the new language, I can know at all times where their strengths are and where work still needs to be done. If, as many people are noting these days, most language learning takes place outside the classroom (such as in sleep), then working on the students' functionings can become my primary goal.

REFERENCES

Heaton, J.B. (1975). *Writing English language tests.* London: Longman.

Oller, J. (1979). *Language tests at school.* London: Longman.

Ryan, C. (1979). The testing maze. Chicago: National PTA. ☐

The C-Test: Another Choice
by Dwight J. Strawn

The construction of good tests is a perennial problem for language teachers. Not only is it difficult to write good items in the first place, but once items are written it is not always possible to pretest them—then once they are used it is often considered inadvisable (for reasons of test security) to use them again. What we need is a simple but reliable system for producing tests, one that is economical, easy to use, does not result in tests that intimidate those who take them, and yet provides an accurate measure of what our students can and cannot do.

Traditional testing formats have various problems. Essay, short-answer

and translation questions are easy to construct but difficult and time-consuming to score. Multiple choice questions are easy to score but difficult to construct, and the development of good multiple choice questions requires both time and resources for pretesting and analysis. The cloze procedure overcomes some of the disadvantages of other formats, but students resist cloze tests because they appear (and sometimes are) far too difficult. The C-test may offer a way around these difficulties.

What is a C-test? Basically, it is a form of reduced redundancy testing derived from the same general theory that supports the cloze test, but it is designed to account for specific weaknesses that have been discovered in the cloze format. As summarized by Klein-Braley & Raatz (1984, p. 135; cf. Alderson, 1979), major weaknesses are that cloze tests: (1) do not automatically

The C-Test: Another Choice
(Continued from page 11)

provide a random sample of points to be tested: (2) may vary in difficulty, reliability and validity according to the deletion rate used; (3) suffer reliability problems for homogeneous groups of test takers; (4) are difficult to score reliably unless the exact scoring method is used, in which case the tests may turn out to be too difficult and frustrating.

Klein-Braley & Raatz also point out that the use of only one text may be a source of bias in cloze test scores and that native speakers, who should be able to obtain perfect scores, rarely do.

In contrast to the cloze test, there are two features of the C-test which, according to its developers, compensate for the disadvantages of the cloze format and result in a better measuring instrument which is also less frustrating for the test taker. These features are (Klein-Braley & Raatz 1984. p. 136): (1) that the C-test is based on several short passages from different sources rather than one long passage from the same source; and (2) that the nth-word deletion procedure is replaced by the "rule of 2," according to which the last half of every second word is deleted instead. (Discussion of the theoretical reasons for these differences is beyond the scope of the present article; interested readers may refer to the references cited above.)

The two examples below illustrate the difference between the cloze procedure and the C-test procedure when the two are applied to the same short passage from a typical university English text. The cloze example results from applying the nth-word deletion procedure by deleting every seventh word after the

end of the first sentence, while the C-test example results from applying the "rule of 2." The sample passage is from *Modern Freshman English II* (Yonsei University English Department, 1985, p. 89).

Example 1: Cloze

Controlling air pollution is another crucial objective. Without food, man can live for _____ five weeks; without water about five _____. Without air, he can only live _____ minutes. so pure air is a _____. Here the wrongdoer is the automobile. _____ there is a concentration of automobiles. _____ in our big cities, air pollution _____ severe. It is important to see _____ our cars are equipped with pollution-control _____. Such devices effectively reduce the harmful _____ emitted from the engine.

Example 2: C-test

Controlling air pollution is another crucial objective. Without fo_____, man c_____ live f_____ about fi_____ weeks: wit_____ water ab_____ five d_____. Without a_____, he c_____ only li_____ five min_____ so pu_____ air i_____ a mu_____. Here t_____ wrongdoer i_____ the autom_____. Where th_____ is a concen_____ of autom_____, as i_____ our b_____ cities, a_____ pollution i_____ severe. I_____ is impo_____ to s_____ that o_____ cars a_____ equipped w_____ pollution-control dev_____. Such devices effectively reduce the harmful gases emitted from the engine.

Example 2 shows blanks of equal length for each mutilation of the text. An alternative, which might make the test easier, is to leave blanks representing the number of missing letters in each deletion. Example 3 shows the result of selecting this alternative.

Example 3: C-test

Controlling air pollution is another crucial objective. Without fo _ _ , man c _ _ live f _ _ about fi _ _ weeks: wit _ _ _ water ab _ _ _ five da _ _. Without a _ _. he c _ _ only li _ _ five min _ _ _ _ so pu _ _ air i _ a mu _ _ .

A full test based on the C-principle would include several short passages from different sources and contain about 100 deletions.

The C-test is a relatively new development in the field of language testing and represents yet another choice among the various formats available to the classroom teacher. Readers may wish to determine its appropriateness in their particular circumstances by comparing results obtained through the use of this procedure with those obtained by using other procedures.

References

Alderson, J.C. (1979). The cloze procedure and proficiency in English as a foreign language. *TESOL Quarterly.* *13,* 219-227.

Klein-Braley, C., & Raatz. U. (1984). A survey of research on the C-Test. *Language Testing.* *1,* 134-146.

Yonsei University English Department. (1985). *Modern Freshman English II.* Seoul: Yonsei University Press.   □

TESOL '89
23rd Annual Convention
March 7-11
San Antonio, Texas, USA

Korean Students' Acquisition...

efforts were to be made to give only positive reinforcement and the student was to avoid making mistakes. In general, the whole atmosphere of the classroom was to be upbeat, moving, and exciting as the students rapidly moved through drills *using* the target language. As those of who first cut our language-teaching teeth in audio-lingual methodology began to realize, there was often a problem of "meaningfulness." More than once, when I first began to teach in Korea, I led students in substitution drills that went something like this:

Me:	She is a student.
Students:	She is a student.
Me:	teacher
Students:	She is a teacher.
Me:	doctor
Students:	She is a doctor.
Me:	Very good!
Student:	She is very good.
Me:	Aaaaagh!

To what extent true audio-lingualism made (or is making) inroads into Korean classrooms is somewhat hard to say. The general overall reluctance of Korean teachers to lead their classes in oral practice, to engage themselves in English exchanges in the classroom, and to attempt to deal with 60-70 students in audio-lingual work, especially when the inevitable English examinations have nothing to do with listening or speaking English, have probably resulted in only a small number of classes really using an audio-lingual approach, though it cannot be denied that a great deal of lip service was paid to it in the past and even today.

The rise of transformational-generative grammar in the late 50's and 60's led to the displacement of structuralism as the dominant grammatical model in many linguistic circles. There was a corresponding attack on behavioral psychology by important personages in the field (Chomsky, 1959), and as a result there has been an upheaval in language teaching in the past twenty years. Brown (1980, p. 243) has characterized this as a "quiet revolution." We are left with a number of different approaches, none of which dominates the scene in a way like audio-lingualism dominated years ago. I list four of these "interpersonal approaches" here: Silent Way, Community Language Learning, Suggestopedia, and Total Physical Response. All are different from each other in specifics, but they all have a somewhat common foundation in learning theory that might be stated this way: language learning is not just habit

formation but rule internalization accomplished through meaningful use of the target language, even though "errors" might be produced in the process. At this point in time it seems that very little influence from these interpersonal approaches has made its way into the regular Korean classroom, but a number of private institutes do use one or more of the approaches.

Most experts in the field today readily admit that language learning will be different for different people. Brown (1980, Chapters 5 and 6) lists a number of personal variables, both in the cognitive domain and in the affective domain, that must be reckoned with by the language teacher as s/he prepares for classes, teaches, and observes the results in the students.

Of the many variables mentioned by Brown, one catches my attention here in the Korean situation. *Ch'emyon*—or "face"—is certainly important across Korean society. Brown talks of "self-esteem" and its connection with language learning. Although no conclusive research has yet been reported on, preliminary indications from some investigations are that there is a high correlation between people who have high self-esteem and those who do well in language classes. Intuitively this seems likely. If I think well of myself speaking this new language, then I will not be afraid to use it, and I will not be devastated by occasional setbacks caused by my errors and, possibly, by the ensuing laughter. There are some unfortunate phenomena among Korean administrators and teachers, however, that seem to me to cause the students to lose self-esteem, to lose face vis-à-vis English. One is the charge-ahead-and-cover-the-book attitude which dominates in some schools at the expense of the students' ever having a firm grasp on even a small range of English. The other is the make-the-test-as-obscure-as-possible attitude which results in incredibly low class averages, often with students scoring not far above mere chance. Both of these attitudes tend to break self-esteem in the affective domain of the Korean students.

Researchers nowadays are also paying close attention to the cultural variables that affect language learning. Of course this is most important when the language learner is residing in the culture of those who speak the target language, but it also affects true foreign language learning situations. Observe the fact in Korea, for example, that the study of the Japanese language still takes a back seat to English, German and French. Although proximity and economic connections should bolt the Japanese language into a position of prominence in Korea, the history between the two countries

precludes this from happening.

As for the cultural variables that play a part when a language learner actually lives in the target culture, Brown (1980, p. 138) has proposed an intriguing hypothesis that there is a "critical period" of language learning in a person's life in a new culture. This falls between the time when s/he is dejected and in a state of culture shock and the time when s/he begins, one-by-one, to discover ways of dealing with the difficult aspects of the new culture. During this time the pressures are sufficiently demanding on the learner to acquire fluency in the target language. Brown suggests that if serious language learning is pushed either before or after this period, the language learner will not attain great fluency.

In the foregoing, we have briefly hit upon some aspects of the grammar-translation method, audio-lingualism, and the so-called interpersonal approaches and have made some brief comments as to how these have manifested themselves in the Korean language learning situation. Anyone who teaches language should come to an integrated understanding of the process of second language acquisition. If this second language happens to be English and the learners happen to be Korean, the teacher must study the various linguistic, cultural, and personal variables that will form an integrated understanding, given the Korean milieu. As professionals we cannot do less; we can never be satisfied to simply "teach the book."

REFERENCES

Brown, H.D. (1980). *Principles of language learning and teaching.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Chomsky, N. (1959). A review of B.F. Skinner's *Verbal behavior. Language, 35,* 26-58.

Diller, K.C. (1971). *Generative grammar, structural linguistics, and language teaching,* Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Lado, R. (1957). *Linguistics across cultures.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Rivers, W.M., & Temperley, M.S. (1978). *A practical guide to the teaching of English as a second or foreign language.* New York: Oxford University Press.   □

TESOL INFORMATION

Looking for a Job?
Let TESOL Help You!

Reprinted from TESOL Newsletter, *Vol. XXII, No. 5 (October 1988).*

TESOL assists job seekers in finding employment or other opportunities in the EFL/ESL/SESD/bilingual education field in four ways: the TESOL Employment Information Service and Bulletin, the *TESOL Newsletter* Job Openings column, and the Employment Clearinghouse at the TESOL Convention.

The Employment Information Service Bulletin is a bimonthly listing of positions, teacher exchanges, and grant announcements received at the TESOL Central Office. The listings in the Bulletin are from all over the world—many are for continuous recruitment. Applicants contact and negotiate with employers directly.

The Employment Information Service maintains applicants' resumes on file. Employers and recruiters seeking qualified professionals may review the resume file or request a computer list based on applicants' registration cards and take copies of the resumes with them. Employers contact the applicants directly.

To register for the Employment Information Service, please contact the Placement Director at the TESOL Central Office, 1118 22nd Street, NW, Washington, DC 20037, USA. The fee to register is US$12 for TESOL members in the US, Canada and Mexico (US$18 for members outside the US, Canada and Mexico) or US$20 for nonmembers of TESOL in the US, Canada and Mexico (US$24 for nonmembers of TESOL outside the US, Canada and Mexico. These prices are effective November 1, 1988.

The Job Openings column in each edition of the *TESOL Newsletter* lists job openings from around the world—usually ones not listed in the Employment Information Service Bulletin. Membership in TESOL is required to receive the *TESOL Newsletter.*

TESOL maintains an Employment Clearinghouse at the annual convention. Employers and recruiters conduct interviews on site for positions, as well as collect resumes for future contacts. All registered convention attendees are eligible to take advantage of the employment opportunities available at the Employment Clearinghouse.

The Field Services Director at the TESOL Central Office is also available to provide career information for newcomers entering the field or for more experienced members wishing to enhance their career options.   □

UPCOMING TESOL AFFILIATE MEETINGS

Jan 16-20   Association of TESOL, Canberra, Australia

For more information, write to Susan Bayley, Field Services Director, TESOL, Suite 205, 1118 22nd Street, NW, Washington, DC 20037 USA. Telephone 202-872-1271.

TESOL Newsletter Introductory Offer

Since AETK is an affiliate of TESOL, members of AETK may subscribe to the *TESOL Newsletter* for one year (6 issues) at the reduced rate of US$5.00 plus postage. The *TESOL Newsletter* contains articles about language teaching, book reviews, job notices, and much more information of interest to ESL/EFL professionals. To take advantage of the offer, send this form with your payment to: *Susan Bayley, TESOL, Suite 205, 1118 22nd Street NW, Washington, DC 20037, USA.* YOU MUST SIGN THIS FORM TO INDICATE THAT YOU ARE A MEMBER OF AETK. *Payment must be in the form of an International Postal Money Order or a check in US funds drawn on a US bank and made payable to TESOL.*

I am a member of AETK (the Association of English Teachers in Korea). Please send me the *TESOL Newsletter* for one year at the special introductory rate of US$5.00 plus postage as shown below (check one):

☐ Surface Mail (US$4.00 postage)..US$ 9.00 enclosed
☐ Air Mail (US$11.00 postage)...US$16.00 enclosed

Name *(Print)*_____   Signature_____

Mailing Address_____

City_____   Province_____

Country_____   Postal Code_____

TESOL MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION

Name *(Print)*_____

Mailing Address_____

City_____

Province/State_____

Country_____Postal Code_____

Please make check in U.S. funds drawn on a U.S. bank payable to TESOL or provide the appropriate credit card information and mail to: TESOL, Suite 205, 1118 22nd Street, NW, Washington, DC 20037, USA.

Check enclosed_____ Visa_____ Master Card_____

Card number:_____ Exp. date:_____

Cardholder's signature_____

MEMBERSHIP CATEGORIES
Membership includes subscription to TESOL QUARTERLY and TESOL NEWSLETTER. Check appropriate box.

☐ INDIVIDUAL..US$42.00
☐ STUDENT *(for those engaged in at least half-time study)*..................................US$22.00
☐ JOINT *(two-member household)*..US$60.00
☐ INSTITUTIONAL/LIBRARY..US$75.00
* Student members are required to provide faculty signature, address, and telephone number to verify minimum half-time status:

Faculty Signature/Title_____

Institution/Address_____

_____Telephone_____

ALL MEMBERS OUTSIDE THE U.S. must add one of the following postage fees to their membership dues:
(1) FOREIGN SURFACE MAIL--All countries outside the U.S.   US$ 6.00_____
(2) NEWSLETTER BY AIR, QUARTERLY BY SURFACE   US$15.00_____
(3) BOTH QUARTERLY AND NEWSLETTER BY AIR
    Canada and Mexico   US$ 8.50_____
    Caribbean, South America, Europe,and the Mediterranean   US$20.00_____
    Africa, Asia, and the Pacific   US$26.00_____

INTEREST SECTIONS
MARK with (1) the Interest Section in which you wish to be active and vote. MARK with (2) not more than two additional Interest Sections in which you have a secondary interest.

___Teaching English Internationally
___English as a Foreign Language for Foreign Students in English-Speaking Countries
___English to Speakers of Other Languages in Elementary Education
___English as a Second Language in Secondary Schools
___English as a Second Language in Higher Education
___English as a Second Language in Bilingual Education
___English as a Second Language in Adult Education
___Standard English as a Second Dialect
___Applied Linguistics
___Research
___Refugee Concerns
___Teacher Education
___Computer-Assisted Language Learning
___Program Administration
___Materials Writers
___Teaching English to Deaf Students

I wish to receive more information about TESOL:
___publications, ___conventions, ___awards and grants, ___summer institutes, ___affiliates, ___interest sections, ___Employment Information Service

ANNOUNCEMENTS

The 55th Linguistic Institute

Cosponsored by the Linguistic Society of America (LSA) and the Modern Language Association (MLA), the 55th Linguistic Institute will be held at the University of Arizona in Tucson, Arizona, USA, from June 26 to August 4, 1989. The Institute theme, Bridges: Cross-Linguistic, Cross-Cultural, and Cross-Disciplinary Approaches to Language, emphasizes the breadth of linguistic investigation and the strengthening of the ties between linguistics and other disciplines.

The Institute courses divide into four major groups: (1) introductory linguistic courses; (2) courses on language and literature, with particular emphasis on the languages of the Southwest, including Spanish and Native American languages; (3) courses on issues in foreign and second language teaching; and (4) advanced linguistic courses.

Courses are of two-, four-, or six-week duration and are offered for graduate credit. Fees are expected to range from US$740 for three units to US$980 for six units. Student scholarships are available. The MLA is also offering special fellowships on a competitive basis to two groups of professionals: (1) full-time elementary-school or secondary-school personnel responsible for supervision of foreign language instruction in schools, school systems, or districts; and (2) full-time college or university faculty members responsible for supervision or coordination of elementary or intermediate level foreign language instruction. Interested faculty members are also encouraged to attend as Visiting Scholars. The Visiting Scholar fee, which provides access to all Institute activities and facilities, is US$500. Further information may be obtained from the Institute Director, Susan Steele, Department of Linguistics, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ 85721 USA or STEELE@ARIZRVAX on BITNET. □

1989 CETA Winter Conference

The College English Teachers Association of Korea (CETA) will hold its annual Winter Conference on Friday, February 24, 1989 at the Language Research Center of Cheon Nam University in Kwangju. The Conference will include a number of presentations related to practical aspects of English language teaching in Korea and a panel discussion concerning in-service training for English teachers.   □

Second International Language Testing Conference

Sponsored by JALT (Japan Association of Language Teachers), Thursday and Friday, March 30-31, 1989, Foreign Language Center, The University of Tsukuba, Tsukuba, Japan. The complete conference schedule will be published in the February issue of JALT's magazine *The Language Teacher.* For further information, contact H. Asano, Foreign Language Center, The University of Tsukuba, Tsukuba-shi, Ibaraki ken 305, Japan.   □

British Council Specialist Courses

Every year the British Council runs over fifty specialist courses for senior academic or professional people who wish to learn about recent developments in Britain relating to their field of work and to participate in international discussion at a high level.

Among the courses planned for 1989 is one on Communicative Language Teaching in Perspective, to be held April 2-14.

For further information, contact Miss Y.J. Kim at the British Council office in Seoul.   □

TESOL Summer Institute

The 1989 TESOL Summer Institute will be held in San Francisco, California, USA. Details will be announced later.   □