Association News

New Officers

Both AETK Vice President Ruth Fischer and Secretary-Treasurer Robert Wissmath have left Korea and have resigned their AETK offices. At the Council Meeting on May 20, action was taken to ask George Matthews (University of Maryland Asian Division) to complete Ruth's term as Vice President and to ask Paul Cavanaugh (Yonsei University Foreign Language Institute) to complete Bob's term as Secretary-Treasurer.

Both George and Paul have agreed to the Council's request and are now serving in these positions. At the same meeting, the Council also appointed Young-Shik Lee to be Chair of the Nominating Committee.

Publications Committee

The Council is still searching for someone who is willing to chair the Publications Committee and assume responsibility for producing the newsletter. If you are interested in this job, please contact Dwight Strawn at 392-3785.

September Meeting

The next AETK meeting will be held at the Yonsei University Foreign Language Institute on Saturday, September 13, at 2:00 PM. Vice President Matthews, as the new Program Chair, is working on plans for this meeting with the Program Committee. Look for announcements in early September, but plan now to attend the meeting even if you don't see the announcements.

Address Corrections Requested

A few AETK members still have not been receiving the newsletter and other announcements sent to them in the mail. If you are having this problem, or know of anyone else who is having it, please see Secretary-Treasurer Paul Cavanaugh at the next meeting or send the correct address information to Dwight Strawn, KPO Box 740, Seoul 110.

June AETK Session on Feedback

The June 1986 AETK meeting was an occasion for members to exchange views on the topic "Error Correction and Feedback in the EFL Classroom." After some introductory remarks on the literature related to feedback in language teaching, there was a rather lively discussion ·which brought out a number of significant questions and comments. What follows is hardly a summary, for it would be impossible to bring the whole discussion together into a neat little paragraph or two. Instead, we give you an unedited list of some of the comments we heard and were able to jot down. Those who attended the meeting will remember the context in which these comments were made and will recognize that they do not represent a full statement of the views they express. And those who missed the June meeting may wish to bring some of these points back to our attention in future meetings later in the year.

These, then, are some of the comments and questions from the June meeting:

1. Correcting errors inhibits; too much correction turns the student off.

2. Is it OK to leave the student just with the knowledge that he or she made a mistake?

3. Should we deal with all the errors our students make, or only some of them?

4. Self-correction is useful, but corrections made by somebody else (e.g., the teacher) are useless.

5. Students need guidance.

6. Thoughtful, encouraging comments from the teacher about the content of what a student says are rewarding (for the student).

7. Do you (the teacher) correct student errors because you have to or because you want to? (If the former, then why do you have to? If the latter, then why do you want to?)

JALT '86

The Japan Association of Language Teachers will hold its annual International Conference on Language Teaching/Learning from November 22–24 at Serei Gakuen in Hamamatsu, Japan. Two of the main speakers for this conference will be Dr. M.A.K. Halliday of Australia and Alan Maley of Britain. The conference will also include a number of other presentations by teachers from Japan, the U.S.A., U.K., Singapore and Italy. On the first day there will be a panel discussion on the topic "The State of English Education in Shizuoka," then a publisher's panel on the second day and a general panel discussion on the last day which will include the featured speakers. Look for more information about this important conference in the September issue of *AETK News*.

Calendar of Meetings Here and There

Sep 13	AETK September Meeting	Yonsei University FLI 2:00 PM
Sep 13	INTESOL Conference	Muncie, Indiana
Oct 15	AETK October Meeting	Yonsei University FLI 7:00 PM
Oct 16-18	4th Rocky Mountain Regional Conference	Albuquerque, New Mexico
Oct 24-25	WATESOL Conference	Washington, DC
Nov 6-8	2nd Southeast Regional	New Orleans, Louisiana
Nov 6-8	6th Midwest Regional	Ann Arbor, Michigan
Nov 7-8	TEXTESOL State Conference	Houston, Texas
Nov 10-11	ORTESOL Conference	Eugene, Oregon
Nov 14-16	NYS TESOL Conference	New York City
Nov 15	AETK November Meeting	Yonsei University FLI 2:00 PM
Nov 21-24	TESL Ontario	Toronto, Ontario
Nov 22-24	JALT Conference	Hamamatsu, Japan

News from the CSPC:
Committee on Sociopolitical Concerns

Terry Cornasniti Dale
Chair, TESOL OSPO

[One of the college English texts used in Korea contains an article about Bertrand Russell in which Russell, upon thinking back over the First World War, is reported to have said, "It just won't do to live in an ivory tower. The world is too bad. We must notice it." The article below, which is reprinted from the *TESOL Newsletter*, Vol. 20, No. 3 (June 1986), reports on one way that TESOL is paying attention to issues in the world.]

What's "CSPC"? CSPC stands for the Committee on Socio-political Concerns. The CSPC is a standing committee of TESOL whose broad purpose is to serve both as an information clearinghouse on socio-political issues and as the coordinator of TESOL responses to issues affecting the teaching of English to speakers of other languages.

The committee's purpose as outlined above was discussed by TESOLers at the convention in Anaheim. Their suggestions about the kinds of specific activities they think the CSPC should pursue will give other members a better idea of just what the CSPC can do. Members at Anaheim suggested that the CSPC get involved in such things as:

- setting up a fast communication (hotline) network;
- setting up procedures for addressing issues within TESOL: U.S. issues, issues outside the U.S. and issues affecting all members of TESOL throughout the world;
- working with the Professional Standards Committee and other groups within TESOL on actions that TESOL can take to improve the working conditions of ESL teachers at all levels of the profession;
- investigating the immigration status of both Central American and Cambodian refugees, including action on pending U.S. legislation;
- writing a position paper that would outline the pros and cons of the "English as the

Language and Content Learning: Finding Common Ground

Bernard A. Mohan
University of British Columbia

A majority of second language learners do not learn language for its own sake. They learn because they must learn subject matter through the medium of the second language. They must use the second language to learn. Accordingly, the integration of language learning and content learning is now considered an important question in the field of language research. Many scholars now believe that a second language is learned not so much by direct instruction in the rules of language, but by using the language in meaningful contexts. The success of Canadian French immersion programs is widely known (Swain & Lapkin, 1981). Krashen (1982) argues that learners will acquire a second language only if they receive comprehensible input in it. Talk becomes comprehensible to second language learners through context and reference to background knowledge and experience. But talk is not enough. Cummins (1984) provides evidence that to succeed in school, bilingual students need more than conversational fluency; they need to develop the cognitive and academic skills required for learning academic subject matter. Thus instead of teaching language in isolation from subject matter, teachers should aim to integrate language development with content learning; they should make good use of learners' experience; and they should focus on higher-level cognitive skills. And instead of seeing language merely as a means of communication, teachers need to see language as a medium of learning.

A theory, research basis, and general model for work toward integrating language teaching and content teaching for ESL students has been under development for the past seven years (Mohan, 1986). Early, Thew, and Wakefield (1986) provide a wide range of sample lessons and annotated resources. Additional examples of teachers working independently will be described here. While there is nothing wrong with large-scale curriculum development, changes in school programs are more likely to succeed if they build on what individual teachers find feasible and useful rather than if practices are imposed on teachers from above, especially if teachers consider them impractical or unnecessary (Sarason, 1982). In general, change is more likely to occur when common ground is found among language teachers and content teachers; that is, when the focus is on issues of common concern to all teachers of limited-English-proficient (LEP) students. The three most important areas of common ground are topics, the learner's experience, and cognitive skills.

Topics

All teachers communicate with learners about topics. When teachers and learners communicate, they communicate about something—to the content teacher, topics are "subject matter"; to the language teacher, topics are often thought of as "themes." Thus language teachers *already know* how to select and use content-based material, although they may not always recognize this fact. But language teachers do not have to be content experts; that is the role of the content teacher.

Sinclair (n.d.) noticed that television was popular with her high school ESL class. They particularly watched situation comedies such as

Language and Content Learning

"Three's Company." So she decided to videotape television programs and discuss them in class. However, rather than use a situation comedy, she chose an attractively presented science program, "3-2-1 Contact." Knowing that many students spend more hours watching television than attending school, she aimed to make their television viewing habits more academically rewarding. In particular, she aimed to increase their background knowledge of science and to develop their ability to talk about scientific matter. Yet she did not aim to "teach science," but rather to help students get more benefit from their science classes. She reported that her students found the material interesting and useful to discuss, and that the approach was well within her skills as an ESL teacher.

The Learner's Experience

Most teachers plan for students to learn not only through textbooks and teacher talk but also through experiences. Science classes have laboratory work in addition to lectures; business education students have textbooks, but they also participate in business simulations. Likewise, language teachers seldom rely on language alone: they draw on all kinds of demonstrations, realia, films, and hands-on activities.

Rose Audia (Hermanson, 1986) teaches an intermediate ESL class in an elementary school. Her students range in age from nine to 13 and vary in educational background and fluency in English. She and her students were working on the topic of insects. Some butterfly cocoons kept in a cage in the classroom had just hatched when a visitor arrived. The children escorted the visitor to the cage and eagerly described what had happened. Later everyone watched a film on the life-cycle of the butterfly. In the discussion following, the teacher took them though a review of the various stages, using questions and drawing and labeling the cycle on the board. The students were told that they would each be drawing a picture of the life cycle of the butterfly and that the pictures would go into the booklets they were making. The children then got to work,

asking the teacher about the size of the circle, placement of title and labeling, and consulting each other. They made frequent trips to the cage to scrutinize the color and pattern of the wings.

With the "insects" topic, the teacher used an experiential approach. The students had interesting things to see, understand, and talk about. When they spoke they could point to what was happening in the cage; when they wrote they could support their ideas with drawings. The teacher did not have to create all of the experiential resources she worked with: she used material that is available to any science teacher. Besides the cocoons and the film, she introduced photographs of insects, boxes of live specimens, display collections, and charts of beetles. Students systematically observed insects with magnifying glasses, collected some of their own specimens, and made model insects with paper and pipe cleaners. Yet these experiences were not a random collection of "visual aids"; they were progressively organized, reflecting the organization of the scientific material they were drawn from. Finally, the experiential approach encouraged the students to inquire further, asking their own questions. The teacher answered these questions, not as a science expert, but as someone who can help student find out for themselves.

Cognitive Skills and Cognitive Structure

Most teachers want their students to go beyond rote memorization and engage in higher-level thinking skills. Content teachers often do this through appropriate questioning techniques and problem-posing inquiry materials. Language teachers often work with higher-level thinking via discourse patterns in academic reading and writing. In both cases, graphic techniques that convey the structure of information are frequently helpful because they provide a knowledge structure or situational frame that helps students interpret their observations and experiences. Meryl Arnott (Arnott, 1985) is a high school ESL teacher who was previously a teacher of social studies, aiming both to develop academic language proficiency and to provide stu-

The Communicative Event, Human Communication Theory, and Teaching Language as Communication

Joseph T. Barnett
Dankook University

Abstract

This article attempts to discuss EFL/ESL instruction as it relates to human communication theory. The communicative event is important because most theories in the human communication field attempt to explain this phenomenon. The communicative event is also important because the goal in EFL/ESL instruction (currently) is to get the students to a point where they can participate in a communicative event. It would follow that the teaching method theory, design, and procedure would have to correlate well with the communicative event as well as having internal consistency (from theory to procedure).

In human communication theory there are four very broad areas of theory construction--the behavioristic, transmissional, interactional, and transactional perspectives. One of the main distinguishing points of each perspective is the placement of meaning. In the behavioristic perspective meaning is in the environment, in the transmissional meaning is in the message, in the interactional meaning is in the person, and in the transactional meaning is between people. Another main difference between the perspectives is that the last two perspectives, the interactional and transactional, view communication as a process, where as the first two perspectives do not.

Most ESL theory and practice falls into the behavioristic/transmissional perspectives. This leaves the interactional and transactional perspectives almost completely out of the discussion. This is heuristic in the fact that if ESL methodology reflected the interactional or transactional perspectives within its theory, there would be significant differences in the methodology itself and possibly in the learner's communicative ability.

It is assumed in this article that the communicative event, human communication theory, and teaching language as communication have a direct relationship with each other. It is also assumed that the communicative event is the starting place for analysis and the subsequent design for language teaching.

The Communicative Event

This is the point of analysis. There are many theories that attempt to explain it and there are language teaching methods that have it as the end goal. If language teaching is to have communication as the main goal, the theory, design, and procedures behind the teaching method must correlate well with the communicative event, otherwise one is teaching a language for some other reason than for communication.

Human Communication Theory

There is a myriad of theories that attempt to explain the communicative event. Most of the theories seem to fall into two very broad positions which further split into two perspectives within each position. The two major positions are the scientific and the wholistic position.

In the scientific position, communication is looked at as an entity that is distinct and is to be discovered outside of oneself. The individual plays a very minor role in the scientific position. Communication is considered to have universal qualities that only need to be discovered and quantified. Once these qualities are discovered, categories and lists can be made and rules established.

Theories within the wholistic position generally view communication as an ongoing process. The emphasis is on the individual, between individuals, or on the interdependency of influencing factors and individuals. Individuals are considered creators of knowledge since they perceive and interpret reality according to their individual, social, and cultural needs. Causal

The Communicative Event

relationships are considered situational.

One of the main differences between the scientific and the wholistic positions is in the degree of openness or closedness of the theoretical system (thinking in terms of General Systems Theory).

A closed system has fixed boundaries which permit no interaction with the environment. the result is that the structure, function, and behavior of the system are relatively stable and predictable if the initial arrangement of components is known. An open system on the other hand, has permeable boundaries which allow for environment-system interaction. The result is that the structure, function, and behavior of the open system is changing perpetually. (Goldhaber, 1983, p. 50)

The scientific theories tend to be quite closed. A limited number of qualities are isolated, defined and tested (quantitatively). These qualities are then considered universally to represent a certain aspect of reality in its entirety. Theories within the wholistic position vary in degree from being somewhat closed to being extremely open. Theories that are very open usually consider it impossible to list all the influencing factors in communication and that constant change (subjectivity) is the norm. Other less open theories are open because they state that influencing factors are situational, but are closed in the fact that it is felt that the influencing factors can be categorized, listed and sometimes tested according to general types of situations.

Within the two major positions there are four basic perspectives. The behavioristic and transmissional perspectives lie within the scientific position while the interactional and transactional perspectives are within the wholistic position. The behavioristic perspective comes from the behavioral school of psychology which is led by B.F. Skinner. The terms stimulus and response are at the core of this thought as well as positive and negative reinforcement. In this perspective the environment dictates meaning to the person. A controlled environment is established by someone (in education--the teacher). The stimulus is then given to produce a predicted response in the individual. If the predicted response did not occur, the process is repeated. Positive or negative reinforcement is used as deemed necessary in order to control the individual to respond with the predicted response. This is at the heart of most educational procedure. The behavioral objectives for class preparation is something that all teachers must learn. Meaning in the behavioral perspective is assumed to be in the environment only. It also assumes that the individual cannot choose, think, or feel--the individual only responds to the environment.

The transmissional perspective assumes that a message is sent by a sender via a channel (verbal, written, or other) and is received by a receiver. It assumes that if the message is produced correctly by the sender and the receiver knows the appropriate rules, the message will be understood. The meaning, therefore, is in the message. The emphasis in language teaching then becomes the "correct" construction of the message. If the rules are known, communication is completely known.

The interactional perspective is a somewhat wholistic perspective. The model is similar to the transmissional perspective in that there is a sender and a receiver and that a message is transmitted to another. Other than this it is quite different. Meaning is considered in the person, so an individual's perception and interpretation becomes very important. People are also considered creators of knowledge since they interpret "reality" to suit their individual, social, and cultural needs. Understanding becomes the reduction of communication barriers. The sender encodes or creates a message to represent her/his ideas, the receiver decodes this set of symbols according to his or her world view and then gives some sort of feedback back to the receiver as a check on whether the message was understood or not. Communication is considered sequential and language is a set of symbols which is used by an individual to represent his or her concepts.

In the transactional perspective communication

Offering Suggestions, Making Proposals and Giving Advice in English[1]

Robert Wissmath
Sogang University Institute for English

The purpose of this article is to provide some insights for Koreans into some cultural, linguistic and functional aspects of the use and forms for offering suggestions, making proposals, and giving advice in English.[2] All three concepts have in common that one person seeks to influence in some way the behavior of another. They differ in the degree to which the speakers believe they can influence the behavior of the other and in the degree to which the speaker seeks to participate in the behavior of the other. Let's consider the following diagram:

	Initiated by	Sought by	Results may be partici- pated in by
PROPOSAL:	Speaker A	not sought	both A and B
ADVICE:	Speaker A or	Speaker B	Speaker B
SUGGESTION:	Speaker A or	Speaker B	A and/or B

The above diagram provides us with a working definition of what we are talking about.

NOTE: Don't forget that proposals, advice and suggestions are language and cultural universals.[3] Speakers of all languages do these things.

I'd like to make a proposal

Now let's look at the following sentences:

	Speaker's Attitude
Let's get married.	Informal, intimate, uncertainty of the answer (the answer could be "no")
Marry me.	Command form (imperative), but the speaker is pleading (begging)
Will you marry me?	Though the form is a question, the expected answer is "yes." The question form is just a formality.
How about (our) getting married?	Casual
What do you say we get married?	Idiomatic, casual, very informal
I propose that we marry.	Very formal, serious, grammatically accurate, traditional, archaic

NOTE: In a proposal, the speaker almost always has the choice of accepting or declining, but the results involve both the proposer and the proposed to. Speaker A has a personal stake in the results.

A: Mary, *let's get married.*
B: I'm not ready yet, John, and neither are you.
A: Oh, come on, Mary. *Marry me.* I graduate from college next year and so do you.
B: Why don't we wait till then. I think that would be better, considering the circumstances. I don't want to have to live with your parents. *What do you say* we wait?
A: Next year is not soon enough. I love you very much. I can't wait that long. *How about getting married* next month?
B: Well, if you feel that way, why wait till next month? If you feel that way *we might as well get married* tomorrow.
A: Good idea. Oh, Look what time it is. It's late. We'd better go home and get some sleep.

I'd like to give you some advice

Let's look at the following sentences:

Offering Suggestions

You should marry Miss Kim, not Miss Lee.
You should get married.
Get married. You'll be happier if you do.
You should not stay single. You're getting old.
Don't get married yet. You're too young.
I don't think you should marry Miss Kim. *You should wait* till you meet someone else.

In all of the above cases, Speaker A is advising Speaker B about a question that deals with B's future. The final decision, though, rests with Speaker B. A typical response to the advice is the following:

> I'll think over your advice and decide later. That's a good idea. I'll act on your advice at once.

NOTE: A is only sharing an opinion with B (possibly based on greater experience), but A has no personal stake in the result. Advice is often initiated by A, but A has no' leverage (other than expertise or friendship) to ensure that B follows the advice. Indeed, B may seek or receive advice on the same matter from several sources. A's advice is only a recommendation, not a demand for compliance.

In English, advice is most frequently couched in the modal system of verbs.[4] The typical structure is as follows:

(IN MY OPINION,) YOU	MODAL	VERB PHRASE
You	should	get married soon.
You	ought to	get married soon.
You	(had better)	get married.

The simple command form *get married* is a particularly urgent, sincere, caring form of advice: "Get married. You'll live longer." This form is sometimes used when Speaker A cares strongly about the results of B's behavior. The meaning is, "I hope you'll get married, because I want you to live longer."

SOME ADVICE: Be cautious about using *had better*. This form is often used inappropriately by learners of English as a foreign language. It requires a very specialized context. Here are a few examples of exchanges in which it may be used:

Situation 1
A: My girlfriend is pregnant.
B: In my opinion, *you'd better get married*, or you'll be sorry for the rest of your life.

Situation 2
A is talking to B in a coffee shop. B has to teach a class that begins a half-hour from now. B is having a good time and doesn't want to leave. A, realizing the time, gives B the following advice: *"You'd better leave* right now. Otherwise, you'll be late for your class."

NOTE: In this case A gave unsolicited advice. This is not really advice. It is merely a statement of fact that B already knows. A is not advising B, rather A is *reminding* B of something bad that might happen if B does not take a particular course of action.

Situation 3
A and B are thieves. They are robbing a bank, and they hear the sirens of police cars. A says to B: *"We'd better get* out of here (because) the police are coming." (If we don't leave right now, we'll be caught and taken to jail.)

In a sense, the phrase *had better* is more of a proposal than advice. It should not be used when someone is trying to be impartial. It is a proposal, because the consequences usually could affect both parties.

I'd like to make a suggestion

Now, let's look at the following sentences:

> *Why don't you wait* two years before getting married?
> *Why don't you meet* her parents before you decide?
> *I suggest that you meet* her parents before you decide.
> *I suggest that we talk* to her parents together.
> *Can't you wait* till next year to get married?
> *You could get married* tomorrow if you want to, but I don't recommend it.
> *Get married* tomorrow. That's a possibility.

Language and Content Learning

dents with access to social studies knowledge and inquiry objectives. Typical of her students is L., a 17-year-old girl who had an interrupted education in Vietnam and who registered in the course after one year in a junior high ESL program.

The class was using a grade 4 social studies unit called "How should Albertans use their natural resources?," part of which was an article, "Soils in Alberta." All of the material was beyond the reading level of the class; they could not understand it. Arnott had to find ways to mediate between these students and the content material. She did this by concentrating on the structure of the information rather than the text.

The pattern of organization in the "Soils in Alberta" article was that of comparison and contrast. She designed a chart to highlight the key features of the different soil types: location, precipitation, fertility, and use. The students had to fill in the details of the chart. Although the students found the article difficult to read, they were able to locate the information for the chart by scanning for the key words in the text. They then did a series of exercises based on the chart, not on the text. First they drew the soil areas on a map. Using an atlas to locate the places named in the chart, they asked questions such as, "Why does the black soil area produce the most wheat?" These reinforced comprehension and forced the students to compose their own sentences rather than copy sentences from the text. Finally the students were helped to express the chart information in written paragraphs.

This teacher did not find graphics difficult to create or unusually time-consuming. Well-written content material reveals its pattern of organization easily. Badly written material needs mediation by the teacher anyway, and a graphic is often the easiest way to do this. Time spent on graphics is repaid by the quality of her students' writing, which she finds rich in content and coherently expressed, though of course not without structural errors.

Integration

These three teachers do not see topics, experience, and frames merely as ways to promote communication and aid second language acquisition. To do so would be to fail to see beyond a language-learning perspective nd to ignore the content teacher's perspective, to fail to integrate language learning with content learning. They see a topic not as a body of verbal information to be transmitted and memorized, but as a way of looking at the world, which *combines* experiences with frames for understanding experiences. The students studying insects were not simply talking about butterflies or learning facts about butterflies. They were systematically observing butterflies and organizing and recording their experiences according to the concept of the life-cycle. At a beginning level they were learning to act and think like biologists. They were learning ways of acting and understanding as well as ways of talking. They were being socialized into the practices of a scientific community of inquirers. Education is the initiation of learners into social practices, or social contexts of action and understanding.

These three language teachers did not organize their lessons around language teaching points or even communicative activities. They began from the common ground of all teaching. They gave learners the contextual resources for understanding language and information. They started from a whole context of action and understanding and worked with language within this context.

This does not mean that they deal with language randomly, and that there was not systematic planning for language learning. On the contrary, they guide their students to describe, classify, and evaluate insects, or to describe, classify, and evaluate soils—to mention just some possibilities—and they capitalize on the specific language-learning opportunities provided. These teachers are all familiar with a general framework that relates language use to subject matter learning. This is described in detail by Mohan (1986).

Although this general framework for integrating language learning and content learning

Language and Content Learning

breaks new ground, even beginning language teachers can readily understand it and use it. It has been used in a basic ESL teaching course for several years. Students are asked to plan a unit around a topic, providing for experiential work, higher–level thinking and systematic language learning. The framework is introduced, along with various examples, to help them see how to do this. A number of students have remarked that they find it easier and more natural to organize learning around topics than around language points or specific skills. Yet at the same time, the topic material provided a context in which detailed language work became more meaningful.

References

Arnott, M. (1985). *Mediating between ESL students and content material*. Unpublished master's paper, University of British Columbia.

Cummins, J. (1984). *Bilingualism and special education*. San Diego: College–Hill Press.

Early, M., Thew, C., & Wakefield, P. (1986). *Integrating language and content instruction K-12: An ESL resource book*. Victoria, Canada: Publications Service Branch, Ministry of Education.

Hermanson, W. (1986). *Educational criticism as applied to the ESL classroom*. Unpublished master's paper, University of British Columbia.

Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. New York: Pergamon Press.

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

Sarason, S. (1982). *The culture of the school and the problem of change*. 2nd ed. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Sinclair, M.V. (n.d.). *Language through television content*. Unpublished manuscript, University of British Columbia.

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1981). *Bilingual education: A decade of research*. Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Education.

The Communicative Event

is viewed as a wholistic process of shared meaning. Like the interactional perspective individuals are considered to perceive and interpret reality differently. This perspective is the most open in that it proposes that influencing factors are not only situational, but there are an infinite number of influencing factors that are too many and too complex to attempt to accurately list them. Meaning surfaces between people as they negotiate for a somewhat mutual understanding. Language is considered a set of symbols through which people express their being.

The Communicative Event––Reprise

Once again it must be remembered that the communicative event is the reality that must be analyzed in order to create communicative language teaching design and procedures. The same event is analyzed differently according to the theoretical perspective held. In the behavioristic perspective the communicative event would be analyzed according to the stimulus/response. The environment being the stimulus and the individual being forced to respond in a certain way. In the transmissional perspective the message would be analyzed for universal cause and effect relationships in order to explain the event. Theories from the interactional perspective would analyze each individual's perception and interpretation (according to their individual, social and cultural concepts) of the event in order to isolate (in order to reduce) the communication barriers. From the transactional perspective a communicative event would be viewed as people (the people participating in the event) who always express their being in their own way (for whatever reason) and who try to arrive at a somewhat common understanding between them. The emphasis and assumptions from each perspective's analysis of the communicative event have a dramatic impact on the way language is taught.

Language Teaching

Language teaching that is considered from the

The Communicative Event

transactional perspective emphasizes the differences in individual, social, and cultural perceptions and interpretations of the individuals in the communicative event and the negotiation of meaning between them. Currently, most language teaching is from the behavioristic/ transmissional perspective. Learning a language from the transactional perspective the emphasis is not on the learning of the language pieces until the whole is known, but the process of perception and interpretation of reality (the student's) being expressed through the target language.

The materials and activities selected for the classroom must allow the students to express themselves. In this perspective it is assumed that people relate to the world around them according to their own perspectives, regardless of the language they may be communicating in. This is not to say that the language does not influence how a concept is stated, however, it does propose that people always view the world in their own particular way. The most suitable materials and activities would then be something from which the students already have a conception of and know quite well. These materials would have to be presented and the following activities carried out in such a way as to be accepted by the students and still be unrestricted enough to allow them to express themselves. From this perspective to give students an exercise (activity, task, problem, etc.) to do in a foreign language (or perhaps a second language) dealing with foreign concepts about a foreign topic is ludicrous. It would probably be difficult or even impossible for the students (for whatever reason) to do the exercise dealing with the foreign concepts and topics in their native language.

Prediction is an impossibility. The response to a certain situation is determined by the person expressing his/herself in trying to come to a somewhat mutual understanding. Understanding then becomes the key. The more one is able to make oneself understood in the target language, the more accurate and fluent one is. this assumes that language is acquired through experiential usage (the process of expressing one's being

while negotiating meaning) and is not learned piece by piece (meaning is between people—not in the message).

Language teaching that is based on the behavioristic/transmissional perspective assumes that language has static and definable functions and structure that can be taught piece by piece until the language is known. Once the pieces are learned the language is assumed to be known in its entirety. Predictability is crucial at the procedure level—the behavioral objectives must be met and tested.

Conclusion

The theory behind a communicative language teaching method should describe the communicative event accurately. Only if this occurs can a design be produced to promote language learning that allows the learners to develop their communicative ability. Also, if the theory accurately describes the communicative event, materials can be produced and procedures arrived at that will promote communicative ability. At this time most ESL methodology falls into the behavioral/transmissional perspectives which generally place the meaning within the message. If it is truly felt that the meaning is in the message in a communicative event, then language instruction at this time must be on the right track. It is felt by the author that the meaning is not necessarily in the message and until language teaching reflects this in theory, design, and procedure, language learners will continue to have disparity between classroom language learning and the ability to use the language.

Note

In this article I have taken much about the major positions and perspectives in human communication theory from Littlejohn (1983, pp. 10–12, 19–23) and my own knowledge about the field. I have also modified his explanations (by emphasizing other qualities of the positions and perspectives) in order to make these ideas more applicable to ESL theory and practice.

Offering Suggestions

Suggestions are often solicited. Speaker B wants to make a decision or take an action, so speaker A is asked to offer some ideas or provide some alternatives for action. While advice is given as a personal recommendation based upon belief, suggestions are given only to help provide a way for how to go about implementing a course of action already decided upon. Suggestions are possibilities. Speaker A doesn't care strongly and does not necessarily expect Speaker B to use the suggestion. A suggestion is something you can use. Advice is something you consider. A suggestion is just one of many possibilities--an idea. One speaker may offer many suggestions on a particular matter. In contrast, advice is an opinion. One speaker usually has just one piece of advice on a particular matter.

Summary

To summarize, a proposal involves *asking* someone's cooperation or permission:

> I propose that we get married.
> I asked her to marry me.

Advice, on the other hand, involves *telling* or *sharing*:

> I advise that you get married.
> I told him that he should get married.
> I advised him to get married.
> I shared some advice (one of my opinions) with him.

Finally, a suggestion, like advice, also involves *telling* or *sharing*, but a suggestion is an idea, while advice is an opinion:

> Why don't you get married?
> I told him that he could get married.
> My suggestion was that he might get married.
> I told him that getting married was an alternative.
> I shared an idea with him.
> I suggested that he could get married.

All three appear in this concluding dialogue:

A: I asked her to marry me and she said no.
B: Here's my advice (unsolicited): Forget her.
A: I can't forget her.
B: If you still want to try to persuade her to marry you, let me give you a suggestion: Next time you propose, propose by candlelight in a fancy restaurant.

Notes

1. This article first appeared under the title of "Giving Advice, Making Suggestions and Proposals" in the April 1984 issue of *The Study of Current English*, a journal published by Shisa Yong-oh-sa. It is reprinted here with the author's permission.

2. The concepts of giving advice, offering suggestions and making proposals are "functions" of language (M. Finocchiaro & C. Brumfit, *The Functional-Notional Approach*, Oxford University Press, 1983). Although we would certainly like to see our students using the functions discussed in this article appropriately, it should be noted that we cannot expect them to do so after just one lesson on the topic.

3. I should say, they are probably universal. It may be discovered that there are languages or cultures in which these functions do not exist.

4. The modals are probably the most difficult area of the English verb system for linguists to adequately explain, and giving advice is but one function in which the English modals play a part.

* * * * *

The Communicative Event

References

Goldhaber, G.M. (1983). *Organizational communication*. (3rd ed.). Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown Co.

Littlejohn, S.W. (1983). *Theories of human communication*. (2nd ed.). Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Co.

Using Videotapes in the ESL Classroom

Robert Wissmath
Sogang University Institute for English

Besides providing interest, entertainment and impact as well as examples of English used in context, videotapes can be used as a form of good clear reference for communicative classroom discussion and as a source of meaningful and challenging language input at a level slightly beyond the student's current level of competence--the "i+1" level recommended by advocates of the Natural Approach (Krashen and Terrell, 1983). At the Sogang Institute for English, we use videotapes in a "videolab" for all of the above purposes.

In our classes, typically, students might spend three 45-minute class periods per week watching a given segment of a videotape series. The series might consist, for example, of a continuing story in a "soap-opera" or movie or mystery format, though some series are episodic. The students are given comprehension questions for each segment they watch and are told that they are responsible primarily for that information. This gives them a guide to what information they will find in the video story, and provides them with a purpose for watching.

They are expected, usually, to watch the same segment several times, so that what they don't understand the first time, they may concentrate upon more the second time and in subsequent viewings. Then, typically on the fourth day, they are "de-briefed" by the instructor. The format for the de-briefing may vary. One way is for different groups of students to be responsible for two or three of the questions. They discuss their answers to the questions in small groups, then each group chooses one person as its representative to present the group's answers to the class. Another way is for the instructor to plead ignorance to the content of what the students have watched and ask them to tell the story. This helps to simulate real communication, in the sense that students are communicating information to the instructor which he or she does not already know (division of information). And the questions the students are given beforehand provides them with a purpose for watching the video-

tapes other than that of pure entertainment.

Reference

Krashen, S.D. & Terrell, T.D. (1983). *The Natural Approach*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

* * * * *

A "Videography" of Some Commercially Produced Videotape Series for ESL

Robert Wissmath
Sogang University Institute for English

The Bellcrest Series: English for Business. London: BBC English by Television, 1973. A continuing story set in a British business; for advanced students with a business/electronics interest; accompanying text available through Oxford University Press.

Bid for Power: English for Commerce and Industry. London: BBC English by Television, 1983. Text & Teacher's Guide by A. Fitzpatrick & C. St. J. Yates, videoscript by John Tully; a continuing story in 13 episodes; international English is spoken--British, American & actors from other countries. Upper-intermediate.

The Blind Detective: Language Learning by Video. Surrey, England: Nelson Filmscan, 1984. Seven mysteries solved by the blind detective; accompanying workbook, teacher's manual & script; British English; upper intermediate.

Follow Me to San Francisco. London: BBC English by Television, 1981. A soap opera in five-minute episodes; accompanying text and teacher's guide by Suzanne Griffin; American English; intermediate.

It's Your Turn to Speak. Surrey, England: Nelson Filmscan, 1982. Accompanying text by Saxon Menne; 20 lessons, some in British English, some in American English; for high beginners.

People You Meet. London: BBC English by Television, 1973. Twenty-six 15-minute films with accompanying text; graduated grammatical syllabus; low intermediate.

June AETK Session

8. Teachers should encourage students to make more mistakes without feeling shy or inhibited about it (because then at least they will be using the language for communication, and we learn from our mistakes).

9. What will happen if we only have the carrot and not the stick? (In reference to positive vs. negative feedback, is there no significant place for the negative?)

10. The carrot is usually on the stick. (So what are we saying about the distribution of power in the classroom and the results that follow when the teacher has all the power and the students are powerless?)

11. The most important thing of all is how much the teacher is interested in the students (i.e., as persons, not just objects of instruction).

* * * * *

Treasurer's Report

Balance on hand March 16, 1986   W505,206

Receipts

Membership dues	360,000	
Bank interest	11,292	
Total receipts		371,292

Expenditures

Newsletter	44,000	
Meetings:		
Announcements	51,400	
Hall rental	57,000	
Honoraria	30,000	
Refreshments	71,938	
Affiliate dues	62,300	
Miscellaneous	4,630	
Total expenditures		321,268

Balance on hand July 1, 1986   555,230

Videography

The Sadrina Project: English for Travel. London: BBC English by Radio and Television, 1979. A story about the travel business in Southeast Asia; twelve episodes; intermediate; British English.

Switch-on: The Mystery of Valley Forge. Surrey, England: Nelson Filmscan, 1982. A continuing story in ten units; for low begenners; accompanying text and teacher's handbook by Saxon Menne; American English.

Addresses

BBC English by Television
P.O. Box 76
London   WCB 4PH
England

Nelson Filmscan Ltd.
Nelson House, Mayfield Road
Walton-on-Thames
Surrey   KT12 5PL
England

* * * * *

Your AETK Council Members are:

Dwight Strawn, President
George Matthews, Vice President
Paul Cavanaugh, Secretary-Treasurer
In-Won Kim, Member-at-Large
Yong-Soon Kang, Member-at-Large
Joe Gene Autry, Past President
Young-Shik Lee, Nominating Committee Chair

AETK September Meeting
Saturday, September 13, 2:00 PM
Yonsei University FLI

News from the CSPC

official language of the United States" movement;

- educating members on how to influence legislators and other policy makers;
- requesting plenary sessions for the next conference that would deal with socio-political topics.

Members are invited to submit suggestions of other topics and issues to the CSPC as well.

Putting together an effective course of action for any one of the many issues affecting TESOL professionals requires commitment and time. There is much work to be done and no one person can do it all. That is why TESOL needs everyone's "brain power" and some time out of busy schedules towards CSPC's work. The international/national CSPC of TESOL has about 20 members from every part of the organization who have been working with the committee.

Focus on You

But the committee's work must involve all of the membership. We need interested TESOLers from every Affiliate and Interest Section to be the CSPC's eyes and ears so that we know what the issues are in your area and how you think TESOL should respond to them. The CSPC also needs you to be the link through which important information on issues is disseminated from the committee to all of the TESOL members in your area.

If you think you would like to be a part of the work that the CSPC does, one of the most constructive steps you can take is to work through your Affiliate president or Interest Section chair and volunteer to help get one going.

We know that this will mean some work for you—but you won't have to do it all by yourself. CSPC is ready to give you all the help and support it can through TESOL members who have experience in working on socio-political issues and concerns.

The CSPC publishes a newsletter called the *CSPC Alert* on a fairly regular basis. The *Alert*

automatically goes to all Affiliate presidents and CSPC liaisons, IS chairs and associated chairs, committee chairs and chairs-elect and the Executive Board. The CSPC uses the *Alert* to get out time-sensitive information that needs to be circulated immediately. You may also wish to be on the *Alert* mailing list. Check with your Affiliate president or Interest Section chair to see a copy of the *Alert*. Or you can get a sample copy by contacting Terry Dale, CSPC Chair, 2727 29th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20008, U.S.A. Telephone: (202) 234-7526 at home; or (202) 429-9292 at work.

The CSPC plans to continue regular communication with you, the members, through periodic news items in the *TESOL Newsletter* and through the *CSPC Alert*. We want to hear from you and we hope you will decide today to work with us through your Affiliate and/or Interest Section Socio-political Concerns Committee. Write to the CSPC, c/o the chair, at the address above.

The One-Minute Teacher

Nick Silva, American College

Who is he? Who is she? Look around. The *one-minute teacher* is one who makes the most of every minute to get the job done because a minute is all it takes to do it well.

The *one-minute teacher* is a positive thinker. He or she doesn't wait for things to happen. He or she makes them happen.

Have you see the *one-minute teacher* lately? If you have, you know what I'm talking about. If you haven't, don't look further than the nearest mirror. The *one-minute teacher* is there. Take a minute. Let the real teacher in you come out. It only takes a minute.

Once you take the first crucial step, you'll be enveloped in a super-right feeling of unparalleled strength. The momentum will propel you through time, minute by minute.

The only limitations you'll have are those you impose on yourself. It's that simple. And it didn't take more than a minute to tell you about it.

ASSOCIATION OF ENGLISH TEACHERS IN KOREA
Membership Application
(Annual Dues W10,000)

Name . . . .   Date. . . . .

Mailing address. . . . .

City. Province. . . . .   Postal code. . . . .

TEL (Office). . . . .   (Home). . . . .

Position title. . . . . Institution. . . . .

Application is for:
          [ ]New membership   [ ]Renewal

Area or level of work:
          [ ]Primary school   [ ]College/university
          [ ]Middle school   [ ]Language institute
          [ ]High school   [ ]Other. . . . .

Major interests:
          [ ] Fellowship and sharing with other teachers
          [ ] Teaching methods and techniques for classroom use
          [ ] Materials development
          [ ] Theory and research on language learning/teaching
          [ ] Language testing
          [ ] Other. . . . .