

SOME PROBLEMS CONCERNING THE EVALUATION OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE CLASSROOM DISCOURSE

WILLIS J. EDMONDSON

Ruhr-Universität Bochum

Teacher: Mary, would you try to take the part of Dr. Headache?

Mary: No

INTRODUCTION

I wish to discuss in this paper some aspects of communicative foreign language teaching which imply or require an *evaluation* of different types of discourse activity. Evaluation is implied for example in the choice of teaching items, in the choice of teaching presentation, and in the assessment of learner performance. In syntax or semantics we may use notions such as grammaticality, acceptability or truth-value as evaluative criteria, however fuzzy-edged these notions might be: in pragmatics I take it that the notion of 'appropriateness' is the best that we can offer. It may be worthwhile to try to investigate how this notion might be interpreted and used with respect to foreign language classroom discourse.

In the first part of the paper the term 'discourse' will be interpreted for my purpose, and some recent and ongoing tendencies in FL teaching and research which reflect such a discourse perspective will be sketched. Secondly, in the light of the peculiar nature of classroom discourse, the question will be posed 'appropriate to what?', and some possible answers to the question will be discussed. In the third section I shall introduce some broader issues concerning the evaluation of communicative acts in general, and then consider these issues with respect to classroom talk conducted in the foreign language. In the fourth and final section some non-startling conclusions will be drawn.

1. DISCOURSE ANALYSIS AND LANGUAGE TEACHING

The potential for confusion over the use of the term 'discourse' or 'discourse analysis' is considerable. Widdowson's phrase 'the use of sentences in combination' (Widdowson 1973, 66 ff.) is a useful starting point in coming to grips with the term. The phrase may be seen to imply two oppositions, firstly between sentential and suprasentential units (the sentence v. sentences in combination), and secondly between language units viewed as pertaining to a self-contained linguistic system (elements of which may or may not be viewed as linking with external states of affairs via reference, truth-value, propositional content and so on), and language units viewed as belonging to a complex of situational and contextual factors generally subsumed under the term pragmatic. Following these two binary oppositions, we may (with considerable oversimplification) establish the following perspectives on the study of language:

Applied Linguistics, Vol. I, No. 3

Sentence grammars (-suprasentential, -use)
 Text grammars (+suprasentential, -use)
 Speech act theory (-suprasentential, +use)
 Discourse analysis (+suprasentential, +use)¹

This seems neat enough—too neat perhaps—but fails to reveal a further distinction relevant for my purposes, namely that between the spoken and the written mode of language use. For my purposes in this paper I shall consider discourse analysis as concerned with spoken, conversational language activity. This restriction seems warranted because

- (i) this may with some justification be seen as the basic or most essential use of language,
- (ii) the main thrust of discourse-oriented research has dealt with this type of data—most markedly in the work of the ethnomethodologists,
- (iii) the central impact of discourse analysis on language teaching seems to me to have been its influence on the teaching of the spoken language as a means of communication, and
- (iv) the relations holding between a written 'text' or 'discourse', and spoken discourse are little understood, such that it is difficult to consider both types of data inside one and the same theoretical framework.²

If we accept this focus on spoken discourse, then in considering a discourse perspective we are viewing language as a means of social interaction, and unless this aspect of the use of language is present we are not strictly handling language as communication. Thus it is not enough to equate a discourse perspective with an interest in speech acts or 'functions' in the sense for example of Candlin et al (1976).³ The work of and following Austin and Searle on a theory of speech acts has had and continues to have a considerable impact on foreign language teaching, and is highly important for the concerns of discourse analysis. However before we can talk of a *discourse* perspective on language, or of *communicative* language teaching, we need to consider both the illocutionary and interactional work that is simultaneously occurring when communication is taking place. Communication does not simply consist of isolated illocutionary acts sequenced in time. I propose that a communicative act be seen as both having an illocutionary and an interactional, or 'discourse' value or function. The distinction is made in the model used by Sinclair and Coulthard 1975, where 'grammatical' and 'situational' categories are distinguished, roughly as is done in speech act theory via the direct/indirect illocutionary force distinction, and then further 'discourse' categories are set up, of which the 'situational' categories are the exponents.

I interpret Sinclair and Coulthard's situational categories as similar to illocutionary acts, and their discourse categories as interactional acts, which are structured relative to one another, this type of structure being precisely what Goffman, Sacks, Schegloff, Jefferson and others seek to discover in the analysis of conversation.⁴

This social aspect of talk is an important aspect of discourse analysis, and finds its reflection in some recent or current trends in foreign language teaching and research. For example

- (a) with respect to the goals of language teaching, a greater concentration

- on 'communicative competence', communicative 'skills' or 'abilities' is noticeable,
- (b) with respect to the content of courses, and materials provided in textbooks, we may discern a greater use of 'authentic' spoken language materials, and of dialogue material,
- (c) with respect to the sequencing of course materials, we are familiar with the notion of a situational progression, following on from the 'notional' or functional sequencing familiar from the work of Wilkins, and also illustrated in *Un niveau-seuil*, Coste et al 1976,⁵
- (d) in foreign language classroom research, interest in the interactional analysis of learning-teaching events has increased, and richer analytic schemata have been developed reflecting a discourse perspective on observed classroom behaviour,
- (e) research into the classroom and school as social institutions, and the implications for the nature of the learning and teaching that takes place in them has flourished.⁶

The above listing is not intended to imply a cause-effect relationship between discourse analysis and language teaching. It would be false to claim that the suggested discernible trends are the *result* of research findings in discourse analysis. To do so further implies a naive interpretation of the relations holding between 'pure' and 'applied' linguistics, which cannot be substantiated in fact.

2. 'LANGUAGE' v. 'TEACHING' IN LANGUAGE TEACHING

The type or types of discourse involving the use of the foreign language which occur in the classroom are clearly one factor determining what is learnt there. We tend to assume with every justification that one profitable way to learn to communicate in English is to practise communicating in English. However the question of appropriateness arises, as we need to ask whether the type of discourse by means of which practice is intended to take place, is in fact the type of discourse which it is intended be practised. Hence we need to ask whether different teaching procedures and strategies are appropriate to the communicative goals of foreign language teaching.

Widdowson notes for example as follows:

. . . the teacher in the early stages of an English course might hold up a pen, point to it and say: *This is a pen*. Here we have a correct English sentence. It is an instance of correct usage. But is it an instance of appropriate use? (Widdowson 1978:7)

Widdowson's conclusion is that it is not, as what is meant is something like *This is called a pen in English*—i.e., 'naming' is going on here, not 'identification'. If, however, Widdowson goes on to argue, barometers had been discussed in a chemistry lesson, and the teacher holds one up and says *This is a barometer*, then the sentence 'takes on a natural function in the situation'.

But note that the chemistry teacher might presumably hold up a barometer of which his class has never heard, and use the same sentence, before going on to characterise the object in question. Here too the sentence is presumably used 'appropriately', but it would appear 'naming' is going on, not 'identification'. In other words, *This is a pen* may well be 'natural' or 'appropriate'

in the situation, *given that the situation is a pedagogic one*. We need to be clear as to what grounds we have for evaluating various foreign language teaching procedures as 'appropriate', and other pedagogic settings do not provide a relevant comparative norm, as classroom discourse of the type to be found in a chemistry lesson is not necessarily the type of discourse one wishes to practise in the foreign language lesson. Note here that the discourse structures discerned by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) are evidenced both in foreign language lessons and in other school subjects.⁷

In short, as has often been pointed out,⁸ there is a tension in classroom discourse between what is appropriate with respect to the teaching goals being pursued (target discourse), and what is appropriate with respect to the teaching setting (pedagogic discourse). In the light of this distinction I have tried to argue elsewhere (Edmondson 1978b) that systems developed for the analysis of classroom interaction may be self-defeating when it comes to interpreting the results, if the categories used in the analysis have relevance only to learning-teaching events, and that an alternative would be to analyse the target language, and then seek to discover what is different in classroom discourse, and where the crucial differences lie. The problem is precisely that of practising target discourse inside a pedagogic setting, where what is 'appropriate' may in fact be some other kind of discourse.⁹

There is then a tension between discourse which is appropriate to pedagogic goals, and discourse which is appropriate to the pedagogic setting. One way out of this dilemma is to propose that if in the classroom setting the learner can be led to express his own communicative needs and interests, then the resultant discourse is appropriate both with respect to target situations and with respect to the pedagogic setting. I have elsewhere described this as the *sincerity* criterion (in Edmondson and House 1979). Inside the conceptual framework proposed here, the sincerity requirement may be interpreted as claiming that appropriateness with respect to the intentional state of the speaker entails appropriateness with respect to the teaching goals—i.e., if the learner is expressing what he feels and needs to say, then the resultant discourse is necessarily 'genuine', and implicitly 'appropriate' in terms of the teaching goals.¹⁰ This sincerity criterion seems to me to be mistaken, and I shall try and show why.

If we go back to Searle, we find that the conditions held to be necessary before a speech act of a particular kind—say a Promise—can be said to have occurred involve intentional states: this is clearly the case with the sincerity condition for example. From the perspective of discourse analysis however, this is to put the cart before the horse. Note that with Grice for example we *assume* sincerity via co-operative principles, such that the illocutionary value of what is said is derived in part from the assumption of sincerity. Thus it does not make sense for C, reporting on a dialogue sequence finishing

A: Okay, I'll do it tomorrow
B: Fine, thanks

to say that A did not *really* promise to do it, even if C knows that A in fact has no intention of doing the deed in question. To say this is in fact a nonsense—A has entered into a commitment and his or anybody else's intentional states do not alter the fact. The sincerity criterion with respect to classroom discourse

also assigns intentional states a role which they are not capable of carrying in the business of conversation, and is thus unrealistic and misplaced. Firstly, intentional states are not open to inspection. Secondly, the needs, drives and interests of the learner *at the time of learning* may not match the goals of the course of study being pursued, are non-predictable, and are unlikely to be a constant for a specific group of learners. Thirdly, the classroom imposes such restrictions as a social setting that the amount of language activity that can be 'genuinely' practised in this setting is severely restricted. Fourthly, the sincerity criterion does not on its own discriminate between classroom-specific and target discourse. Consider the following extract from an English lesson, in which the teacher is practising the word *prefer*:¹¹

- T : Do you prefer cornflakes with or without sugar?
 P1: I prefer cornflakes with sugar
 P2: I prefer cornflakes without sugar
 P3: I don't like cornflakes

We tend to applaud the third pupil, but have in fact no means of knowing whether he is telling the truth or not: the first or second pupil may be being just as sincere or insincere—we cannot tell. Part of the reason the third response is striking is in fact the assumption that the learner is deliberately flouting a discourse pattern established by the teacher—an assumption that the learner resents being a learner—i.e., carrying this social role. But it is evident from the total sequence that it is pedagogic and not target discourse that is occurring here.

Again, we may claim with every justification that, for example, the initiation of repair work and the performance of various non-co-operative communicative acts we may gloss as 'contradictory' are valuable communicative skills for a learner, but are under-represented in classroom discourse relative to other settings (see e.g., Sornig 1977, von Unwerth and Buschmann 1980). A conclusion drawn by a proponent of the sincerity criterion would be that the conventions holding for classroom discourse be changed, such that learners *do* freely initiate repair work¹² and do 'contradict' their teachers. The conclusion does not remedy the problem however, as the learner will perform the desired communicative act only if he disagrees, or fails to understand. The motivation for changing the nature of the classroom as a social setting cannot be simply derived from an analysis of the problems of teaching a foreign language as a means of communication in this setting.

The above argumentation is not to be seen as denying the importance of catering for learner interests and experience in the choice of the content of teaching programmes and materials, but claims that 'sincerity' itself does not suffice as regards the appropriateness of the discourse that results to communicative teaching goals. The only point of any discourse is to produce outcome: in classroom discourse, the desired outcome on the part of at least one participant involved—the teacher—is we may say learning. The discourse that occurs in classroom settings is necessarily affected by this.¹³

3. THE EVALUATION OF INDIVIDUAL COMMUNICATIVE ACTS

If we accept that spoken discourse is social activity, then in evaluating an actual communicative act, we are evaluating both the utterance as a social act

and the speaker as a social member.¹⁴ It follows that the teacher in deciding which forms of discourse to teach and practise is determining in part which forms of social action the learner will be (in theory at least) equipped to perform. Further in evaluating learner discourse, the teacher may be implicitly evaluating the learner as a social member. What an individual says and does in an ongoing discourse is determined by his social competence, as much as by his 'linguistic' or 'communicative' competence.¹⁵ By which social norms is the teacher to evaluate—indeed is the teacher justified in imposing social evaluations on the learner?

Take the case of a specialist English course for doctors, and let us assume that the doctor-patient interview is an important element of the desired terminal behaviour. It is a non-trivial question to ask how far in producing such a course the teacher or researcher seeks to make the learner a 'successful' doctor in terms of his interpersonal relations with his patients. If the learner is to practise in a country where a doctor's income is proportionate to the number of patients he can attract, we may be asking how far the teacher is involved in teaching the learner how to make his practice a profitable one.

A more concrete case is provided by the following: imagine conducting an oral examination to test a student's 'proficiency' or 'communicative skills' in spoken English. The student however responds to every question by saying 'I don't know really', 'It depends I suppose', or the like. How does the examiner assess this student?¹⁶

These two illustrations are marked cases: I am suggesting that the same sort of issue is raised implicitly in for example the teaching of 'greetings'—often found early in communicative-oriented teaching courses. Note that what may be established in sociolinguistic research are *probabilistic* rules, based on a macro-survey, and such rules have therefore only a probabilistic predictive value. If I greet a group of colleagues, some will return the greeting, others will not. The returned greeting may be in the form of a ritualised expression in some instances, in others it might be best described as a grunt, in other instances it might fairly be described as idiosyncratic, maybe involving the use of an esoteric literary reference, the use of a foreign language, and so on. It is clear that large-scale research into native-speaker usage does not in itself resolve any evaluative issues, as what might at best result is a probabilistic spectrum detailing who greets whom when and how. On what criteria does the teacher make use of such empirical data? (Unfortunately, the question as of now ought to be posed as how *would* the teacher use such empirical data if he had them).¹⁷

When communicative activity is evaluated, the following criteria are amongst those which might be employed:

- (a) the utterance is consistent with/inconsistent with hearer expectation,
- (b) the utterance is consistent with/contrary to that which the hearer desires to hear—in the case of a responding communicative act this is equivalent to saying that the utterance is consistent with/contrary to the perlocutionary intent of the hearer's preceding communicative act,
- (c) the utterance is consistent with/inconsistent with the behaviour patterns implied by socially-sanctioned norms of authority,
- (d) the utterance is consistent/inconsistent with what the evaluator interprets as

social norms of politeness (as formulated in the 'tact-principle' in Leech 1977, for example),

(e) the utterance is consistent/inconsistent with the evaluator's beliefs as to the speaker's beliefs, state of mind, or feelings. This is the sincerity criterion once more, reformulated with respect to non-pedagogic discourse. Note that this criterion tends to be invoked to counter a non-positive evaluation made according to some other criterion ('Well at least he speaks his mind', 'You know where you are with him' and so on).

These criteria may converge, but need not, though it would seem likely that criteria (a) and (c) would most commonly lead to the same evaluation. Further, these criteria are clearly subjective,¹⁸ and may be exercised both with respect to *which* communicative act is performed in a particular case, and with respect to the linguistic (and other) means through which it is performed (its 'modality' in the sense of House and Kasper 1978). On the first dimension we might evaluate a communication as being a 'turn-down' of a request, as opposed to an 'agree' for example, while on the second, we might evaluate the realization of a turn-down, as a choice from a set of possible realizations including for example *no/sorry . . . /I would normally, but . . . /can't do I'm afraid/I'd love to I really would but . . . /get stuffed/do it yourself* and so on.

The learner as a social member brings to the classroom his own social values. It is unlikely that these are a constant for a group of learners, and it is unlikely that for any individual learner these values remain a constant for other than a short period of time relative for example to the nine-year period of English study which is commonly undergone by a learner completing his secondary education in a German *Gymnasium*.¹⁹ The teacher as a social member also brings his social values to the learning-teaching situation. The confrontation of different social values in a foreign language classroom is further complicated by the fact that there is some evidence that even for two language communities as closely related as are the English and the German, there may be different social norms with regard to communicative activity operant in the two language communities (House, 1979, House and Kasper, 1978).

The problems of evaluation are then considerable and complex. One major issue is how far the teacher is professionally obliged or expected to uphold the social values of the institution and of the society in which he teaches, and who is to decide exactly what those values are. This is a political issue. Again, how far is the learner to be expected to *conform with* social norms assumed to operate for the foreign language community, assuming these can be established? There is here a danger of the promulgation of national stereotypes, whereby, for example, English people not only like queuing and invariably eat porridge for breakfast (which we have known for some time), but are also invariably polite, and preface almost every remark with the expression *oh* (this we have learnt more recently).

The notion that the learner in his communicative behaviour should conform to this stereotype would seem even more dangerous. That the learner's own real or assumed social values be taken as the evaluative criterion has been argued against in 2 above.

4. CONCLUSIONS

Much of what I have said has been negative in tone: I have also raised some issues which I have not attempted to answer, nor in some cases do I feel competent to do so.²⁰ Two general conclusions I would draw concerning the discourse by means of which the foreign language is used as a means of communication in the classroom setting are as follows:

(a) A wide spectrum of communicative activities and of ways of performing them should be taught (not necessarily for active control) and practised in communicative language discourse, and this will largely be done within the restrictions imposed by the pedagogic setting via simulations of various kinds, role-play, pupil-pupil discourse, and other techniques. Thus the practice of target discourse will often be embedded within a pedagogic discourse. Any teacher evaluation is then addressed to the pupil as learner, and not to the pupil as social actant.

(b) Side by side with this, the social values implicit in spoken discourse, and affecting issues of face, tact, social convention and social authority need to be brought out in the practised target discourse. Alternative realizations of communicative acts may be put forward and compared evaluatively. This reinforces Candlin's (1975) point concerning a *cognitive* element in communicative language teaching, and links with suggestions concerning the usefulness of the analysis of register and the potential usefulness of translation made in Widdowson 1974, House 1977.

What we require in order to follow such teaching procedures is more empirical findings from discourse analysis concerning the social values implicit in spoken discourse, such that these may be taught, and such that subjective, intuitive, or dogmatic evaluations of classroom discourse be replaced by empirically-based descriptions of what is involved in speaking a foreign language.

NOTES

¹ On the text/discourse distinction made here, see Widdowson 1973, Sandulescu 1976, Edmondson 1978a.

² But see Gray 1977, Edmondson (forthcoming), and the papers by Sinclair and Widdowson in this volume, for some suggestions.

³ A discourse perspective is of course often implicit in such work. For example Candlin in discussing doctor-patient interviews talks of limiting the range of speech 'functions', and of indicating 'function patterns', noting that in 'oral discourse, speech functions co-occur and entail each other in predictable ways' (Candlin 1975:80).

⁴ A shift from a speech act perspective to a discourse perspective is most readily achieved of course via the notion of speech act sequences, a sequence forming some higher order unit—an example of this approach is the work of Ehlich and Rehbein—e.g., Rehbein and Ehlich 1976, Rehbein 1977.

⁵ In itself a 'notional' syllabus does not reflect what is specific to a *discourse* perspective on language use, as the notional units are dealt with in isolation one from another. Similarly, Leech and Svartvik (1975) is not in the terms being used here a *communicative* grammar.

⁶ To document all these alleged tendencies fully would require a plethora of references likely to exceed this article in length. The literature cited elsewhere in this paper perhaps suffices.

⁷ Students in fact sometimes assume that the data in Sinclair and Coulthard provide a model of 'real' FL teaching. The implicit reasoning would seem to be: 'We wish to teach natural native-

speaker discourse in the FL classroom. Here we have documented natural native-speaker discourse in the FL classroom. Therefore we may model our teaching on this data'. The reasoning is of course false, but the unfortunate conclusion seems to be implied in the following, taken from a brief review of Sinclair and Coulthard 1975: 'Für den deutschen Anglisten liegt ein weiterer, gar nicht beabsichtigter Anreiz vor: das Buch enthält ca. 50 Seiten gegliederten Textes von tatsächlichem "class-room discourse", eine Fundgrube für die Sprache des Lehrers im Englischunterricht.' (Götz, 1978).

⁸ See for example Edmondson, 1978b, 1978c and the references therein.

⁹ The question-answer technique as a teaching strategy for example does not necessarily lead the learner to practise any skill other than that of answering such pedagogic 'questions'. (See e.g., Edmondson 1979). It is difficult to accept therefore conclusions such as the following: . . . 'um die Schüler auf das Führen von freien Gesprächen besser vorzubereiten, müssen sie sprachlich reaktiv und initiativ tätig sein. Deshalb muß die Frage-Technik in situativen Übungen einen bedeutend größeren Raum einnehmen' (König 1979, p. 19).

¹⁰ A certain amount of simplification is inevitable here, but the position I have sketched is strongly reflected in the work of Piepho (e.g., Piepho 1974, 1979 centrally pp. 120–123), for example, and in part underpins the stress on 'emancipatory' language teaching—see e.g., Maas 1974. This does not imply of course that to argue against the validity of the sincerity criterion is necessarily to argue against the validity of the notion of emancipation.

¹¹ The data is taken from Walmsley 1978. Similar data are cited in Krumm 1978, Edmondson 1978b.

¹² With repair-work, the main point must be *how* it is initiated: I would guess that learners initiate repair-work quite frequently—the trouble is they do this most commonly by maintaining silence, breaking eye-contact, and so on.

¹³ Jakobovits and Gordon 1974, p. 80: '. . . we shall call "natural" conditions of acquisition those situations in which the individual is exposed to social interactional settings that exclude the learning of language as one of its recognised and legitimate functions—all other conditions of acquisition are artificial'.

¹⁴ In Labov's research into varieties of American English for example (e.g., Labov 1972a, pp. 201–240) it is clear that the question as to the status of a non-standard dialect or variety as a means of communication necessarily involves the question as to the status of that dialect or variety as social members.

¹⁵ I have tried elsewhere to sketch a distinction between 'communicative' and 'social' competence (Edmondson 1978b and forthcoming). The distinction is not a totally sharp one, but communicative competence concerns the ability to encode and decode 'central' communicative acts, and an awareness of their potential sequencing in discourse. Social competence concerns the use to which these abilities are put, and may involve the use of 'supportive' communicative acts, and the use of conversational strategy. Some of us are 'better' at this than others.

¹⁶ This example is derived from an anecdote supplied by Werner Hüllen: in the actual case encountered by Hüllen he later discovered that the examinee was in fact a native-speaker of English.

¹⁷ There are clearly some issues concerning language use which cannot be resolved by surveys. Klein (1977, 1979) for example has established that a majority of people when asked for directions give *false* information. To describe this as a norm for German speakers to be adopted by learners of German is clearly absurd: it is perhaps instructive however to ask why this conclusion is absurd.

¹⁸ For example, the 'natural' thing to say may also be the 'wrong' thing to say. An illustrative anecdote occurs in Russell's *Autobiography*, Vol. II, p. 101: note that Russell provides this account as evidence that Wittgenstein 'was not always easy to fit into a social occasion'.

¹⁹ With intensive courses, and with adult learners, the point here is less valid.

²⁰ There are of course several issues associated with the discussion of evaluation I have not gone into here at all—one such is the notion of 'pragmatic error' in the study of interlanguages. See e.g., Kasper 1978, 1979a.

REFERENCES

- Allen, J. P. B. and Corder, S. P. 1973–1975. *The Edinburgh Course in Applied Linguistics*. London: Oxford University Press. Volumes 1–3.
- Anscombre, J.-C. and Ducrot, O. 1976. 'L'argumentation dans la langue', *Langages* 42.
- Anscombre, J.-C. 1977 'La problématique de l'illocutoire dérivé', *Langage et Société* 2.
- Austin, J. L. 1962. *How to do Things with Words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962. Trad. 1970 *Quand dire, c'est faire* Paris: Le Seuil.
- Bally, C. 1943. 'Syntaxe de la modalité explicite', *CFS* 3 3–13.
- Bausch, K. R. (ed.) 1979. *Beiträge zur didaktischen Grammatik*. Kronberg: Skriptor.
- Bazell, C. E., Catford, J. C., Halliday, M. A. K. and Robins, R. H. (eds.) 1966. *In Memory of J. R. Firth*. London: Longmans.
- Beacco, J. C. and Dacrot, M. 1978. *Pour lire les sciences sociales: une analyse de discours*. Paris: BELC (multigr.)
- Benveniste, E. 1966. *Problèmes de linguistique générale I*. Paris: Gallimard, (1974).
- Benveniste, E. 1974. 'Structure des relations d'auxiliarité', in *Problèmes de linguistique générale II* Paris: Gallimard.
- Brazil, D. and Coulthard, M. 1977. *Exchange Structure*. University of Birmingham: Monographs on Discourse, No. 5.
- Brown, R. and Bellugi, U. 1964. 'Three Processes in the Child's Acquisition of Syntax'. *Harvard Educ. Review* 34.
- Brown, R. 1976. *A First Language*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Brown, P. and Levinson, S. 1978. 'Universals in Language Usage: Politeness Phenomena'. in Goody, 1978.
- Candlin, C. N. 1975. 'Some Metalinguistic Problems in Communicative Language Learning', in Corder and Roulet 1975.
- Candlin, C. N. Leather, J. H. and Bruton, C. J. 1976. 'Doctors in Casualty: Applying Communicative Competence to Components of Specialist Course Design'. In *IRAL* 14.
- Chomsky, N. 1957. *Syntactic Structures*. Mouton: The Hague.
- Colombier, P. et al 1976. 'Niveau avancé, travailleurs migrants: la recherche d'un emploi'. Saint-Cloud: CREDIF. (multigr.)
- Cole, P. and Morgan, J. L. (eds.) 1975. *Syntax and Semantics. Vol. 3 Speech Acts*. New York: Academic Press.
- Corder, S. P. 1967. *Introducing Applied Linguistics*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Corder, S. P. and Roulet E. (eds.) 1972. *Theoretical Linguistic Models in Applied Linguistics*. Brussels: AIMAV. Paris: Didier.
- Corder, S. P. and Roulet, E. (eds.) 1975. *Some Implications of Linguistic Theory for Applied Linguistics*. Brussels: AIMAV. Paris: Didier.
- Corder, S. P. 1978. Learner Language and Teacher Talk. *Audio Visual Language Journal*, Vol. 16 No. 1.

- Coste, D., Courtillon, J., Ferenczi, F., Martins-Baltar, M., Papo, E. et Roulet, E. 1976. *Un niveau-seuil*. Strasbourg: Conseil de l'Europe.
- Coulthard, M. 1977. *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis*. London: Longman.
- Culioli, A. 1979. 'Why teach how to learn what is best learnt untaught?'. *Cahiers Charles V* No. 1 Université de Paris VII.
- Darot, M. 1975. 'Discours mathématique et discours didactique'. Paris: BELC (multigr.)
- Descamps, J. L. 1979. 'Contribution à l'analyse des discours fonctionnels (pédagogie des langues de spécialité et lexicographie contextuelle.)' Saint-Cloud: CREDIF (multigr.)
- Descamps, J. L. et al 1978. *Dictionnaire contextuel de français pour la géologie*. Paris: Didier,
- Diller, A.-M. 1977. 'Le conditionnel, marqueur de dérivation illocutoire', *Semantikos* Z/1.
- Ducrot, O. 1972. *Dire et ne pas dire, principes de sémantique linguistique*. Paris: Hermann.
- Ducrot, O. 1974. *La preuve et le dire*. Paris: Repères-Mame.
- Ducrot, O. 1977. 'Illocutoire et performatif', *Linguistique et Sémiologie*
- Ducrot, O. 1979. 'Les lois du discours', *Langue française*, 42.
- Duncan, S. 1972. 'Some signals and rules for taking speaking turns in conversation' in *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 23.2.
- Duncan, S. 1973. 'Toward a grammar for dyadic conversations'. *Semiotica* 9
- Edmondson, W. J. 1978a. 'A note on "Pragmatic Connectives"', in *Interlanguage Studies Bulletin*.
- Edmondson, W. J. 1978b. 'Worlds within Worlds—Problems in the Description of Teacher-Learner Interaction', paper read at the 5th AILA Congress, Montreal 1978. (To appear in Congress Proceedings.)
- Edmondson, W. J. 1978c. 'Context and Stress—the "Old" and the "New" in Foreign Language Teaching', in *Anglistik und Englischunterricht* 6.
- Edmondson, W. J. 1979. 'Funktionen von Fragen im Fremdsprachenunterricht', in Heuer et al 1979.
- Edmondson, W. J. (forthcoming) *Spoken Discourse: a Model for Analysis*.
- Edmondson, W. J. and House, J. 1979. 'Konzeption einer didaktischen Interaktionsgrammatik', in Bausch 1979.
- Faerch, C. 1979. 'Describing Interlanguage through Interaction Problems of Systematicity and Permeability.' *Working Papers on Bilingualism* 19.
- Firth, J. R. 1957. *Papers in Linguistics 1934–1951*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fraser, B. 1975. 'Hedged Performatives', in Cole and Morgan 1975.
- Galisson, R. et Coste, D. (eds.) 1976. *Dictionnaire de didactique des langues*. Paris: Hachette.
- Garfinkel, H. and Sacks, H. 1970. 'On formal structures of practical actions' in McKinney and Tiryakian 1970.

- Gauvenet, H. 1976. *Pédagogie du discours rapporté*, Paris: Didier, Collection VIC.
- Giles, H. and Smith, P. 1979. 'Accommodation Theory' in Giles and St. Clair 1979.
- Giles, H. and St. Clair, R. 1979. *Language and Social Psychology*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Goffman, E. 1971. *Relations in Public: microstudies of the public order*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Goffman, E. 1973. *La mise en scene de la vie quotidienne*. Paris: Minuit.
- Goody, E. N. (ed.) 1978. *Questions and Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Götz, D. 1978. Review of Sinclair and Coulthard 1975 in *Die Neueren Sprachen*.
- Gray, B. 1977. *The Grammatical Foundations of Rhetoric*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Greene, J. 1972. *Psycholinguistics: Chomsky and Psychology*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Gremmo, M.-J., Holec, H. and Riley, P. 1977. 'Interactional structure: the role of role' in *Mélanges Pédagogiques*. CRAPEL: Université de Nancy II.
- Gremmo, M. J. Holec, H. and Riley, P. 1978. 'Taking the initiative: some pedagogical applications of discourse analysis' in *Mélanges Pédagogiques* CRAPEL: Université de Nancy II.
- Grice, H. P. 1975. 'Logic and Conversation' in Cole and Morgan 1975.
- Gutknecht, C. 1977. (Hrsg) *Grund begriffe und Hauptströmungen der Linguistik*. Hamburg: Hoffman und Campe Verlag.
- Halliday, M. A. K. 1961. 'Categories of the Theory of Grammar', *Word*, 17.
- Halliday, M. A. K. 1968. 'Notes on Transitivity and Theme in English: Part 3' *Journal of Linguistics* Vol. 4 No. 2.
- Halliday, M. A. K. 1978. 'Language Structure and Language Function' in Lyons 1970.
- Halliday, M. A. K. 1973. *Explorations in the Functions of Language*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Harder, P. 1979. 'Tekstpragmatik' *Nydanske Studier* 10–11 Copenhagen 1979.
- Hatch, E. M. 1978. 'Discourse Analysis' in Hatch, 1978.
- Hatch, E. M. (ed.) 1978. *Second Language Acquisition*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.
- Heringer, J. T. 1972. 'Some Grammatical Correlates of Felicity Conditions and Presuppositions'. *Working Papers in Linguistics* II.
- Heritage, J. C. and Watson, D. R. 1979. 'Formulating as conversational objects' in Psathas 1979.
- Heuer, H. et al (eds.) 1979. *Dortmunder Diskussionen zur Fremdsprachendidaktik*. Dortmund: Lensing.
- Holec, H. 1975. 'L'approche macro-linguistique du fonctionnement des langues et ses implications pédagogiques: role du visuel' in *Mélanges Pédagogiques*, CRAPEL: Université de Nancy II.
- Holec, H., Gremmo, M.-J. and Riley, P. (forthcoming) 'Prolégomènes a une description de la structure des échanges communicatifs directs'. Paper read at the

- 5th International Congress of Applied Linguistics, Montreal, Canada. To appear in IRAL.
- House, J. 1977. *A Model for Translation Quality Assessment*. Tübingen: Narr.
- House, J. 1979. 'Interaktionsnormen in deutschen und englischen Alltagsdialogen', in: *Linguistische Berichte* 59.
- Householder, F. W. V. (ed.) 1972. *Syntactic theory I*, Penguin Modern Linguistics Readings. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Hutchinson, T. 1978. 'An analysis of the effect on discourse structure of a visual display'. In *Practical Papers in English Language Education*: University of Lancaster.
- Jacobs, R. A. and Rosenbaum, P. S. (eds.) 1970. *Readings in English Transformational Grammar*. Waltham, Mass: Blaisdell.
- Jakobson, R. 1963. *Essais de linguistique générale*. Paris: Editions de Minuit.
- Jakobovits, L. A. and Gordon, B. 1974. *The Context of Foreign Language Teaching*. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House.
- Jupp, T. C., Hodlin, S. Heddeshimer, C. et Lagarde, J. P. 1978. Apprentissage linguistique et communication: méthodologie pour un enseignement fonctionnel. (Traduit et adapté de: Jupp, T. C. et Hodlin, S. 1975. *Industrial English*. Paris: C. L. E. International.)
- Kasper, G. 1978. 'Pragmatische Defizite im Englischen deutscher Lerner'. In *Kongressberichte der 8. Jahrestagung der Gesellschaft für Angewandte Linguistik*, II. Stuttgart: Hochschul-Verlag.
- Kasper, G. 1979. 'Communication Strategies: Modality Reduction'. Paper presented at the 17th Interaction Conference on Polish-English Contrastive Linguistics, Boszkowo.
- Kasper, G. 1979. 'Errors in Speech Act Realization and Use of Gambits'. In *Canadian Modern Language Review* 35.
- Keenan, E. L. (ed.) 1975. *Formal Semantics of Natural Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kendon, A. 1967. 'Some functions of gaze direction in social interaction'. *Acta Psychologica*, 24.
- Klein, W. 1977. 'Wegauskünfte'. Max Planck-Institut Nijmegen. (To appear in *Gutschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Linguistik*.)
- Klein, W. 1979. *Local Deixis in Route Directions*. L.A.U.T. paper no. 41, Trier.
- König, E. 1979. Vorschläge zur situativen Unterrichtsgestaltung. In *Fremdsprachenunterricht* 23.
- Krumm, H.-J. 1978. 'Lehrerverhalten im Hinblick auf Lernerverhalten: Entwicklungsgemässer Fremdsprachenunterricht?'. In *Kongressberichte der 8. Jahrestagung der Gesellschaft für Angewandte Linguistik* 1 pp. 29-42. Stuttgart: Hochschul-Verlag.
- Labov, W. 1972. *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Labov, W. 1972. *Language in the Inner City. Studies in the Black English Vernacular*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

- Labov, W. and Fanshel, D. 1977. *Therapeutic Discourse: Psychology as Conversation*. New York: Academic Press.
- Lakoff, G. 1971. 'On Generative Semantics'. In Steinberg and Jakobovits 1971.
- Lakoff, G. 1973. 'Pragmatics in Natural Logic'. In Keenan 1975.
- Lakoff, G. and Thompson, H. (eds.) 1975. *Introducing Cognitive Grammar*. Proceedings of the First Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistic Society, Berkeley 1975.
- Lakoff, R. 1977. 'What You Can Do with Words: Politeness, Pragmatics and Performatives'. In Rogers *et al* 1977.
- Leech, G. N. 1977. *Language and Tact*. L.A.U.T. Paper No. 46, Trier.
- Leech, G. N. and Svartvik, J. 1975. *A Communicative Grammar of English*. London: Longman.
- Lehmann, D., Catalan, R., Moirand, S. and Marlet, F. 1979. *Lire en français les sciences économiques et sociales*. Paris: Didier.
- Lyons, J. 1966. 'Firth's theory of meaning'. In Bazell *et al* 1966.
- Lyons, J. (ed.) 1979. *New Horizons in Linguistics*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books
- McKinney, J. C. and Tiryakian, E. A. (eds.) 1970. *Theoretical Sociology*. New York: Appleton-Century-Croft.
- McRae, A. 1977. 'Comprehension: the psycholinguistic view'. In *The Teaching of Comprehension*. London: The British Council.
- Maas, U. 1974. *Argumente für die Emanzipation von Sprachstudium und Sprachunterricht*. Frankfurt: M. Athenäum Fischer.
- Maingueneau, D. 1976. *Initiation aux méthodes de l'analyse du discours*. Paris: Hachette Université.
- Martins-Baltar, M. 1977. *De l'énoncé à l'énonciation: une approche des fonctions intonatives*. Paris: Didier, Collection VIC.
- Martins-Baltar, M. et al 1979. *L'écrit les écrits: problèmes d'analyse et considération didactiques*. Strasbourg: Conseil de l'Europe.
- Moirand, S. 1977. 'Analyse de textes écrits et apprentissage "grammatical"'. *Etudes de linguistique appliquée*, no. 25.
- Moirand, S. 1978. 'Les textes aussi sont des images'. *Le Français dans Le Monde*, no. 137.
- Morgan, J. L. 1978. 'Two Types of Convention in Indirect Speech Acts'. In Cole and Morgan 1978.
- Müller B. D. (ed.) 1980 *Konfrontative Semantik*. Weil der Stadt: Lexica-Verlag.
- Murphy, D. and Candlin C. N. 1976. *Engineering Discourse and Listening Comprehension*; K.A.A.U. Project in Listening Comprehension. First annual report. Department of Linguistics and Modern English Language: University of Lancaster.
- Nickel, G. (ed.) 1976. *Proceedings of the Fourth International Congress of Applied Linguistics*, Volumes 1-3. Stuttgart: Hochschul-Verlag.
- Oldfield, C. and Marshall, J. C. (eds.) 1968. *Language*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

- Olson, D. R. and Filby, N. 1972. 'On the Comprehension of Active and Passive Sentences' in *Cognitive Psychology* 3.
- Parret, H. (ed.) 1974. *Discussing Language with Noam Chomsky*. Mouton: The Hague.
- Perret, D. 1974. 'Les verbes "pouvoir" et "vouloir" dans les énoncés de propositions'. *Langue Française* 21.
- Peytard, J. et Charolles, M. (dir.) 1978. 'Enseignement du récit et cohérence du texte'. *Langue Française*, 38.
- Piepho, H.-E. 1974. *Kommunikative Kompetenz als Übergeordnetes Lernziel im Englischunterricht*. Dornburg-Frickhofen: Frankonius.
- Piepho, H.-E. 1979. *Kommunikative Didaktik des Englischunterrichts*. Limburg: Frankonius.
- Portine, H. 1978. 'Apprendre à argumenter. Analyse de discours et didactique des langues'. Paris: BELC (multigr.)
- Psathas, G. (ed.) 1979. *Everyday Languages: Studies in Ethnomethodology*. New York: Irvington.
- Rehbein, J. and Ehlich, K. 1976. 'On Effective Reasoning'. In Nickel 1976, Volume 1.
- Rehbein, J. 1977. *Komplexes Handeln*. Stuttgart: Metzler.
- Riley, P. 1976. 'Discursive and communicative functions of non-verbal communication'. In *Mélanges Pédagogiques*, CRAPEL: Université de Nancy II.
- Riley, P. 1979. 'Towards a contrastive pragmalinguistics'. *Papers and Studies in Contrastive Linguistics*, Vol. 10 Poznań, Poland, Arlington, Virginia.
- Rogers, A., Wall, B. and Murphy, J. (eds.) 1977. *Proceedings of the Texas Conference on Performatives, Presuppositions and Implicatures*. Washington, D.C.: Centre for Applied Linguistics.
- Ross, J. R. 1970. 'On declarative sentences' in Jacobs and Rosenbaum 1970.
- Roulet, E. 1976. 'L'apport des sciences du langage à la diversification des méthodes d'enseignement des langues secondes en fonction des caractéristiques des publics visés'. *Études de linguistique appliquée*, 21.
- Roulet, E. 1977. *Un niveau-seuil—Présentation et guide d'emploi*. Strasbourg: Conseil de l'Europe.
- Roulet, E. 1977. 'Étude des réalisations directes et indirectes de l'acte d'offre en français parlé'. *Studi Italiani di Linguistica Teorica ed Applicata* 6.
- Roulet, E. 1978. 'Essai de classement syntaxique et sémantique des verbes potentiellement performatifs du français'. *Cahiers de Linguistique* 8.
- Roulet, E. 1980. 'Modalité et illocution—pouvoir et devoir dans les actes de permission et de requête'. *Communications* 32, 216–239.
- Roulet, E. and Holec, H. (eds.) 1976. L'enseignement de la compétence de communication en langues secondes. *Bulletin CILA* no spécial 24.
- Roussel, F. 1974. 'The Modulation of Discursive Functions'. *Mélanges CRAPEL* 41–52.
- Sandulescu, C. G. 1976. 'Theory and Practice in Analysing Discourse'. In Nickel 1976, Volume 1.

- Scollon, R. T. 1974. *One Child's Language from One to Two*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Hawaii.
- Searle, J. R. 1975. 'Indirect Speech Acts'. In Cole and Morgan 1975.
- Selinker, L. 1972. 'Interlanguage' *IRAL* 10.3.
- Sinclair, J. McH and Coulthard, R. M. *Towards an Analysis of Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Slobin, D. I. 1975. 'The more it changes . . . on understanding language by watching it move through time'. *Papers and Reports on Child Language Development* No. 10.
- Sornig, K. 1977. 'Disagreement and Contradiction as Communicative Acts'. In *Journal of Pragmatics*.
- Steinberg, D. D. and Jakobovits, L. A. (eds.) 1971. *Semantics: An Interdisciplinary Reader in Philosophy, Linguistics and Psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stevens, P. 1974. *Patterns in Nature*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Tarone, E., Cohen, A. and Dumas, G. 1976. 'A Closer Look at some Interlanguage Terminology: A Framework for Communication Strategies'. *Working Papers in Bilingualism* 9.
- von Unwerth, H. J. and Buschmann, U. 1980. 'Konfliktive Sprechakte und Lehrwerk-text' in Müller 1980.
- Van Dijk, T. A. 1977. *Text and Context: Explorations in the Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse*. London: Longman.
- Van Ek, J. A. 1975. *The Threshold Level*. Strasbourg: Conseil de l'Europe.
- Varadi, T. 1973. 'Strategies of target language learner communication: message-adjustment'. Paper presented at the VI Conference of the Romanian Linguistics Project in Timisoara, 28/29 May.
- Vignaux, G. 1973. 'Le discours argumenté écrit'. *Communications*, no. 20.
- Vignaux, G. 1976. *L'argumentation. Essai d'une logique discursive*. Geneve: Droz.
- Vigner, G. 1975. *Ecrire pour convaincre*. Paris: Hachette.
- Walmsley, J. B. 1978. 'Cloud-cuckoo-land' or: Feedback as the central component in foreign language teaching'. Paper read at the 5th AILA Congress, Montreal 1978.
- Wason, P. C. 1965. 'The contexts of plausible denial'. In *Journal of Verbal Behaviour and Verbal Learning* Vol. 4 reprinted in Oldfield and Marshall 1968.
- Widdowson, H. G. 1973. 'Directions in the Teaching of Discourse'. In Corder and Roulet 1973 and in Widdowson 1979a.
- Widdowson, H. G. 1974. 'The Deep Structure of Discourse and the use of Translation'. In Corder and Roulet 1974, and in Widdowson 1979a.
- Widdowson, H. G. 1977. 'Approaches to Discourse'. In Gutknecht 1977, and in Widdowson 1979a.
- Widdowson, H. G. 1978. *Teaching Language as Communication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Widdowson, H. G. 1978. 'The realization of rules in written discourse'. Paper read at the British Council/Goethe Institut Seminar. Paris October 1978 mimeo.

- Widdowson, H. G. 1979a. *Explorations in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Widdowson, H. G. 1979b. 'New starts and different kinds of failure'. Paper read at the CCTE Conference Ottawa May 1979 mimeo.
- Wilkins, D. A. 1976. *Notional Syllabuses*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wunderlich, D. 1977. *Studien zur Sprechakttheorie*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.