THE STATING OF BEHAVIORAL OBJECTIVES

FOR A COLLEGE LEVEL MODERN LANGUAGE PROGRAM

by

STEVEN ROY CHANDLER

B. A., Kansas State University, 1969

42-6074

A MASTER'S REPORT

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Modern Languages

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

Manhattan, Kansas

1972

Approved by:

William A. Coats

Major Professor

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter I

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Statement of Purpose

A cursory survey of the current professional literature concerning second language learning and teaching will reveal that the intense research and study of methodology, which was so much in evidence only a few years ago, has given way to increasing agonizing over the shortcomings of audiolingual methods. The declining enrollments in foreign language programs across the United States, is often attributed to the severity of audiolingual methods. It is not yet clear if such (largely undirected) philosophizing is a symptom or a cause of the reduction of new research by applied linguists interested in language learning. Nonetheless, this writer feels that one cause of the apparent frustration among language education specialists may lie in the overgeneralized goals expressed for their programs.

The purpose of the paper is to investigate, by means of the available pertinent literature, what theoretical and methodological advantages, if any, might be obtained by stating explicit behavioral objectives for a modern language program such as is required for the Bachelor of Arts degree at Kansas State University.

This investigator had originally intended to treat one aspect of audiolingual methodology. However, it was soon clear that any treatment of methodology must take into account the goals toward which a particular program is striving. An extensive survey of the literature revealed that the majority of applied linguists are well aware of the need to have their objectives in mind before attempting to select an appropriate teaching strategy. Nonetheless, the linguists have been too often content to leave the stating of explicit objectives to the language teacher while they pursue their particular interests such as doing contrastive analyses and designing drills. This preoccupation with methods is not new with the "modern methods". As early as 1934 Algernon Coleman (1934:3) commented on the zeal directed toward methodology, much to the exclusion of all else.

By the late 1950's a consensus had been reached that the failure to decide upon one's objectives prior to constructing a course or program placed the cart before the horse. The "how to do it" books stressed the importance of this, usually within a single paragraph placed early in the book.

> Of primary consideration, therefore, is the necessity
> for a clear definition of basic objectives. No intel-
> ligent discussion of procedure and materials is possible
> unless there is some agreement as to the outcome desired
> or attainable. Any generalization made here or anywhere
> as to "the most effective way" or "the most desirable
> method" would have to be studied and modified in terms of
> the language goals we are seeking and in light of other
> factors related to the learners... (Finocchiaro 1958:3).

Over the succeeding years the need to establish objectives was constantly reiterated. Among language education specialists

a vague notion began to emerge about the form and nature of course objectives. In 1963 Hutchinson (1963:54) called for a "detailed specification of the behavior desired". Two years later William Mackey, in his milestone work <u>Language Teaching Analysis</u>, reiterated Finocchiaro's words and then described in meticulous detail just how to go about selecting the proper objectives for any particular course or program (Mackey 1965:323). By the beginning of this decade applied linguists had added yet another requirement to the language teacher's workload. No longer was it sufficient merely to formulate one's goals, but now the teacher was enjoined to "set these objectives down in black and white <u>seriatim</u>, to use as a checklist" (Walsh 1970:347). Walsh is in effect asking the teacher to do what this paper will attempt to do. There is little evidence that this has been done. Only last year Valdman (1971:47) commented that "Foreign language teaching has been handicapped by a failure to carefully define instructional objectives". These pleas were not falling on deaf ears so much as they were being misinterpreted. As will be shown below, while the language education specialists were evolving their own notion of how to state explicit objectives, the education instructional specialists were developing a technique which lends itself very well to the needs of the language teacher for just such purposes.

The failure to specify precisely what a student would be able to do after successfully completing a language program

led to the publishing of nebulous goals and aims which gave vague and often incorrect notions to students and their prospective employers about how the graduate of a given program should be able to perform. Bolinger (1971:148ff) notes that for various reasons, the foreign language requirements in curriculums (such as that for the B.A. here at Kansas State) are resented by students. He says that part of this resentment must be attributed to the failure to give students insights into what will happen to them in a language classroom, i.e. by preventing them from recognizing an appropriate complex goal and their progress toward it. Surveys of students indicate that they often have aims of their own in mind before enrolling in language courses, aims which vary from those listed in the college catalog (Mueller 1970:297). Furthermore, once in the course the teacher's expressed goal often proves to be very unrealistic (Benevento 1970:1).

This paper will use a specific technique for stating objectives which was developed for use with nearly any educational program and will apply it to a typical college language program for Spanish. This paper, however, will be restricted to the linguistic content of a language course. It is well recognized that the modern language course has other important goals and aims in addition to developing the linguistic abilities of the student. Therefore, the language teacher must be prepared to draw material and techniques from not only the contributing discipline of linguistics, but also from anthropology,

sociology, and educational psychology.

The successful integration of all the divers fields necessary in a language class is an art requiring considerable skill in the teacher. It is not feasible for a single person to master them all. A division of the labor poses the question: What is the applied linguist's professional responsibility to the language teacher? The linguist is responsible for selecting the best available descriptions of the target and mother languages. By means of a contrastive analysis and an internal analysis of the target language he will specify what needs to be taught and where potential learning problems may be expected. Furthermore, he will draw upon his knowledge of theoretical linguistics, psycholinguistics, and the nature of language to present the language teacher with a packaged product containing not only the "what" but also the best available notions of the "how". It is then the language teacher's job to implement the linguistic data into pragmatic classroom experiences.

Pertinent Theoretical Background

As indicated above, both applied linguists and language education specialists have been well aware of the necessity for stating their goals and objectives. From its beginning the proponents of audiolingual methods had, through some sort of consensus, tacitly agreed that all language programs would as a matter of course, strive for a "mastery" -of some unspecified nature- in the target language. In his report about the

U. S. War Department's special language training programs, Paul

Angiolillo (1947:3) states:

> The objective of the language instruction is to
> impart to the trainee a command of the colloquial
> spoken form of the language. This command includes
> the ability to speak the language fluently, accurately,
> and with an acceptable approximation to a native
> pronunciation. It also implies that the student will
> have a practically perfect auditory comprehension of
> the language as spoken by natives.

This short statement was very nearly all Angiolillo

had to say about goals. At the same time that linguists and

audiolingual advocates were exalting the rigorous systematic

nature of their work, they were continuing to state their

goals in generalized terms such as "fluent" and "native-like".

The meanings of such terms were seldom consistent from one

work to another. A decade after Angiolillo's effort the

situation had worsened, causing Finocchiaro (1958:4) to charge

that language teaching studies were augmenting the confusion

over objectives, "because of the manner in which terms such as

'automatic control' and 'bilingualism' have sometimes been

used and misinterpreted." She adds, "The term 'mastery'...

brings us well-nigh to an unanswerable question."

The year 1964 saw a sweeping transformation of descriptive

linguistics initiated by the generative grammarians. The

fundamental concept of the nature of language, as essentially

a set of behavioristic habit patterns, which had been supported

by the majority of linguists was superseded by a new concept

of it as innate rule-governed behavior. Applied linguists

began to speak of their goals in terms consistent with the

new theory. In the foreword to Valdman's book of readings on
new trends (1966:iv), A. Hayes says that, "language teachers
and scholars have accepted the challenge of new goals...
The ultimate objective... is to lead the student to generate
all and only grammatically correct and stylistically congruent
sentences..." In other words, the new covenant has come down
to us as: "A pedagogical grammar... attempts to provide a
student with competence" (Chomsky, in Searle 1971:73).

The sometimes bitter controversy over language teaching
methods which had been smoldering just below the surface,
now gained new life. Criticisms by the more traditional
language teachers had been held in check by the claims of
success for "modern methods". The new champion of linguistics
was able and willing to attack the current audiolingual method
on its own ground.

> ... transformational generative theory has negative
> implications for language teaching. (There is) convincing
> evidence that habit-structure view of language learning
> is erroneous and is a very bad way -certainly an
> unprincipled way- to teach language... it is not a
> method based on any understanding of the nature of language.

Chomsky goes on to say:

> My own feeling is that from our knowledge of the
> organization of language and of the principles that
> determine language structure one cannot immediately
> construct a teaching programme. All we can suggest
> is that a teaching programme be designed in such a
> way as to give free play to those creative principles
> that humans bring to the process of language-learning..."
> (By Chomsky to MacIntyre in Lester 1970:107)

With the audiolingual dike broken, criticisms poured
through. John Carroll (Carroll in Reichman 1970:27) declared

the massive foreign language education effort of the fifties
and sixties "disappointing" and "largely useless". In spite
of Chomsky's doubts of the pedagogical usefulness of generative
grammars, efforts went forward to incorporate the new concepts
into the field. Emphasis was placed on the creative nature of
language and the internalization of the very abstract conceptual
rules which would permit the student to form new and original
sentences (Valdman in Marchione 1971:51)

Much as the structuralists had earlier attempted to
construct pedagogies along the lines of what they believed to
be the model of language acquisition by a child, the trans-
formationalists began to incorporate their new ideas about
acquisition into a new pedagogy.* They pointed out that
"natural language learning" is not linear and additive.
They tried to sequence drills to show better the underlying
regularities of the target language (Newmark in Lester 1970:211).

The efforts to design pedagogical grammars along the lines
of a transformational generative grammar have not been able to
demonstrate any more success than did the audiolingual attempts.
In actuality about all the generative grammarians have succeeded
in doing thus far, is to give a glimpse to us of how much more

----

*In this paper the term language learning is used for the
conscious effort made by an adult to learn a foreign language
by means of formal instruction. It is contrasted with language
acquisition which here refers to the "normal" acquiring by a
child of his native language by means which are not yet understood.

complex the phenomenon of language really is. Jakobovits

(1970:80) summarized the current state of the art this way:

> There is no guarantee that transformational-generative
> grammar, or for that matter any other linguistic theory,
> will be able to account for all the facts about language
> which native speakers possess. This consideration,
> coupled with the reasonable assumption that what is not
> known cannot be explicitly taught, leads to the sobering
> conclusion that language teaching may never become an
> exact science, and of course, it is not now, or likely
> to become one in the foreseeable future.

As if Jakobovits had not seen a sufficiently bleak future for

language teaching, last year Chomsky (1971:9-10) drove what

might be considered the last nail into the coffin.

> It is in fact, possible that insight into or under-
> standing of these matters lies beyond the scope of
> conscious human knowledge... The same innate principles
> of mind that make possible the acquisition of knowledge
> and systems of belief might also impose limits on
> scientific understanding that excludes scientific know-
> ledge of how knowledge and belief are acquired or used,
> though such understanding might be attainable by an
> organism differently or more richly endowed.

Thus it is possible that real "mastery" of a foreign language

may never become a realistic goal for formal language instruction.

It will be necessary, therefore, to keep the above judgments

in mind when preparing program objectives and when publishing

success claims for particular methodologies.

The nature of language defies the segmentation and

isolation of structural units by investigators interested in

very specific areas of the language sciences. The division of

language into arbitrary structural levels and components must

eventually be judged in light of its total system. Just as the

selection of one's methods and pedagogies presupposes certain

objectives, the stating of a set of objectives will presuppose an adequate description of the target and native languages. These language descriptions will in turn depend upon a metatheory, the metatheory upon a concept of the nature of language, and the concept of language upon an interpretation of the observed phenomena. At times it is beneficial for an individual to scrutinize some specific aspect of language in more detail than certain other aspects. However, the ramifications of statements and observations made about one aspect of language should be consistent with the best available information about the nature of language in general. Therefore, the goals proposed below must be consistent with some sort of working notion about the nature of language.

The limits of this paper do not permit a full discussion of the continuing debate on the nature of language, nor is it possible to evaluate thoroughly the significance of that debate to language learning strategies. Before listing the explicit behavioral objectives proposed here, the general aim of the program must be ascertained in light of what are realistic and reasonable expectations. Considering current notions about language, is it reasonable to expect the student who successfully completes the program to have become an incipient bilingual? If not, why not? What lesser expectation might be reasonable?

As concerns bilingualism, any experienced language teacher can attest that it is not a realistic goal for a three-semester

college language program. This does not imply that a near-bilingual mastery is not a desirable goal for foreign language majors. The need to establish an intermediate set of objectives below that of full proficiency forces the teacher to select some items for teaching and to reject others. The criteria for making such selections involve complex judgments about time limitations, the student's needs, his desires, and the prospective usefulness of the language skills to the student in relation to the amount of effort required by him.

It is necessary to ask if competence as envisioned by generative grammarians can be taught or learned. If so will learned competence be of a similar nature to that of the native speaker? Several prominent investigators have assumed that knowledge of a second language is essentially similar to that of the mother language, although the former may be of a rather poor quality and quantity. Not atypical is the opinion of the Polish linguist Muskat-Tabakowska (1969:46). She writes, "... it is perhaps justified to assume that the basic schema of the process of language acquisition in a native child, ... would be in general similar to the schema process of learning a second-language." She goes on to demonstrate why she assumes that the student internalizes a grammar from a corpus to which he is exposed in the classroom. Since Muskat-Tabakowska and Jakobovits agree that competence cannot be taught, it is fortunate that evidence exists that one's use of a non-native language may operate in a different manner.

Probably the most easily noticed distinction is the phenomena known collectively as "interference". Applied linguists, have long been concerned about interference and have offered various explanations to account for it. Transformationalists, on the other hand, seldom are too concerned with interference and often relegate it to a rather low level of importance as a relatively superficial problem.

That more may be involved in the problems of learning a second language than the mere conflict of two systems is evidenced by the findings of developmental psycholinguistics. For instance, whereas the "normal" child apparently can acquire one or more native languages with ease, among adults a new language is only rarely learned without an accent. Is only interference responsible or may there be a more fundamental biological cause? It has been demonstrated that a child who experiences aphasia has a good prognosis for full recovery. Among biological adults, however, recovery from aphasia is the exception rather than the rule (Lenneberg 1970:9ff). Obviously the adult aphasiac's faulty relearning of his native language cannot be attributed to interference. It appears instead, to result from the loss of the biological ability to acquire a language. Another difference is indicated by Lenneberg's evidence (1970:40ff) that language acquisition is relatively free of influence from I.Q. This situation contrasts with statements by Politzer (1960:15), Lambert (1963: 117) and others that an important factor in a student's ability to learn a foreign language successfully is his intelligence or

I.Q. Although still very debatable, evidence such as that above seems to indicate that second language learning may very well differ in some fundamental, biological way from first language acquisition.

Speaking about biological limitations on the structure of language rather than about second language learning, Noam Chomsky (1965:56), may have provided an answer to the nature of language learning.

> Notice that when we maintain that a system is not
> learnable by a language-acquisition device that
> mirrors human capacities, we do not imply that this
> system cannot be mastered by a human in some other way,
> if treated as a puzzle or intellectual exercise of
> some sort. The language-acquisition device is only
> one component of the total system of intellectual
> structures that can be applied to problem solving
> and concept formation; in other words, the faculté
> de langage is only one of the faculties of the mind.
> What we would expect, however, is that there should
> be a qualitative difference in the way an organism
> with a functional language-acquisition system will
> approach and deal with systems that are languagelike
> and others that are not.

There are pragmatic advantages to modifying one's claims to say that a given language program will teach a language-like behavior. Pedagogically it means that one must no longer claim to be attempting to teach competence. Rather it would be possible to revert to past methodologies and techniques which seek to instill a set of habit patterns which will -to the greatest extent possible- permit the student to exhibit a language behavior, i.e. performance, much like that of the native speaker. Bernard Spolsky reports in an unpublished paper (Spolsky 1968:10) on an experiment in which he compared the aural comprehension of the native speaker with that of a fluent non-native speaker. When presented with a

very clear tape recording their comprehension was about equal.
However, when increasing amounts of noise were added to the
tapes the non-native speaker's comprehension performance
decreased dramatically. Spolsky attributes the results to
the non-native speaker's inability to function with reduced
redundancy, an inability caused by insufficient knowledge of
the target language on which to base guesses as to what is
missing. Spolsky (1968:14) says that the non-native speaker
was exhibiting "language-like behavior" as contrasted with the
native's real language behavior. However, he also includes
under "language-like behavior" the parroting of patterns, the
failure to create new sentences and the speaking of a second
language with the grammar of the first.

Spolsky's last three items are often the major criticisms
generative grammarians direct toward audiolingual methods.
Such criticisms, however, overlook the fact that the student's
performance is much more important than is the nature of the
knowledge on which it is based. The applied linguist seeking
to describe a speaker/hearer's knowledge of his language, is
interested in that knowledge a speaker has which differentiates
him from a non-speaker of the language. Such a description
would by definition exclude linguistic universals.

According to the transformationalists even the most simple
utterance has a complex and abstract underlying representation.
If the deep structure representation of sentences is in fact a
language universal, then there is no need to teach it. On the
other hand, if it is not universal, the problems of trying to

teach a foreign deep structure can be greatly simplified by teaching a number of kernel sentences and a set of transformations for them (Ney 1971:63ff). The requisite "creativity" can be achieved by teaching embedding and sentence concatenation transformations. A structuralist's pedagogy does not deny the importance of transformational insights for constructing a program which will best exemplify the underlying regularities of the target language, particularly those which are not immediately noticeable on the surface.

In the final analysis the realistic aim of language teaching is probably as Muskat-Tabakowska (1969:44) suggests, not to teach the whole language, but rather to teach the student to produce the correct and appropriate utterances. The student cannot be guaranteed that he will be able to understand every- thing the native speaker may say to him, but he should be equipped to express his own thoughts adequately and when necessary be able to request a paraphrase or explanation.

Behavioral Objectives

It is beyond the scope of this paper to discuss the rationale and educational theory behind the technique of stating behavioral (or performance) objectives. A brief sketch of the mechanics and advantages of the technique is placed here for the benefit of those readers who are not familiar with them. Although this technique does not lack critics, its acceptance is widespread and well-documented.

The general description here of the use of behavioral
objectives is based largely on a series of manuals by W.
James Pophan and Eva L. Baker (1970). This technique is an
outgrowth from the research in programmed learning. It was
developed primarily as a means to help the teacher to state
his course objectives unambiguously and explicitly. The
technique alone does not insure that the "proper" goals will
be selected. However, when combined with a taxonomic system
developed by Benjamin S. Bloom for the labeling of learning
activities it helps the teacher to visualize just what kinds
of behavior he really is expecting from his students and to
reconcile that reality with his expressed intentions.

The advantages claimed for this technique are that it
forces the teacher to decide exactly what it is he wants to
measure, exactly on what the student will be evaluated.
Furthermore, these expectations are published for the benefit
of the students, colleagues, and administrators. Having
expressed his goals, classroom digressions which do not
contribute to them can be minimized, thus making instruction
more efficient. Disick (1971:4) proposes four parts to
performance objectives:

    (1) PURPOSE- the reason for engaging in the learning activity
    (2) STUDENT BEHAVIOR- what the student will do to show
                           accomplishment of the objective
    (3) CONDITIONS- what the test and testing conditions will be
    (4) CRITERION- the minimum level of acceptable performance

Statements of this nature have been used for "competency-
based instruction". Essentially this means that the student
who enrolls in a course will receive credit for it when he can

successfully demonstrate the performance objectives, regardless
of how long it takes him to master it: a few weeks or a few
semesters. While competency based instruction has much to
commend it, many institutions simply are not willing to deviate
from the traditional lockstep progression of the semester. In
such situations Pophan and Baker (1970:68) suggest that a
minimum level of student successes be established. This is an
added protection for the student to insure that his interests
are uppermost when objectives are being formulated.

Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives (1956) divides
all learning objectives into three fundamental categories.
They are the Cognitive Domain, the Affective Domain, and the
Psychomotor Domain. Each domain is subdivided and examined in
detail in separate manuals (however, the manual for the Psycho-
motor domain has not yet been published). The taxonomy is used
to indicate the kind of learning activity best suited for a
particular behavioral objective by identifying the kinds of
psychological processes it entails. The act of labeling one's
objectives forces the language teacher once again to make some
very basic judgments about the nature of language.

It is necessary to decide, for instance, if comprehension
and production involve the same processes or if they are
basically different. Proponents of audiolingual methods have
generally emphasized the learning of language as a "skill".
Consistent with this notion they have often proposed a motor
theory of comprehension in which the receiver constructs a
mental model of the neurophysical process for articulating an
acoustic pattern and then compares that pattern to his own

nearest equivalent pattern within his competence (Fry 1970:30).
The implication of this theory to the language teacher was that
the student's success depended upon how well he could become
proficient in production (particularly phonological production)
before he could become proficient in comprehension.

The transformational generative grammarians with their
primary interest in constructing a model for language copetence
have not been greatly concerned with problems of performance.
They have assumed that competence is the same for both the
speaker and the hearer. They too see comprehension as a
comparison of patterns or structures, but they envision it as
a cognitive process rather than a psychomotor process involving
the speech mechanisms (Chomsky 1965:140). Recently there has
been some evidence published that languages may be used for
communication while circumventing the speech and auditory
mechanisms completely (Geschwind 1972:76-83 and McNaughton in
Time 1972:57). Presently there appears to be no strong evidence
favoring either theory.

The language-like behavior which the modern language
student will attempt to learn seems to subsume well under two
of the three taxonomic domains. The comprehension of aural
and written materials and some aspects of production may entail
processes outlined in the Cognitive Domain (Bloom 1956:201ff).
This domain is divided among such areas as: knowledge, com-
prehension, and synthesis. Knowledge is defined as the recall
of specifics and universals, the recall of methods and processes,
or the recall of a pattern, a structure, or a setting.

Knowledge of specifics refers to the recall of specific and isolatable bits of information with the emphasis on symbols having concrete referents. There may also be knowledge of conventions such as the characteristic ways of treating and presenting ideas and phenomena.

Bloom defines comprehension as knowing what is being communicated without necessarily relating it to other material or seeing its fullest implications. Comprehension can be evidenced by translation in which a communication is paraphrased or rendered from one language of form of communication to another. A student may also indicate comprehension by interpretation of a communication or by explaining its content or by summarizing it.

Synthesis is the putting together of elements and parts so as to form a whole. This involves the process of working with pieces, parts, elements, etc. and arranging and combining them in such a way as to constitute a pattern or structure not clearly there before. Synthesis may also involve the production of a unique communication.

As was noted above, the make up of the Psychomotor Domain is not yet completed. However, Norris Sanders (1966:25) has proposed a taxonomy for it. In his treatment of it he identifies these characteristics of a skill:

(1) It is a physical, emotional, and/or intellectual process.
(2) It requires knowledge, but knowledge alone does not insure proficiency.
(3) It can be used for a variety of situations.
(4) It can be improved through practice.
(5) It is often made up of a number of subskills that can be identified and practiced separately.

Elementary language skills seem to subsume well under the psychomotor domain which is tentatively subdivided into five levels:

(1) Perception- The becoming aware of objectives, qualities, or relations by way of the sense organs
(2) Set- A preparatory adjustment for a particular kind of action or experience; may be mental, physical, or emotional
(3) Guided response- An overt behavioral act of an individual under the guidance of another individual with the emphasis upon the abilities that are motor components of more complex skills
(4) Mechanism- At this level the learner has achieved a certain confidence and degree of skill in the performance of an act; the habitual act is a part of his repertoire of possible responses to stimuli and the demands of situations where the response is apprpriate
(5) Complex overt response- An individual can perform a complex motor act efficiently and smoothly

The similarities of these five levels of motor skill development to the sequencing of drills in audiolingual programs is obvious.

There are criticisms of this method for outlining course objectives. Briefly they fall under one of two headings; the pragmatic and the humanistic. The latter are generally more subjective in nature and therefore more difficult to respond to satisfactorily. Such criticisms are that behavioral objectives "create trivia", "neglect abstract human values", and "lead to rigid, standardized education in which machines take precedence over people" (Disick 1971:7). Some teachers are offended by the demand to use observable behavioral objectives because it is too mechanistic (Kibler 1970:249).

The more pragmatic criticisms are of a more concrete nature and demand like responses. Foremost is the criticism that this

technique does not assure that the proper objectives will be selected. Some of the most trivial items can be most easily specified (Pophan and Baker 1970:44). Obviously this is meant to be a teacher's tool and not a substitute for competent teaching. Of more immediate relevance to language teachers is the question of whether the field has developed a sufficient body of observational data to prescribe the desired related behavior for students (Kibler 1970:253).

Francis Cartier (1968:24) lists three important limiting factors of applying the operation to language. In essence they amount to recognizing that linguistic theory has not yet prepared an unambiguous, explicit description for any language which would be suitable. Also, many of the criterion tests will still rely on the subjective judgments of pronunciation, fluency, and so on often made by people skilled in understanding an accented version of the language.

Review of the Related Literature

Having briefly outlined the development and rationale for stating performance objectives, attention is now directed to prior attempts to specify more detailed goals and behaviors for language learning programs. As was described above, applied linguists and language teachers gradually grew more aware of the need for very explicit objectives.

In 1961 Bruce Gaarder (1961:164), in a research report he did for the Modern Language Association, maintained that a basic one year college language course would as a minimum; teach a

standard dialect of the language, including all of the morphemes commonly used in speech; sufficient syntactic patterns for the active participation in the most common situations; and a vocabulary of about 1500-2500 items suitable for the student's needs. Gaarder was moving in the right direction and probably had specific items in mind for those languages with which he was familiar. However, the goals for a program must be derived in light of the specific target language. Teaching all of the inflections of a Romance language in a single year may be possible (if not feasible), but the same is not true of some other more highly inflected languages such as *Russian*.

Writing for the College Entrance Examination Board, Albert Markwardt (in the CEEB, 1963:19) suggested that language teaching could learn a great deal from the contemporary efforts at programming in other fields. He called for sequential and cumulative goals in terms of specific abilities or performance. Advancement would be based on performance and not on the length of time spent in class. Here, Markwardt had touched upon one of the basic components of stating instructional goals as behaviors.

A major milestone in the progression toward explicit objectives was the publication of Language Teaching Analysis by William Mackey in 1965. This book is an extremely thorough treatise about how to select the proper goals and materials to be taught. He outlines the considerations for determining one's priorities when a course is to be limited in some way. The questions which a course writer must keep in mind about

the purpose, level, and duration of a program are discussed in detail. Furthermore, the book includes both explicit formulae and general rules of thumb for selecting items. In short, Mackey's book is a useful tool for insuring that the proper goals are selected for a given program, conventional or otherwise.

By the end of the last decade language course designers had discovered performance/behavioral objectives and were beginning to apply that technique to certain specialized language programs. However, in the meanwhile a different approach to establishing one's goals became popular. Courses were directed toward certain proficiency levels in each of the four traditional language skills.*

Proficiency levels are often useful for explaining course objectives to laymen; however, there are shortcomings in using them for professional purposes. An example of the weaknesses is exemplified in a report to the Department of Defense by the Human Resources Research Organization (HumRRO) on efforts to establish a self-instructional Spanish course.

> The overall objective of the course, was to produce
> graduates with proficiency comparable to the "one"
> level on the DLI scale... Since precise, quantitative
> descriptions of these scale points do not exist, it
> was obviously not possible to specify with precision
> what terminal behavior the graduates of the AUTOSPAN
> course should exhibit.(Brown 1970:4).

----

*See appendix A for extracts from the proficiency levels established by the Defense Language Institute (DLI); the College Entrance Examination Board (CEEB) and the Modern Language Association (MLA).

The problem encountered with proficiency levels is basically the same as that seen above where nebulous and imprecise terms were used. Very subjective judgments are required for evaluating "ability to speak fluently...", "approximate native speech" and "Demonstrate, in hearing and speaking, control of the whole sound system." These efforts constitute a goal, but there is no mention of the conditions or criteria which would demonstrate satisfactory achievement of the goal. Many of the statements amount to tautologies and can be paraphrased as, "The student will demonstrate that he has learned what he has learned."

The technique of stating one's instructional goals as performance objectives was not designed specifically for language teaching. Nonetheless, it is well suited to the need and was quickly incorporated into some programs. The use of performance objectives was introduced into modern language programs via the growing popularity of innovative language training efforts such as self-instructional courses, individualized courses and programmed language learning. Particularly well received was the accompanying concept of competency-based instruction. Aamong the earliest teachers to adopt behavioral objective-like statements were teachers of English as a second language. Perren (1971:135ff) listed in his syllabus such specific goals as lists of consonants, clusters, vowels, and major distinctions of stress and intonation which the student should have mastered by the end of two years of study. There were similar listings for the syntactic and

vocabulary items. The student's proficiency was stated in terms of approximation to the native speaker.

Other isolated attempts to state behavioral objectives have been made within individual school systems as widespread as Philadelphia (Sandstrom 1970) and Colorado (Sandstedt 1971). In Washington, D.C. Clay Christensen (1968) exemplified the stating of syntactic patterns to be mastered by high school students. His purpose was much the same as that of this paper, but he was using the performance objectives to set up proficiency levels in terms of competency-based instruction.

The engineering of a programmed language course by its very nature requires a rigorous specification of the terminal behaviors as operational, observable, measurable entities (Valdman 1966:136ff). Unfortunately this task has not always been done satisfactorily either. Valdman (1966:138) cites the proposed behaviors of an audiolingual programmed Spanish course designed by Friedrich Morton. Morton, says Valdman, seeks, "Mastery of the Phonology... similar to that of a ten year old native speaker...". According to most developmental psycholinguists, the native speaker has pretty well mastered his language by age four or five. Thus it appears that Morton hopes to make his students phonological bilinguals. On the other hand, Ferdinand Marty (1962:132) specified goals for his programmed instruction and classified them under such headings as "structures the student must learn to handle without difficulty", "morphological items that must be learned", "optional liaisons that will be taught" and so on. He goes on

to specify a vocabulary of 1200 words to be taught and to require that the student acquire an oral fluency of 150 syllables per minute and an audio comprehension of 200 syllables per minute. He does not specify, however, what it means to handle a structure "without difficulty".

Performance objectives with an emphasis on competency-based instruction is an obvious technique for use with individualized instruction. Such courses may or may not be programmed. However, they are supposed to help optimize the use of the teacher's time by releasing him from routine and uncomplex matters which the student can understand with little personal explanation.

One of the better efforts at stating behavioral objectives for an individualized approach has been done by Florence Steiner (1970:579ff). She emphasizes that properly stated objectives should not use verbs such as "understand", "have an appreciation for", "have a feeling for", "know", and "believe". Rather they should read: "to write in Spanish", "to translate into written German", "to say in French", "read aloud", "to identify the tense", and "to conjugate in writing". She suggests as a format for stating an objective:

"Given _____, the student will _____ using _____."

In summary, two considerations have been presented as the rationale for this paper. One is a historical perspective showing how course objectives have been stated in the past. The changes in the manner of stating goals and objectives

were caused by changing needs. As developments were made in course programming and the individualization of instruction, greater explicitness was required. The second major factor was the fundamental change in linguistic theory. This caused an indepth reexamination of what constituted "knowledge" of a language and of how much of that knowledge a student could realistically be expected to learn. In line with that major change in theory, this writer presented a working definition of language and reconciled it with what would be taught in the classroom. The crux of the working definition is that in a course limited in time and resources no claim will be made for teaching the same kind of competence as that of the native speaker. Rather, a language-like behavior will be taught which will permit the learner to exhibit a language behavior (performance) as near to that of the native speaker as is feasible within the course limitations. This is the first step in the process of giving a general aim or goal for the program. The general aim is refined as more specific observable behaviors are proposed within the constraints of the overall goal. Equally important as those objectives which are stated are those which are rejected. Therefore, the set of objectives which follows will not include such ill-defined notions as language "mastery". Instead, there will be an itemized listing of performance objectives that when "mastered" -that is, when satisfactorily demonstrated, according to the criteria- will be indicative of the desired language-like ability.

Chapter II

Practical Application

Introduction

The technique for stating course objectives outlined
in Chapter I will be exemplified here in order to examine
its applicability to a more conventional language program.
No attempt is made to produce a complete set of objectives
within the confines of this paper. Rather a thoroughness
of example is the goal.

Many colleges and universities still include a foreign
language requirement within some or all their curriculums.
At Kansas State University, for instance, all students
currently pursuing the Bachelor of Arts Degree must complete
two years of one modern language or demonstrate the equivalent
competence (KSU Bulletin 1972-73:82). To fulfill this
requirement, the student with no prior foreign language
experience and who opts to study Spanish will take two elementary
courses which seek to teach the basic grammar of the language.
The third semester he will begin a rapid review of the
grammar, lasting about half the semester, and during the
latter half of the semester elementary literature will be
introduced to him. The final semester usually continues
with more literature and has almost no formal grammar training.

The very fact that a language requirement exists implies
that some minimum level of foreign language proficiency is
deemed important to a liberal education. The content and
sequencing of the course indicates that by the end of the

first half of the third term, the student should have learned the grammar of the language and the balance of the program can then be given over to reading and to gaining fluency by actually using the language.

Explicit goals have never been stated for the language programs at Kansas State. Faculty members involved with the program each have a notion of what they are striving for, but their objectives have never been formulated and verbalized in detail. The objectives listed herein may or may not be the most suitable. It is the procedure, however, which is under investigation, not this student's manipulation of it. The formulation of behavioral objectives is a tedious, slow procedure requiring the collective wisdom of all concerned.

This investigator's efforts were intended to conform to two sets of parameters. One was the working notion of language or language-like behavior arrived at in Chapter I. The second was a very subjective consensus of the program aims as expressed by the faculty, past examinations and the text books, past and present. The present text is Spanish 2400 A Programmed Review of Spanish Grammar by Katherine J. Hampares. The two preceding texts were Modern Spanish (an MLA project) edited by Dwight Bolinger, J. E. Cirute and H. H. Montero; and Contemporary Spanish by Robert Lado and Edward Blansitt. Great use was made of the grammatical descriptions in the Contrastive Series for Spanish and English: The Sounds of Spanish and English by Robert P. Stockwell and J. Donald Bowen and The Grammatical Structures of English and Spanish by Stockwell, Bowen, and John W. Martin. The phonological information used here conforms very closely

with their system. The latter work was used as a reference but required considerable modification to bring the data more nearly into line with subsequent developments in generative theory.

The broad linguistic aim of the program is to provide the student with a sufficient number of performance patterns so that he may converse with a native speaker of the language on any topic involving familiar vocabulary. Implicit in this goal is the student's ability to produce an indefinite number of novel, yet appropriate sentences. The student may not understand all that is said to him but he will have sufficient capability to request a paraphrase and/or explanation until he can understand what is said. The target language is a hypothetical, regularized Latin American dialect of Spanish.

To evaluate fairly the student's achievement of the above goal could only be done very problematically, if at all. Therefore, a more explicit set of observable objectives is formulated which when taken together, hopefully, will indicate accomplishment of the goal. Performance criteria will be stated for comprehension and production in each of the three structural "levels" of language. It is neither desirable nor really possible to isolate these levels when speaking of real language behavior. Therefore, a fourth criterion will be proposed for the use of integrated language skills.

The format of a performance objective makes it look very much like a test item. In a sense it is. Performance objectives tell the student exactly what he will have to do to complete the program satisfactorily. It is often considered poor teaching practice to teach for a specific test. On the other hand, a

properly written final examination which includes all and only those specific items which the student is to master is not only a test but a list of the course objectives as well. A performance objective, however, also states the purpose for learning the item and the minimum level of mastery acceptable.

Both language production and comprehension are desired. Little will be said in this paper about reading and writing proficiency. In general the student will be expected to be able to read and write anything he can say. Therefore, unless an oral or written response is specified, either is acceptable. At this level the student should be able to spell correctly those features of the language which are differentiated phonologically.

Phonology

The phonological system of a language comprises a relatively small, closed set of behaviors. Since the student is expected not to show creativity in sound production, the generally accepted audiolingual methods are suitable for demonstrating the teaching and testing of phonological comprehension and production. The third semester Spanish student should be able to understand spoken Spanish at the rate of 175 syllables per minute. This arbitrary figure is the average speaking rate derived from several speech samples taken from the most advanced laboratory tape lessons. All performance items which incorporate aural comprehension should approximate this speech rate.

As a minimum the third semester student will be able to distinguish all the segmental phonemes of Spanish in all their

positional variants. He will also be able to differentiate the two stress phonemes and recognize the three terminal junctures. It is necessary to test only those phonemes and allophones which may cause difficulty to English speakers. The following sounds will be tested:

[e] and [ey]
[-r-] and [-rr-]
[-h-] and [-g-]

Given orally, a series of paired sentences with phonologically minimal pairs, the student will select the second sentence from among four printed choices with 95% accuracy.

Ex. (1) La palabra es 'lee'.
La palabra es 'ley'.

(a) La palabra es 'leí'.
(b) La palabra es 'ley'.
(c) La palabra es 'lea'.
(d) La palabra es 'lee'.

(2) Quiero decir 'pero'.
Quiero decir 'perro'.

(a) Quiero decir 'perro'.
(b) Quiero decir 'pero'.
(c) Quiero decir 'Pedro'.
(d) Quiero decir 'pelo'.

(3) Alguien dijo 'ajo'.
Alguien dijo 'hago'.

(a) Alguien dijo 'ajo'.
(b) Alguien dijo 'hado'.
(c) Alguien dijo 'hato'.
(d) Alguien dijo 'hago'.

In the interest of brevity this paper will give only one example for each specific variation within an item. Ideally there would be several examples of each of the above sound contrasts, requiring the student to identify it in the various environments. The criterion then would specify satisfactory performance as a percentage of correct responses.

The nature of the Spanish phonological system is such that aural comprehension is a source of few problems for the speaker of English. On the other hand, oral production may pose some serious problems. Failure to select the proper allophonic variant for certain Spanish phonemes can lead to misunderstanding. The third semester student will be able to produced all of the phonemes of Spanish and will supply the appropriate allophones for the following phonemes:

/d/ ⟶ [d] initially; after [n,l]
          [đ] elsewhere internally; finally

/b/ ⟶ [b] initially; after [m,l]
          [b�б] elsewhere

/g/ ⟶ [g] initially; after [n]
          [ǥ] elsewhere

/r/ ⟶ [r̃] initially; after [n,l,s]; optional finally
          [r] elsewhere; optional finally (free variation)

/-rr-/ ⟶ [r̃] This is considered a double consonant which only occurs word medially.

/t/ ⟶ [t] This sound is fairly uniform throughout Spanish and should not be pronounced as the intervocalic flap as in English ['bʌdɚ] or as the glottal catch before a syllabic nasal or liquid ['bʌt̚ʔn].

/e/ ⟶ [e] The distribution for these allophones is
          [ɛ] not clear. The principal problem for English Speakers is substituting [ey] for [e].

/V̆/ ⟶̸ [ə] Unstressed vowels are not reduced to schwa in Spanish.

Given a series of written sentences which when said aloud will require production of the desired allophones, the student will read the sentence and then -without looking at it- he will repeat the sentence supplying the proper allophone with a 95% accuracy.

Ex. (1) Dónde está la ciudad? [dónde·stálasÿudad]

(2) Ambos viøven en la Habana. [ámbos bíbenla:bána]

(3) Guillermo, riégate los garbanzos. [ɣiyέrmo r̃iégatelosgarbánsos]

(4) Romero quería verla ayer. [r̃omέro kεríabεrla+ayέr]

(5) Catalina es gata. [katalína+εsgáta]

(6) El rey le lee la ley. [εlr̃éy+lele:laley]

(7) La amiga es de La Habana. [la·míɣa+εsdela·bána]

Morphology and Syntax

The morphological and syntactic systems of a language
are much more difficult to describe adequately, even for
the limited purposes here. Neither is a closed set as is
the phonology. Furthermore, one of the course objectives
is to enable the student to produce novel yet appropriate
utterances when a new situation arises. This creativity
will exist primarily in the manipulation of the syntax.
The foreign speaker of a language is not normally expected
to coin new words and phrases. Creativity is difficult to
evaluate objectively. On the other hand, the student's mastery
of certain basic structures and the conjoining of them is not
as difficult to ascertain.

For the sake of simplicity, the morphological system of
Spanish will be divided into two classes along the lines
suggested for English by Bolinger (1968:48ff). One class,
the source morphemes, consists of the content lexical items
-nouns, verbs, adjectives, and certain adverbs- and the
derivational affixes. This class is approximately the same
as Chomsky's Complex Symbols (Chomsky 1965:82ff). The
second group, system morphemes, consists of the relatively
small closed sets of inflectional suffixes and function words.

The system morphemes will be considered as part of the syntax
and will be included with the basic syntactic patterns. The
source morphemes then will be considered as fillers for
specific slots within the patterns.

No attempt will be made in this paper to specify a minimum
vocabulary which the student should know upon completion of the
program. There are several word lists available for language
teachers. The vocabulary will vary from textbook to textbook
and should vary from program to program depending upon the needs
of the student. Hampares (1971:xvi-xviii) reproduces a modified
version of the Allen-Harper vocabulary list. It is supposed to
list words which, according to Allen and Harper, 80% of all
students completing one year of Spanish in the United States
have been exposed to. The list excludes months, days of the
week, numbers, personal pronouns, possessive adjectives, common
prepositions, conjunctions, and demonstratives. Charles Ogden
(1968) discusses the technique of determining a basic vocabulary
and Mackey's book (1965) treats the subject also. The latter
specifically points out some of the dangers of using straight
frequency counts as determiners (Mackey 1965:162ff).

There are a few derivational affixes which the third
semester student should recognize. Given a list of words with
glosses and the same word plus a derivational affix the student
will explain the change in English.

```
hablar  'to speak'............hablador
social  'social'..............socialismo; socialista
libro 'book'..................librería
fácil 'easy'..................facilidad; facilitar;
                                facilitación
vaso '(a) glass'..............vasito
cuchara 'table spoon'.........cucharilla
hombre 'man'..................hombrón
```

The student should form the habit of looking for shorter words contained in longer ones. Given a list of compound words, the student will identify the constituent words.

pasatiempo	parasol	cuentagotas	sacamuelas
salvavida	tocadisco	lavamanos	rompecabezas
ojinegro	rascacielos	plumafuente	supermercado

The student will demonstrate how to formulate and use certain basic, kernel sentences. He must also be able to expand constituents within the kernel sentences and to conjoin two or more patterns. Finally he must be able to apply certain fundamental transformations to the appropriate patterns.

Each kernel sentence is an active, declarative sentence in "normal" word order and contains a single finite verb. Given a model sentence for each basic type, the student will produce (an indefinite number) of like sentences observing proper grammatical agreements.

Type I.a.	NP:Subj.	VP-ser	ADJ:Pred NP:Pred ADV	
Models:	El hombre	es	profesor.	
	La mujer	es	vieja.	
	La clase	es	aquí.	
b:	NP:Subj.	VP-estar	ADJ:Pred ADV	
Models:	Juan	está	triste.	
	La clase	está	aquí.	
Type II.	NP:Subj.	VP_i	(ADV)	
Models:	El niño	habla.		
	El niño	habla	bien.	
Type III:	NP:Subj.	VP_t	NP:D.O.	(ADV)
Models:	La esposa	busca	el perro.	
	El perro	muerde	a la niña.	
Type IV:	NP:Subj.	VP_t	NP:D.O.	NP:I.O.
Model:	El hijo	da	el libro	a Juan.

After the student has demonstrated his ability to produce the four basic sentence types in the minimal form they are then available for use as frames for expansions and transformations. First, however, the student's mastery of some basic morphological processes will be determined.

Subject-verb agreement:

Given any kernel sentence as a frame, the student will substitute an appropriate Subject Pronoun for the NP:Subj. maintaining number and person agreement with the predicate. He will maintain 95% accuracy.

```
Ex. (1)   (A hungry boy says:)   "_____ tengo hambre."
    (2)   (You tell your friend:)   "_____ estás tarde."
    (3)   (You tell a policeman:)   "_____ está loco."
    (4)   Un hombre llegó a la casa.
    (5)   La niña lame un helado.
    (6)   (You and I are running.)   "_____ vamos a matarnos."
    (7)   (You tell your friends:)   "_____ van a tomarla.*
    (8)   María y Catalina venden los tacos.
    (9)   Juan y María viven aquí.
   (10)   Juan y José leen el libro a María jesú.
```

Given a kernel sentence with an infinitive verb in the VP slot and the tense cued, the student will be able to supply any of the following inflections which might be requested observing grammatical agreements and stem changes.

Present indicative:

Regular -ar		Regular -er		Regular -ir	
-o	-amos	-o	-emos	-o	-imos
-as	-áis	-es	-éis	-es	-ís
-a	-an	-e	-en	-e	-en

---

* 'vosotros forms will be taught for recognition only

Irregular present tense verbs:

"Yo" form only: caber, caer, dar, hacer, poner, saber, salir,
                traer, valer, ver, and V_{base} + -ecer, -ducir.

All forms: ir, tener, poder, venir, oir, decir, ser, estar

Given a series of Spanish sentences in the present tense, the student will demonstrate his knowledge of the semantic range of the present tense by giving an equivalent English sentence (including the idiomatic use of the present as "near future" and "familiar commands").

Ex. (1) Juan come la ensalada.
    (2) María lava los platos.
    (3) Yo voy mañana.
    (4) ¡Oye Juanita!

Given a series of sentences with an infinitive in the VP slot, the student will give the proper irregular "familiar command" form for the following verbs: dar, venir, decir, hacer, poner, saler, valer, saber, ver, tener.

Ex. (1) ¡ venir acá Joselito!   Response: ¡Ven acá!

    (2) ¡ decir que pasó!   ¡Di que pasó!

Imperfect tense:

Regular -ar		Regular -er and -ir		Irregular
-aba	-ábamos	-ía	-íamos	ir
-abas	-abais	-ías	-íais	ser
-aba	-aban	-ía	-ían	ver

Preterite tense:

Regular -ar		Regular -er and -ir	
-é	-amos	-í	-imos
-aste	-asteis	-iste	-isteis
-ó	-aron	-ió	-ieron

Irregular preterite: andar, caber, conducir, dar, decir, estar, hacer, haber, ir, poder, poner, querer, saber, ser, tener, traer, venir, V_{base}-ducir, and stem changing -ir verbs in which -i- $\longrightarrow$ -u- in 3rd.p.

Given a series of Spanish sentences, the student will demonstrate knowledge of the general semantic distinction between the preterite and imperfect tenses by selecting the appropriate tense for sentences including the following temporal phrases:

Preterite (exact past): una vez, dos veces, en seguida, de repente, hasta las dos

Imperfect (indefinite past): muchas veces, frecuentemente, siempre, generalmente

Given five pairs of Spanish sentences using the following verbs in the preterite and imperfect, the student will demonstrate knowledge of their special use in the preterite by giving English equivalents for each sentence.

Special preterite: poner, poder, saber, querer, conocer

Ex. Juan conocía a Maria.	Response:	Juan knew María.
Juan conoció a Maria.		Juan met María.
Sabía la respuesta.		He knew the answer.
Supo la respuesta.		He learned the answer.

Future tense:

Regular, all forms		Irregular stems: caber, decir, hacer
(infinitive +)-é	-emos	poder, poner, querer
-ás	-éis	saber, salir, tener
-á	-án	valer, venir

Conditional tense:

Regular, all forms		Irregular: (Same as for future
(infinitive +)-ía	-íamos	tense and uses the
-ías	-íais	same stem)
-ía	-ían	

Given a series of paired Spanish sentences using the future and conditional tenses, the student will give two English equivalents for each sentence including one of probability.

Present progressive:
(estar+ present participle)

Regular -ar	Regular -er and -ir
-ando	-iendo

Irregular present participle: ir, decir, poder, venir

Given a series of Spanish sentences in the present progressive tense, the student will give an approximate English equivalent.

Ex. Juan está cantando.   Response: Juan is singing.

Perfect tense construction:
(haber + Past participle)

Regular past participle:	-ar	-er and -ir
	-ado	-ido

Irregular past participle: abrir, cubrir, decir, escribir, hacer, poner, morir, rober, soler, saler, ver, volver, ir

Given a series of Spanish sentences containing the perfect tense construction, the student will demonstrate knowledge of its meaning by giving an appropriate English equivalent.

Ex. María ha salido.   Response: María has left.

The student will be able to combine the perfect construction with: present tense, imperfect, preterite, future, and conditional tenses. Given a model sentence the student will demonstrate his ability to manipulate the tense inflections by changing the finite verb in a series of sentences to the same form as in the model.

The student shall demonstrate knowledge of the following verbal expressions by giving English equivalents

(1) Haber (hay, había, habrá, habría) + NP "There is/are + NP"
(2) Haber + que + infinitive "It is necessary to_____"
(3) Hace + time expression + que + VP:present tense
(4) Hacía + time expression + que + VP:imperfect tense
(5) Hace mal tiempo hoy.

Ex. Hay dos libros aquí.   Response: There are two books here.
     Hay que trabajar.   One should work.
     Hace dos años que vivo ahí.   I have lived there for
                                          two years.

     Hací tres meses que vivía ahí.   I lived there three months.
     Hace mal tiempo hoy.   The weather is bad todday.

SER and ESTAR:

One of the more difficult problems for English speakers to master in Spanish is the distribution of <u>ser</u> and <u>estar</u>. There are a few constructions in which only <u>ser</u> is used such as with a predicate noun, adjectives of nationality or geographic origin, time expressions, material of construction, possession, and some "impersonal" expressions. On the other hand, nearly any place that <u>estar</u> can be used, <u>ser</u> could also be used with a corresponding change in meaning. Some of these distinctions are very subtle.

Given a series of Spanish Type I.a. sentences with the verb omitted, the student will supply the appropriate Spanish equivalent of the English "to be".

```
Ex. (1)  El hombre _____ profesor.
    (2)  Las mujeres _____ secretarias.
    (3)  Juan _____ mexicano.
    (4)  Cuando llegaron _____ las dos.
    (5)  _____ lástima.
    (6)  La silla _____ de madero.
    (7)  El libro _____ de Juan.
```

<u>Ser</u> is used to indicate a permanent characteristic; the norm; part of the subject's essence of being; a general classifying property. Conversely <u>estar</u> is used to indicate a temporary state or status of being; a variant from the norm.

Given a pair of Spanish sentences differing only by the use of <u>ser</u> or <u>estar</u> as the copulative, the student will explain in English the semantic difference signaled by the verb.

```
With ADJ:Pred.:
Ex. (1)  Juan es loco.     (He is a madman.)
         Juan está loco.   (He is -momentarily- insane.)
    (2)  Soy listo.    (I am clever.)
         Estoy listo.  (I am ready.)
    (3)  EL orador es aburrido.    (He is boring.)
         El orador está aburrido.  (He is bored.)
```

(4) La señorita es bonita. (She is a beautiful girl.)
La señorita está bonita. (The girl looks beautiful.)

(5) Ella es buena. (She is a good person.)
Ella está buena. (She is in good health.)

(6) Es cierto. (a true fact; an unargueable truth)
Está cierto. (a personal opinion of what is fact)

(7) Mi coche es nuevo. (new to me; a different one)
Mi coche está nuevo. (a brand new one; first owner)

With ADV and prepositional phrases of location estar is usually used. Particularly when the NP:Subj. is conceived of merely as a physical item or structure. However, ser is sometimes used in this construction to indicate a very subtle change from emphasis on the object to emphasis on its essence as an event.

Ex. (1) La casa es en Kansas. (The 'home' is in Kansas.)
La casa está en Kansas. (The house is in Kansas.)

(2) Aquí es la clase. (The class session is being conducted here.)
Aquí está la clase. (This is where the class is.)

Negation:

Given an example of any kernel sentence pattern, the student will properly negate it including the negative variant for all "dummy" slot fillers where appropriate.

Ex. (1) El hombre es profesor.
(2) La mujer busca a María.
(3) La mujer siempre busca a alguien.
(4) Aún estudio en México.
(5) Ella quiere comer algo.
(6) También necesito alguna revista.

Yes/No Interrogatives:

Given any sentence pattern, the student will transform it into a Yes/No question.

Ex. (1) El muchacho corre bien.
(2) María quiere la ropa.
(3) Ella no lee el libro al niño.

Resp. (1) ¿Corre bien el muchacho?
(2) ¿Quiere María la ropa?
(3) ¿No lee ella el libro al niño?

Given any sentence pattern, the student will supply the appropriate Yes/No (¿No?/¿Verdad?) tag question.

Ex. (1) Juan escucha bien. (¿No?)
    (2) María nunca escucha. (¿Verdad?)

Noun Phrase expansions:

Pluralization:

Given any noun, the student will pluralize it using the proper plural allomorph.

Ex. (1) Juan grita a la <u>mujer</u>. (... mujeres.)
    (2) No habló al <u>hombre</u>. (... hombres.)
    (3) Estudian del <u>país</u>. (... paises.)
    (4) Hablamos de la <u>crisis</u>. (... crisis.)

Determiners: definite article

Given a series of sentences with blanks preceding the nouns or nominals, the student will (1) decide whether an article is appropriate, with 80% accuracy, and (2) supply an article which agrees in number and gender with the noun.

Ex. (1) ____ hombres vienen hoy. (los)
    (2) María escribió ____ carta. (la)
    (3) Ella habla ____ español bien. (no art.)
    (4) Llegan a ____ dos de la mañana. (las)
    (5) ____ señor Quijote vive aquí. (El)
    (6) Llegó ____ jueves ____ 13 de ____ agosto 1953. (el, Ø, Ø)
    (7) Nació ____ viernes por la tarde. (el)
    (8) Comen ____ almuerzo. (el)
    (9) ____ revistas son caras. (Las)
    (10) ____ Argentina es país. (La)
    (11) Ramón vivía en ____ Habana. (la)
    (12) ____ policía es muy guapo. (El)
    (13) ____ plátanos cuestan $1.50 ____ libre. (Ø, el)
    (14) Se me olvidó ____ abrigo. (el).
    (15) Juan está en ____ casa. (Ø)
    (16) Va a ____ casa. (Ø)
    (17) ____ estudiar sigue bien. (El)
    (18) ____ actor practicaba ____ entrada. (El, la)

Determiners: demonstratives

Given a sentence containing an article, the student will replace it with a demonstrative using a cued stem and properly inflect it for gender and number.

Ex. (1) <u>Los</u> hombres corrían al patio.   (aquello, este)
     (2) <u>El</u> libro no vale la lena.   (ese)

Given a series of sentences differing only in the demonstrative determiner used, the student will explain the difference in meaning, in English.

Ex. (1) Hablaron a este hombre.
         Hablaron a ese hombre.
         Hablaron a aquel hombre.

Determiners: possessive*

Given a sentence containing a determiner, the student will replace it with a possessive determiner observing proper grammatical agreement.

Ex. (1) Juan lee el libro. (his)
     (2) María busca esa revista. (your)
     (3) Los gatos están aquí. (my)

Given a sentence, the student will insert one or more cued limiting adjectives into the appropriate position and properly inflect them when necessary.

Ex. (1) Todos los hombres corren bien. (tres)
     (2) Esas mujeres hablan bastante. (primero, cuatro)
     (3) Ana habla a dos mujeres. (otro)
     (4) La niña quiere dos gatos. (más)

Given a sentence containing the predeterminer "todo", the student will explain its semantic function, in English.

Ex. (1) Todo el día trabajo aquí.   (all day long)
     (2) Todos los días trabajo aquí. (every day)

----

*The term possessive adjective which traditional grammar uses for these forms will be used elsewhere in this paper for an authentic possessive adjective which enters an NP as an embedded predicate adjective. The possessive described here belongs to the same position class as the definite article and functions as such.

Attributive Adjectives:

Given any basic sentence type and one or more Type I.a. sentences having an ADJ:Pred. and a NP from the first (matrix) sentence as its NP:Subj., the student will form a single sentence placing the embedded predicate adjective in the proper attributive position and observing proper agreements.

     Ex. (1) El profesor nunca sale temprano.
              El profesor es viejo.

   Response: El profesor viejo nunca sale temprano.

       (2) Los hijos hacen una barca.
           La barca es de madera.

       (3) Los estudiantes viven en aquel edificio.
           Los estudiantes son ingleses.
           El edificio es de ladrillo.

       (4) Quieres un abrigo y un sombrero.
           Un abrigo es azul.
           Un sombrero es azul.

       (5) María lavó las ventanas y el piso.
           Las ventanas eran sucias.
           El piso era sucio.

       (6) La hija no está.
           La hija es mía.

Given a set of sentences similar to the above, but containing certain common adjectives which "appear" to violate the normal attributive adjective position rule, the student will place them properly in the matrix sentence.

     Ex. (1) Los niños juegan en la nieve.
              Nieve es blanca.

   Response: Los niños juegan en la blanca nieve.

       (2) Se ve la sangre en el piso.
           Sangre es roja.

       (3) Manuel leía de la Biblia.
           La Biblia es santa.

Given matched pairs of sentences containing attributive adjectives which show some semantic contrasts based on the positioning before or after the noun head, the student will

describe in English the distinction in meaning.

Ex. (1) El labrador tenía una linda hija.
    El labrador tenía una hija linda.

Response: The first sentence means he has a daughter who is
      a pretty girl. The second means he has a pretty
      daughter and implies that he he has others who are
      not pretty.

 (2) La buena anciana sonrió.
    La anciana buena sonrió.

 (3) El pobre estudiante graduado sudaba.
    El estudiante graduado pobre sudaba.

 (4) Saludé al viejo profesor.
    Saludé al profesor viejo.

 (5) El psicólogo buscaba a cualquier hombre.
    El psicólogo buscaba a un hombre qualquiera.

 (6) El hombre conoció a una gran señora.
    El hombre conoció a una señora grande.

 (7) El mismo actor la besó.
    El actor mismo la besó.

Given a series of sentences with blanks before a noun, the

student will supply the proper form of a cued adjective.

Ex. (1) _____ alumnos viven aquí. (alguno)
 (2) El _____ estudiante llegó ayer. (primero)
 (3) Ese _____ hombre es _____ amigo mío. (grande, bueno)
 (4) Llegaron a la iglesia de _____ Tomás. (Santo)
 (5) _____ Cristóbol ayudó al niño. (Santo)
 (6) Necesita _____ dólares. (ciento)
 (7) El libro cuesta _____ pesos. (cuatro)
 (8) _____ profesoras están en la clase. (ninguno)
 (9) No pudo hallar el tomo _____. (tercero)

Noun Head Deletion:

Given a context sentence followed by a related sentence with

an NP omitted, the student will fill in the blank with the

appropriate NP, deleting the noun head.

Ex. (1) La casa nueva es muy bonita.
    _____ es muy bonita.

Response: La nueva es muy bonita.

 (2) Se quemaban los buenos libros.
    Solamente destruían _____.

 (3) Hablé con la hija mía.
    _____ me escuchó.

(4) Hay <u>una camisa blanca</u> y hay otra <u>camisa azul</u>.
     ¿Quieres _____ o _____?
     _____ por favor.
(5) Voy a leer <u>este libro</u>.
     Me gusta _____.
(6) <u>Esa cosa</u> es muy importante.
     _____ me interesa mucho.

Given a series of sentences with a NP omitted, the student will fill the blank with the appropriate nominalized neuter form of the cued adjective.

Ex. (1) _____ de esto es el precio. (malo.
     Response: Lo malo de esto es el precio.
    (2) Hay que buscar _____.
    (3) _____ dijo ayer. (mismo)
    (4) Me gusta _____. (bello)

<u>Pronominalization:</u>

Object pronouns:	Direct Object		Indirect Object	
	me	nos	me	nos
	te	vos	te	vos
	la, lo	las, los	le	les

Given any basic sentence, the student will substitute the appropriate pronoun form for all of the NP's in the sentence, changing <u>le(s)</u> to <u>se</u> where necessary and adding a clarifying phrase after <u>le(s)</u>.

Ex. (1) El profesor vendió su libro al estudiante.
     Response: El se lo vendió al estudiante.
    (2) La maestra quiere narrar el cuento a los niños.
    (3) Juan compró la camisa para ella.
    (4) Mi compañero me dió la revista.
    (5) Alguien está fumando cigarros.
    (6) ¡Pepito! Tira la pelota a mamá.

Given a sentence, the student will paraphrase it using the cued verb requiring the special use of the indirect object.

Ex. (1) Tengo afición para el coche nuevo. (gustar)
     Response: Me gusta el coche nuevo.
    (2) Ellos tienen todavía un pedazo. (quedar)

        (3) La esposa necesita dos dólares más. (faltar)
        (4) Juan tiene dinero que alguien querría. (pedir)

Reflexive pronoun:

Given one or more context sentences, the student will
produce a single paraphrase using the reflexive construction.
    Ex. (1) Juan habla a Miguel. Miguel habla a Juan.
    Response: Juan y Miguel se hablan.
        (2) Yo te hablo. Tú me hablas.

Given a sentence with a transitive verb and an object, the
student will change the object as indicated by a cue and will
supply the reflexive pronoun where necessary.
    Ex. (1) María lava los platos. (herself; her face)
    Response: María se lava la cara.
        (2) El nombre del niño es Juanito. (llamarse)
        (3) La señorita va a la silla. (sits down)
        (4) Los niños van a la recámara. (go to bed)
        (5) El ya está durmiendo. (has gone to sleep)

Given a sentence using _ponerse_ + adjective, the student
will paraphrase it using a verbal form of the adjective.
    Ex. (1) El viejo se ponía enojado.
    Response: El viejo se enojaba.
        (2) Cada día el joven se pone más enfermo.
        (3) La novia se ponía alegre.
        (4) La madre se ponía triste.

Impersonal Reflexive/"Passive":

Given one or more context sentences, the student will
paraphrase them as a single sentence using the impersonal
"you", _se_ construction (or false passive).
    Ex. (1) Todo el mundo dice que es rico.
    Response: Se dice que es rico.
        (2) Aquí todo el mundo habla español.
        (3) Ellos organizaron los juegos.
        (4) Algo ensució las paredes.
        (5) Hablas mucho aquí. Hablan mucho aquí.

Given a context sentence, the student will formulate a
new sentence using the cued verb requiring special use for
accidental happenings.

    Ex. (1) Un día salí sin abrigo. (olvidarse)

    Response: Un día se me olvidó el abrigo.

       (2) Juan no pudo hallar su libro de texto. (perderse)

       (3) La cara me causó pensar en ella. (acordarse)

Prepositions:

Given a list of Spanish prepositions and a series of
sentences with prepositions omitted, the student will decide
if a preposition is needed and then will supply the proper
preposition where appropriate.

    Given: de, a, en, con, por, para, tras, sin

    Ex. (1) Tiene un reloj nuevo ____ oro.

       (2) Juan es ____ puertorriqueño.

       (3) Hay un jugador ____ España.

       (4) Este libro es ____ ella.

       (5) Allí va la chica ____ pelo negro.

       (6) María lo veía cerca ____ la fuente.

       (7) El gato corre ____ el ratoncito.

       (8) Voy ____ casa ____ descansar.

       (9) La niña se sentía ____ el rincón.

    (10) María vió ____ Juan.

    (11) La tienda está ____ la calle ocho.

    (12) La madre tenía ____ hijo.

    (13) La novela fue escrita ____ Cervantes.

    (14) Ellos la enviaron ____ la comida.

    (15) Llegó ayer ____ la mañana.

    (16) ____ eso necesito ayuda.

    (17) Estas cosas son ____ el ejército.

    (18) Juan lo necesita ____ las once.

    (19) Llegaré ____ el lunes.

    (20) María anda ____ juan.

    (21) El hijo soñó ____ la joven.

    (22) Salgo ____ la ciudad.

    (23) Juan Y María van ____ casarse.

    (24) Juan se casa ____ María.

    (25) No quiere ____ nadie.

Given a series of sentences which differ only in the preposition following the verb, the student will describe in English the difference in meaning.

Ex. (1) Acabo de leer el libro.
Acabo por leer el libro.
(2) Juan estaba por dejarla.
Juan estaba para dejarla.
(3) La foto está delante del vaso.
La foto está detrás del vaso.
(4) Querría escribirla antes de salir.
Querría escribirla despúes de salir.

Adverbs:

Given a series of sentences, the student will place an appropriate adverb or adverbial in the sentence, as cued in English.

Of time:
Ex. (1) El compañero no está. (on time)
(2) Voy a salir. (tomorrow)
(3) Hay que leerlo. (right now)
(4) Se lo dió a la señorita. (yesterday)
(5) El gato cazaba las criaturas. (at night)

Of order:
Ex. (1) Vamos a lavarnos. (afterwards)
(2) No podíamos hacerlo. (before)
(3) El profesor llega a la estación. (later)

Of place:
Ex. (1) Vivía en México. (near Chapultapec Park 'Bosque')
(2) ¿Conoces a alguien en México? (there)
(3) Está. (here)
(4) Sí, el coche está. (in the street)
(5) Sí, la criada está. (outside)

Of direction:
Ex. (1) ¡Ven! (here)
(2) Todos llegan. (at the gate)
(3) Pasen señores. (through here/there)

Of manner:
Ex. (1) Habla de eso? (well)
(2) Pasó la noche. (thus)
(3) Escribe la lengua. (perfectly)
(4) Lo hizo. (clearly, rapidly and easily)
(5) Lo hice tres veces. (only)
(6) Es tarde. (very)

Of extent:

Ex. (1) El niño no habla. (much)
    (2) La niña habla. (too much)
    (3) La joven come el pollo. (hardly)
    (4) Juan podrá acabar la tarea. (at least)
    (5) Por favor señor, quiero gachas. (more)

Information Question Words:

Given a sentence in Spanish with one constituent under-lined, the student shall formulate a question from the sentence using the appropriate question word(s) required to elicit the underlined information.

Ex. (1) El profesor pidió <u>los papeles</u> a los estudiantes.

Response: ¿Qué pidió el profesor a los estudiantes?

    (2) <u>El profesor</u> pidió los papeles a los estudiantes.
    (3) El profesor pidió los papeles <u>a los estudiantes</u>.
    (4) María venda flores <u>rojas</u> en el mercado.
    (5) María vende flores rojas <u>en el mercado</u>.
    (6) Las flores son <u>$1.00 la docena</u>.
    (7) Ella las vende <u>el lunes</u>.
    (8) Ellas son <u>muy bonitas</u>.
    (9) Son las flores <u>de María</u>.
    (10) Manuel hace viaje <u>a la capital</u> para verlas.
    (11) El viaja <u>para verlas</u>.
    (12) No se puede decir <u>si esto o eso</u> sea más grande.

Conjunctions:

Co-ordinating:

Given two or more basic sentences, the student will combine them using an appropriate co-ordinating conjunction. They will delete the duplications of constituents common to all the sentences and make any changes of grammatical agreement necessary and select the appropriate allomorphs.

Ex. (1) Juan se fue ayer. María se fue ayer.

Response: Juan y María se fueron ayer.

    (2) El hombre es profesor. El hombre es director de
         la escuela.
    (3) Ella gritó al verlos. Ella rió al verlos.

(4) Las rosas rojas están en el vaso. La rosa blanca
    está en el vaso.
(5) El pintaba la pared. Ella lavaba las ventanas.
(6) Busca el perro. No lo halla.
(7) La casa no es amarilla. No es azul.
(8) ¿Quiere la falda azul? ¿Quiere la falda verde?
(9) El baile comienza a las nueve en punto. Comienza a
    las nueve y media en punto.
(10) María no está enferma. María está cansada.
(11) Juan es guapo. Juan es inteligente.

Comparison conjunctions:

Given a pair of sentences containing comparable adjectival
or adverbial phrases, the student will formulate a complex
sentence using the appropriate comparison conjunctions.

Ex. (1) Ella es guapa. Su hermana es guapa.

Response: Ella es tan guapa como su hermana.

(2) Juan quiere una pintura bella. María tiene una
    pintura bella.
(3) Leo despacio. Lees despacio.
(4) Juan tiene muchos libros. María tiene muchos libros.
(5) Le faltan tres sillas (a Juan). Le faltan tres
    sillas (a María).
(6) El tiene unos libros. María tiene un libro.
(7) Mi coche anda muy rápido. El suyo es despacio.
(8) Tengo poco dinero. Tienes mucho dinero.
(9) Tengo unos libros. Lees un libro.
(10) Me compro muchas corbatas. El tiene pocas corbatas.
(11) Escribo muy bien. El no escribe bien.
(12) Escribo muy bien. Cualquier personas no escriben bien.

Given a complex sentence containing an expression of
comparison, the student will formulate an absolute superlative
expression from it.

Ex. (1) Juan escribe mejor que cualquier personas.

Response: Juan escribe lo mejor.

(2) La camisa de María es más bella que cualquier otra.
(3) Recibió una marca peor que la de cualquier otro alumno.

Subordinating conjunctions:

Learning the most common subordinating transformations avails the student of another option for use in creating novel sentences. It provides an alternate method for modifying nouns with subordinate clauses. Subordinate clauses are also the origin of all subjunctive sentences which permits the student another source for expressing subtle differences of meaning. The subjunctive in turn is the source for most commands.

Present subjunctive: (first person singular present indicative
         stem + present subjunctive inflection)

Regular -ar		Regular -er and -ir	
-e	-emos	-a	-amos
-es	-éis	-as	-áis
-e	-en	-a	-an

Past subjunctive: (third person plural preterite indicative
         stem + past subjunctive inflection)

All verbs		*Alternate form	
-ra	-ramos	-se	-semos
-ras	-rais	-ses	-seis
-ra	-ran	-se	-sen

Given a matrix (independent clause) sentence with a dummy NP filler and a subordinate (dependent clause) sentence, the student will embed the latter within the matrix sentence using the subjunctive mood when appropriate after expressions of emotion, uncertainty, or a desire to influence the action. Proper sequencing of tenses will be observed.

    Ex. (1) Dudo algo. El tren ha llegado.
    Response: Dudo que el tren haya llegado.
        (2) Quieren algo. Salgo.
        (3) Juan espera algo. El profesor no está.
        (4) Lupita no cree nada. Juan está aquí.

----

*taught for recognition only

(5) Quiero algo. Tú no lo has visto.
(6) Juan lo sentía. María todavía no había llegado.
(7) Algo es lástima. No ganamos ayer.
(8) Algo es claro. Nos falta dinero.

Relative clauses:

Given a matrix sentence and an embedding sentence with a common NP, the student will formulate a complex sentence using an appropriate relative clause pronoun in place of the embedded NP.

Ex. (1) El profesor llega mañana. El profesor es joven.
(2) El hombre ya no está. Ese es el coche del hombre.
(3) María trata de vender unas rosas. (Es dudoso) que las rosas sean frescas.
(4) Alguien les vendió un rocín (a ellos). Ellos eran novatos.
(5) El vive allí. Lo buscas.

Conjunctions requiring the subjunctive:

Given a complex sentence containing a conjunction which requires the subjunctive, the student will fill in the appropriate form of the cued verb.

Ex. (1) El querría terminarlo antes de que _____. (tú; llegar)
Response: El querría terminarlo antes de que llegaras.
(2) Favor de decirme para que lo _____. (tú: necesitar)
(3) No puedo sacarlo sin que me _____. (tú: ayudar)
(4) Con tal de que _____ un taxi, llegarás temprano. (tú: tomar)

Contrary-to-fact constructions:

Given a series of complex sentences -some of which are contrary-to-fact expressions- the student shall tell if the speaker (subject) was what he claimed to be or if he was only expressing wishful thinking.

Ex. (1) Si yo fuera el rey, no lo permitiría.
(2) Si yo estuviera jugando, sentirías.
(3) Si soy el oficial allí, no lo harán.

<u>Commands:</u>

Given a complex sentence containing a subjunctive clause, the student will formulate a polite command by deleting the matrix sentence and changing the positions of the object pronouns as necessary.

Ex. (1) Quiero que vayan uds. conmigo.

Response: Vayan conmigo.

(2) Quiero que no lo hagas.
(3) Quiero que ud. lo haga.
(4) Quiero que los deje el hijo.
(5) Quiero que nos vayamos.
(6) Quiero que no nos vayamos.
(7) Juan quiere que María llegue.
(8) Ojalá que no haga lluvía.

<u>Complements:</u>

Infinitive Complementizer (I):

Given a pair of basic sentences having the same subject and one sentence expresses an emotion, uncertainty, or desire; the student will formulate a single complex sentence containing an infinitive phrase.

Ex. (1) Juan quiere algo. Juan visita a la tía.

Response: Juan quiere visitar a la tía.

(2) Juan espera algo. Juan les lee el libro.
(3) Los atletas tenían duda de algo. Ellos ganaron.
(4) Los niños tienen miedo de algo. Nadan.
(5) Lo comencé. (Yo) leía la lección.
(6) Ya voy. Lo estudio.
(7) Terminó. Escribía la tarea.

Infinitive Complementizer (II):

Given a pair of basic sentences in which the direct object of the first, is the subject of the second; the student will formulate a complex sentence having an infinitive complement.

Ex. (1) Juan vió a María. María corre.

Response: Juan vió a Marría correr.

    (2) La escuché. María les lee el libro a los niños.

    (3) Vi a alguien. Alguien me miraba.

Noun Phrase Complements:

Given a pair of basic sentences in which the direct object of the first one is the subject of the second, the student will formulate a complex sentence having a noun complement.

Ex. (1) Ellos lo eligieron. El es presidente.

Response: Ellos lo eligieron presidente.

    (2) Juan consideraba a María. María es bonita.

    (3) La tripulación consideraban a Juan. Juan no es capacitado. Juan es capitán.

Progressive Complementizer:

Given a pair of basic sentences in which the direct object of the first is the subject of the second, the student will formulate a complex sentence having a progressive participle.

Ex. (1) Juan vió a María. María estaba corriendo.

Response: Juan vió a María corriendo.

    (2) Observan la barca. La barca está velando.

    (3) La escuché. María estaba leyéndoles la leyenda.

True Passive Transformation:

Given a sentence containing a transitive verb, the student will transform it into the true passive, observing correct grammatical agreements.

Ex. (1) Maté el ratón.

Response: El ratón fue matado por yo.

    (2) El les leyó la novela.

    (3) El niño comía todos los frijoles.

Integrated language skills:

Up to this point the objective has been a minimum and uniform mastery of individual items of basic grammar.

However, the fruit of the one and a half year effort by the student and teacher is the ability to integrate all of the individual items into a unified system and to apply it to realistic communicative situations. Unfortunately this genuine use of the language is also the most difficult to evaluate.

It is beyond the scope of this paper to discuss the present state of the art of language testing. There is, however, a possible solution available here at Kansas State. Some degree of success has been achieved in testing the oral English proficiency of non-native speakers enrolled at Kansas State University. All newly arrived foreign students are tested by the Engler: Aural-Oral Test for Proficiency in English developed by Dr. Leo F. Engler.

The Engler test uses ten short, simple questions in English as primarily an artifice to get the student to speaking extemporaneously. The student is told to answer each question fully and to continue speaking untill the instructor -on the tape- says, "Thank you". The recorded responses are then graded on a one to five point basis against a perfect score by a native speaker. On the scorer's cut sheet a score is marked for each question in five categories: promptness of response, appropriateness, fluency, pronunciation, and grammar. A total score is then computed for the student.

The simplicity and success of the Aural-Oral test indicates that a similar procedure might be feasible for testing modern language students. Some modifications would be necessary to reflect the differences in purpose. The English

version is intended to measure the proficiency of students who have tacitly already had considerable training in English. A further difficulty is that the test is designed to be scored by a native speaker of the target language. Therefore, a modern language program would have to have access to a native speaker on the faculty or a non-native speaker who is extremely knowledgeable of the structure of the target language.

The problems seem, nonetheless, to be resolvable. To that end this student has proposed a format applicable for Spanish (Appendix B). The test would require considerable experimentation and refinement in order to assertain a realistic minimum acceptable score and to evaluate its reliability.

Chapter III

Discussion and Summary

Having sowed havoc through one Spanish program, it is now proper to inquire what benefits are to be gained from such an effort. Before delving into the more subjective and probabilistic areas, let the concrete benefits be discussed. At the very least the teacher now has a complete itemized list of what structures a student is going to be expected to have mastered when he completes three semesters of Spanish. Is such a list of any value?

The procedure for formulating performance objectives forces the teacher to choose some items and to eliminate others. Hardly an area of the objectives in Chapter II could not be expanded, but the constraints of time and student needs preclude adding to them. Based on the objectives the teacher knows that while he may wish to point out additional points such as the Spanish voiceless stops are never aspirated or that /t,d,s/ are dentals, he should not spend much class time trying to teach these points because it is not helping the student to progress toward the program goals.

The existence of a list of terminal behaviors means that one's goals are available for the inspection of colleagues and other interested persons. Fellow faculty members within the department may compare his objectives with those on the list. Other colleges and universities may better compare their programs with that of this institution and on the basis of such comparisons make better decisions about the transfer of

courses and credits. People who are concerned with curriculum
design and the sequencing of courses can study a list of
objectives and determine just what the student will be able
to do upon completing his language requirement. This in turn
can then be reconciled with the rationale for having the
requirement in the first place.

The articulation of high school and junior college
language programs with that of this university would be
facilitated by the publication of a list of performance
objectives. Teachers could then ensure that their students
who intend to attend K-State will have an optimum opportunity
to master the proper language structures. The criticism that
some teachers may teach toward a specific test, much to the
exclusion of all else, can be minimized by writing a "final
examination" so specific and inclusive that teaching the test
will itself entail achieving the course objectives.

The resemblance of the objectives in Chapter II to a test
is obvious and almost forces the consideration of them as a
proficiency test or placement examination. However, the objectives
in Chapter II are only examples and therefore, lack a fourth
constituent in most cases, the criterion of mastery. Take
for instance, the item concerning the use of the definite
article. It lists one example of each different use the student
is expected to master. To measure his mastery one would want
perhaps ten examples of the particular usage in question.
It can be seen then, that the use of performance objectives
as a single large test would make it an extremely long one

for both teacher and student. However, for testing purposes many items could be combined and therefore, the use of performance objectives as the basis of an examination is feasible. The potential use of such a test is considerable. A single institution, or even all of the state's colleges and universities could use such tests for the granting of credits or the waiving of the language requirement. It might also be useful for placement and diagnostic purposes. A test could be used to determine in what areas the student is weak.

The progression of the objectives in Chapter II is approximately from the more basic (less inclusive) to the more complex (more inclusive). Therefore, it readily lends itself to being modularized. This is exactly what a competency-based program would do. The student's advancement is then based on the successful demonstration of intermediate objectives. In a more conventional program such as the one here at Kansas State, modules could be used for placement and diagnosis of weak areas. Particular sections might be set aside for the intensive work on certain problem areas. This procedure contributes to the more efficient advancement of the student.

There are commercial standardized tests available to do most of the above mentioned items. However, a test based on the objectives for the K-State program has the advantage of testing exactly those items which the student will encounter at Kansas State University. It can be tailored to the local needs and practices.

The teacher looking forward to the new academic year can consult his list of objectives in order to devise an appropriate lesson plan. He can compare the textbook materials with his own goals. Some textbook materials may contribute nothing to the program's goals while in other areas additional outside material may be necessary to augment the text. The text currently used here in Spanish III (Hampares 1971) contains no material on pronunciation. It is doubtful that the third semester student has mastered Spanish phonology, so the instructor may need to gather material for teaching toward the pronunciation objectives in Chapter II.

In addition to helping the teacher with "what" to include in his lesson plans, the list of objectives suggests the manner of instruction. Morphophonemic variations are probably best taught by established audiolingual drill methods. On the other hand, those objectives which are demonstrated by having the student explain in English, are often very subtle variations of meaning which are usually quite difficult to contrst within the target language . Such distinctions probably will require careful explanation from the teacher rather than merely more mechanical manipulations.

Another possible use for a list of objectives is to supply the student with a copy of them in the form of a course syllabus which he can use as a check list. The student can then visually measure his progression toward the complex goal at the end of the program.

In summary this paper has attempted (1) to show how performance objectives can be written for a conventional language program, (2) to propose a set of objectives, and (3) to determine if it was worth doing. The need for explicit program objectives was established by reference to several leading applied linguists and language teachers who have written about the need. The view was offered that the applied linguist by virtue of his specialized preparation, was in the best position to provide the language teacher with the strictly linguistic objectives for a program.

A quick overview of the theoretical background for this paper was presented. It was determined that the current theoretical issues concerning the nature of language and language learning, preclude any claims for the student acquiring an internalized "competence" of the target language. Rather, the aim of the program proposed here is to provide the student with a language-like behavior which will attempt to approximate the performance of a native Spanish speaker. The rationale and technique for writing performance objectives was sketched for information purposes

The review of the related literature briefly examined alternative attempts to describe explicit objectives for foreign language programs. The use of performance levels by several different agencies was discussed. The concept of performance levels is useful, but the formats will have to be changed and the use of vague terminology eliminated. Probably performance levels should be stated in terms similar

to behavioral objectives. Finally some earlier attempts at
writing behavioral objectives for foreign language programs
was discussed. The technique had been confined to specialized
programs such as programmed instruction and individualized
instruction both of which require itemized objectives in order
to write the programs.

In Chapter II an example set of performance objectives
was proposed for a conventional college program such as the
one here at K-State. In conclusion it was noted that the
physical existence of a list of objectives is useful to any
type of language program because it forces the teacher to
form certain judgments and considerations about his goals
and it makes the results of those judgments and considerations
available for all to see. The teacher is forced to think
about his course.

REFERENCES

Angiolillo, Paul F. 1947, Armed Forces' Foreign Language Teaching
Critical Evaluation and Implications. New York: S.F. Vanni
Publishers and Booksellers.

Bemis, Katherine A. and George B. Schroeder. 1969. The Writing
and Use of Behavioral Objectives. New Mexico: Southwestern
Cooperatice Educational Laboratory, Inc. (Unpublished
paper ERIC ED 033 881).

Benevento, Jacqueline. 1970. "Developing End-of-the-year Student
Performance Objectives in a Secondary Schoole Foreign
Language Program" New Jersey Foreign Language Notes. 13:2:
1-5 (ERIC ED 051 690).

Bennett, W.A. 1968. Aspects of Language and Language Teaching.
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bloom, Benjamin S. Taxonomy of Educational Objectives The
Classification of Educational Goals Handbook 1: Cognitive
Domain. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1956.

Bolinger, Dwight L. and J.E. Cirute and H.H. Montero (eds.) 1966.
Modern Spanish. (MLA Project) New York: Harcourt, Brace, &
World, Inc.

---------. 1968. Aspects of Language. New York: Harcourt, Brace
& World, Inc.

---------. 1971. "Let's Change Our Base of Operations" Modern
Language Journal. 55:3:148-156.

Brooks, Nelson. 1963. "The Change from Traditional to Modern in
Language Teaching" Curricular Change in the Foreign Languages
(1963 Colloquium on Curricular Change) Princeton: College
Entrance Examination Board.

Brown, George H., Richard Beym, Thelma R. Smackey and Angelo
A. Cozzetto. 1970. "Development and Evaluation of a Self-
Instructional Spanish Course" HumRRO Technical Report 70-14.

Carroll, John B. 1963. "A Primer of Programmed Instruction in
Foreign Language Teaching" IRAL 1:2:115-142.

----------. 1970. "Psychological Aspects" The Teaching of German,
Problems and Methods. (Teaching Aid Project) ed. by E.
Reichmann. Philadelphia.

Cartier, Francis A. 1968. "Criterion-Referenced Testing of
Language Skills" TESOL Quarterly. 2:1:27-32.

Chomsky, Noam. 1965. Aspects of the Theory of Syntax. Cambridge,
Mass.: M.I.T. Press.

----------. 1971a. Problems of Knowledge and Freedom. The Russell
Lectures. New York: Pantheon Books.

----------. 1971b. "Topics in the Theory of Generative Grammar"
The Philosophy of Language. ed. by John R. Searle. London:
Oxford University Press.

Christensen, Clay B. and James Shaw. 1968. A Definition of
Achievement Level II in Control of Spanish Syntax. (Final
Report) Washingto, D.C.: H.E.W. (ERIC ED 032 797).

Coleman, Algernon. 1934. Experiments and Studies in Modern
Language Teaching. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

del Olmo, Guillermo. 1968. "Professional and Pragmatic Perspective
of the Audiolingual Approach: Introduction and Review"
Foreign Language Annals. 2:1:19-29.

Disick, Renée S. 1971. "Performance Objectives in Foreign
    Language Teaching. ERIC Focus Reports on the Teaching of
    Foreign Language, No.25" New York: MLA/ACTFL (ERIC ED 055 522).

Finocchiaro, Mary B. 1958. Teaching English as a Second Language.
    New York: Harper and Row, Publishers.

Fry, D.B. 1970. "Speech Reception and Perception" New Horizons
    in Linguistics. ed. by John Lyons. Harmondsworth, England:
    Penguin Books Ltd.

Gaarder, A. Bruce 1961. "The basic course in modern foreign
    languages" Reports of Surveys and Studies in the Teaching
    of Modern Foreign Languages. New York: MLA Foreign Language
    Research Center, pp.168-172

Geschwind, Norman. 1972. "Language and the Brain" Scientific
    American. 226:4:76-83.

Hampares, Katherine J. 1971. Spanish 2400 A Programmed Review
    of Spanish Grammar. New York: Harper and Row Publishers.

Hesse, Everett W. and H.H. Orjuela. 1964. Spanish Conversational
    Review Grammar. 2nd. edn. New York: American Book Co.

Hutchinson, Joseph C. 1963. "The Technology of Modern Language
    Learning" Curricular Change in the Foreign Languages. (1963
    Colloquium on Curricular Change) Princeton: CEEB.

Jakobovits, Leon A. 1970. Foreign Language Learning A Psycho-
    linguistic Analysis of the Issues. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury
    House Publishers.

Johnson, Francis C. 1969. "The Failure of the Discipline of
    Linguistics in Language Teaching" Language Learning.
    19:3&4:285-291.

Kibler, Robert J. and Lary L. Barker and Donald J. Cegala. 1970
    "A rationale for using behavioral objectives in speech-
    communication instruction" The Speech Teacher. 19:4:245-256.

Lado, Robert. 1964. Language Teaching: a scientific approach.
    New York: McGraw-Hill.

----------. 1967. Contemporary Spanish. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Lenneberg, Erich H. 1970. "The Biological Foundations of
    Language" Readings in Applied Transformational Grammar.
    ed. by Mark Lester. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston,
    Inc., pp.3-20.

Lewis, Karen, R. 1972. "Transformational Generative Grammar: A
    New Consideration to Teaching Foreign Languages" MLJ 56:1:3-10.

MacIntyre, Alasdair. 1970. "Noam Chomsky's View of Language"
    Readings in Applied Transformational Grammar. ed. by Mark
    Lester. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., pp.96-115.

Mackey, William F. 1965. Language Teaching Analysis. Bloomington,
    Indiana: Indiana University Press.

Markwardt, Albert H. 1963. "The Contribution of Linguistics to
    Language Teaching and Language Learning" Curriculum
    Change in the Foreign Languages.(1963 Colloquium on
    Curricular Change) Princeton: CEEB, pp.5-22.

Marty, Ferdinand. 1960. Language Laboratory Learning. Wellesley,
    Mass.: Audio-Visual Publications.

Mueller, Theodore H. and R.D. Miller. 1970. "A Study of Student
    Attitudes and Motivation in a Collegiate French Course Using
    Programmed Instruction" IRAL. 8:4:297-309.

Muskat-Tabakowska, Elzbieta. 1969. "The Notions of Competence and Performance in Language Teaching" Language Learning. 19:1&2:41-54.

Neale-Silva, Edward and Dana A. Nelson. 1967. Lengua hispánica moderna. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Newmark, Leonnard and D.A. Reibel. 1970. "Necessity and Sufficiency in Language Learning" Readings in Applied Transformational Grammar. ed. by M. Lester. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Ney, James W. 1971. "Transformational-generative Theories of Language and the Role of Conditioning in Language Learning" Language Learning. 21:1:63-74.

Ogden, Charles K. 1968. Basic English International. 2nd. edn. Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc.

Perren, George. 1971. "Specifying the Objectives: Is a Linguistic Definition Possible?" English Language Teaching. 25:2:132-139.

Politzer, Robert L. 1971. "Toward Individualization in Foreign Language Teaching" MLJ. 55:4:207-212.

Popham, W. James and Eva L. Baker. 1970a. Establishing Instructional Goals. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

----------. 1970b. Systematic Instruction. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Reichmann, Eberhard (ed.). 1970. The Teaching of German, Problems and Methods. Philadelphia: National Carl Schrz Association, Inc.

Rivers, Wilga M. 1964. The Psychologist and the Foreign
    Language Teacher. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Sanders, Norris M. 1966. Classroom Questions, What Kinds?
    New York: Harper & Row.

Sandstedt, Lynn A. 1971. Articulation Objectives for the
    Teaching of Foreign Languages in Colorado. Colorado:
    Congress of Foreign Language Teachers.

Sandstrom, Eleanor L. S. 1970. Learning a Foreign Language:
    Behavioral Objectives. (Unpublished paper) Philadelphia
    School District (ERIC ED 056 617).

Searle, John R. (ed.) 1971. The Philosophy of Language. London:
    The Oxford University Press.

Spolsky, Bernard. 1968. What does it mean to know a language,
    or how do you get someone to perform his competence?
    (Unpublished paper) (ERIC ED 028 411).

Starr, Wilmarth H. 1962. "MLA Foreign Language Proficiency
    Tests for Teachers and Advanced Students" PMLA. 77:4:31-42.

Steiner, Florence. 1970. "Performance Objectives in the Teaching
    of Foreign Languages." FLA. 3:4:589-591.

Stockwell, Robert P. and J. Donald Bowen. 1965. The Sounds of
    English and Spanish. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

---------, and John W. Martin. 1965. The Grammatical Structures of
    English and Spanish. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Time. June 26, 1972, p.57.

Valdman, Albert. 1964. "Programmed Instruction and Foreign
    Language Teaching" A Psycholinguistic experiment in foreign
    language teaching. ed. by George A.C. Scheres and M.
    Wertheimer. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.

————— (ed.). 1966. Trends in Modern Language Teaching. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.

—————. 1971. The Implications of Recent Theoretical Issues on Objectives of Foreign Language Instruction (Foreign Language Teaching and Learning: Proceedings of the Colloquium. ed. by Margherita Marchione and Guillermo del Olmo.) Rutherford, N.J.: Fáirleigh Dickinson University. (ERIC ED 059 653)

Walsh, Donald D. 1970. "Textbook Selection" The Teaching of German, Problems and Methods. Philadelphia: Teaching Aid Project.

Appendix A

Proficiency Levels: excerpts

I. MLA Qualifications for Modern Language Teachers: Superior

Listening Comprehension: Ability to follow closely and with ease all types of standard speech, such as rapid or group conversation and mechanically transmitted speech.

Speaking: Ability to speak fluently, approximating native speech in vocabulary, intonation, and pronunciation. Ability to exchange ideas and to be at ease in social settings.

Reading: Ability to read almost as easily as in English material of considerable difficulty.

Writing: Ability to write on a variety of subjects with idiomatic naturalness, ease of expression, and some feeling for the style of the language.

II. College Entrance Examination Board

Level I: Demonstrate, in learning and in speaking, control of the whole sound system. Repeat the account of a brief incident as he hears it read, phrase by phrase. Retell aloud such an incident after repeating it in this way. Participate (with a fluent speaker) in a dialogue about any one of perhaps twenty situations. Read aloud a familiar text. Write a familiar text from dictation. Rewrite a sample narrative containing familiar material, making simple changes in tense. Do orally and in writing exercises that involve a limited manipulation of number, gender, and word order, tense replacement, negation,

interrogative, command, comparison, possession.

Level II: Demonstrate continued accurate control of the
sound system. Recognize all of the basic syntactic patterns.
of speech and use most of them. Comprehend, by listening
and also by reading, any subject matter that is comparable
in content and difficulty to what he has learned. Be able
to write all that he can say. Have first hand knowledge of
brief samples of cultural and of contemporary literary
prose, and be able to converse in simple terms about them.

Level III: Demonstrate continued accurate control of the
sound system. Demonstrate continued accurate control of
the syntactic patterns of speech. Read aloud a text
comparable in content and style to what has been studied.
Demonstrate the ability to understand through listening
a variety of texts prepared for comprehension by the ear.
Write from dictation a text he has previously examined for
the details of its written form. Demonstrate adequate
control and comprehension of all but low-frequency patterns
of syntax and unusual vocabulary encountered in printed texts.

Level IV: Read aloud an unfamiliar printed text. Write from
dictation, (a) following a preliminary reading and (b)
without a preliminary reading, passages of literary prose.
Converse with a fluent speaker on a topic such as a play
seen, a novel read, a trip taken, or a residence lived in.
Read a text; then in writing, (a) summarize its contents
and (b) comment upon a stated number of points that are

culturally significant; these may be in linguistics; in idiom, or in vocabulary reference. Receive oral instruction about an assignment to be written; its length, nature; its contents, to whom addresses, its form, its style of presentation; then write it.

III. Defense Language Institute Scale:

S-1 Able to satisfy routine travel needs and minimum courtesy requirements. Can ask and answer questions on topics very familiar to him; within the scope of his very limited language experience. He can understand simple questions and statements -allowing for slowed speech, repetitions or paraphrases; speaking vocabulary inadequate to express anything but the most elementary needs; errors in pronunciation and grammar are frequent, but can be understood by a native speaker used to dealing with foreigners attempting to speak his language. While topics which are "very" familiar and elementary needs vary considerably from individual to individual, any person at the S-1 level should be able to order a simple meal, ask for shelter or lodging, ask and give simple directions, make purchases and tell time.

C-1 Sufficient comprehension to meet survival needs and travel requirements. Able to understand the essentials of face-to-face speech in a standard dialect, often delivered at a rate slower than normal, with frequent repetitions, about basic needs: meals, lodging, trans- portation, time and simple directions.

S-2 <u>Limited Working Proficiency</u> Use of the language sufficient for most social situations and limited military requirements.

S-3 <u>Minimum Professional Proficiency</u> Sufficient command of the language to handle with ease general conversational and professional discussions in a specific field.

S-4 <u>Full Professional Proficiency.</u> Fluent and accurate use of the language at all levels pertinent to service needs.

S-5 <u>Native or Bi-Lingual Proficiency</u> Command of the language equivalent to that of a well educated native speaker.

Appendix B

Engler: Aural-Oral Test for Proficiency in English
(Modified for Spanish)

You will hear a series of ten questions in Spanish. Each question will be followed by a pause long enough for you to give a complete answer in Spanish. In all cases answer in complete sentences and keep on talking as much as possible until the speaker says, "gracias". This will be your signal to stop talking and to listen carefully for the next question.

Please speak clearly into the microphone and remember to keep talking as much as possible.

1. Cómo se llama? (15 seconds)
   Gracias

2. Cúanto tiempo hace que estudia español? (30 seconds)
   Gracias

3. A qué hora llegó Ud. aquí hoy? (20 seconds)
   Gracias

4. De dónde es Ud.? (30 seconds)
   Gracias

5. Dígame algo de su familia, por favor. (30 seconds)
   Gracias

6. Qué le gusta como pasatiempo? (30 seconds)
   Gracias

7. Descríbame la sala en que estamos ahora. (30 seconds)
   Gracias

8. Cúal día sigue el viernes? (15 seconds)
   Gracias

9. Qué hacía Ud. durante las vacaciones? (30 seconds)
   Gracias

10. Dónde quiere vivir despúes de graduarse? (30 seconds)

   Muchas gracias. Fin del examen.

ORAL-AURAL TEST
CUT SHEET

Examinee's Name_____
         Last (family)   First (personal)   Middle

Nationality_____Native Language_____

School_____Department_____Major_____

Date_____Grader_____Graduate Undergrad Special
                                   (circle one)

Question	Prompt	Appropriate	Fluent	Pronun	Gramm	Total
1.						
2.						
3.						
4.						
5.						
6.						
7.						
8.						
9.						
10.						

Grading Scale: Grader's Comment:
5 = native speaker
4 = near native
3 = restricted
2 = tries, but...
1 = one-word answer,
    "I don't know",
    "Didn't understand the question."
0 = no attempt

THE STATING OF BEHAVIORAL OBJECTIVES
FOR A COLLEGE LEVEL MODERN LANGUAGE PROGRAM

by

STEVEN ROY CHANDLER

B. A., Kansas State University, 1969

———————————————

AN ABSTRACT OF A MASTER'S REPORT

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Modern Languages

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1972

This paper investigates, by means of the available literature, the writing of explicit instructional objectives for a modern foreign language program. The need for precise goals is documented and justification is given for delegating the responsibility to produce these goals to the applied linguist rather than to the language teacher. Past attempts to establish goals are surveyed. In particular, the deficiencies of efforts to define objectives in terms of proficiency levels are discussed.

The theoretical basis for the proposed set of performance objectives is presented. The rationale for claiming only to teach a language-like behavior is explained within the consideration of current psycholinguistic evidence. There is a format included for stating instructional goals as behavioral objectives.

Chapter II exemplifies the use of behavioral objectives through a proposed set of objectives for a Spanish program. In addition to the list of specific performance objectives there is an integrated language skills objective. In the final chapter there is a discussion of the contributions this technique of stating objectives has for classroom and administrative use.

There is a bibliography followed by two appendices having excerpts from language proficiency levels used by the MLA, College Entrance Examination Board and the Defense Language institute. There is also a proposed Spanish version of the Engler Aural-Oral Test for Proficiency in English.