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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 intelligent 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 *Language Teaching Analysis*, 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 *seriatim*, 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 diverse 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 Waldman'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 transformationalists 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 understanding 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 knowledge 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 aphasic'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 languagelike 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 everything 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 rationales 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 Popham 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 Psychomotor 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 competence 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, comprehension, 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 appropriate
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. Among the earliest teachers to adopt behavioral objective-like statements were teachers of English as a second language. Parren (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:

\[ [\text{e}] \text{ and } [\text{ey}] \]\n\[ [\text{-r-}] \text{ and } [\text{-rr-}] \]\n\[ [\text{-h-}] \text{ and } [\text{-g-}] \]

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 'lef'.
(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]
[ε] elsewhere internally; finally
/b/ → [b] initially; after [m, l]
[b] elsewhere
/g/ → [g] initially; after [n]
[g] elsewhere
/r/ → [ɾ] initially; after [n, l], optional finally
[r] elsewhere; optional finally (free variation)
/-rr-/ → [ɾ] 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 ['bʌdə] or as the glottal catch before a syllabic nasal or liquid ['bʌtən].
/e/ → [e] The distribution for these allophones is [ɛ] not clear. The principal problem for English Speakers is substituting [ey] for [e].
/ʌ/ → [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·stálas·yúdah]
(2) Ambos viven en la Habana. [ámbos bibenla·bána]
(3) Guillermo, riégate los garbanzos. [qiýermo fiýetelos·garbánsos]
(4) Romero quería verla ayer. [romerо kеřfa·erla·ayer]
(5) Catalina es gata. [katalína·es·gáta]
(6) El rey le lee la ley. [el·rе́y·le·le·la·ley]
(7) La amiga es de La Habana. [la·míga·es·de·la·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 1965:62ff). 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type I.a.</th>
<th>NP:Subj.</th>
<th>VP-ser</th>
<th>ADJ:Pred</th>
<th>NP:Pred</th>
<th>ADV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Models:</td>
<td>El hombre es profesor, La mujer es vieja, La clase es aquí.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b:</td>
<td>NP:Subj.</td>
<td>VP-estar</td>
<td>ADJ:Pred</td>
<td>ADV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Models:</td>
<td>Juan está triste, La clase está aquí.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type II.</td>
<td>NP:Subj.</td>
<td>VP</td>
<td>(ADV)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Models:</td>
<td>El niño habla, El niño habla bien.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type III:</td>
<td>NP:Subj.</td>
<td>VP</td>
<td>NP:D.O. (ADV)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Models:</td>
<td>La esposa busca el perro, El perro muerde a la niña.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type IV:</td>
<td>NP:Subj.</td>
<td>VP</td>
<td>NP:D.O.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model:</td>
<td>El hijo da el libro a Juan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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:) "____ tango 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 lama 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:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regular -ar</th>
<th>Regular -er</th>
<th>Regular -ir</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-o amos</td>
<td>-o -emos</td>
<td>-o -imos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-as -áis</td>
<td>-es -éis</td>
<td>-es -ís</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-a -an</td>
<td>-e -en</td>
<td>-e -en</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* '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 \( V_{\text{base}} - \text{ecer}, -\text{ducir} \).
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 WP 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regular -ar</th>
<th>Regular -er and -ir</th>
<th>Irregular</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-aba</td>
<td>-íamos</td>
<td>ir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-abas</td>
<td>-ías</td>
<td>ser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-aba</td>
<td>-ía</td>
<td>ver</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Preterite tense:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regular -ar</th>
<th>Regular -er and -ir</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-é</td>
<td>-í</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-esté</td>
<td>-iste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-e</td>
<td>-ió</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-eron</td>
<td>-ieron</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Irregular preterite: andar, caber, conducir, dar, decir, estar, hacer, haber, ir, poder, poner, querer, saber, ser, tener, traer, venir, \( V_{\text{base}} -\text{ducir} \), and stem changing -ir verbs in which -i- \( \rightarrow \)-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 María. Response: Juan knew María.
        Juan conoció a María.
        He knew the answer.
        He learned the answer.
        Sabía la respuesta.
        Supo la respuesta.

Future tense:

Regular, all forms (infinitive +) -é -emos
-ás -éis
-á -án

Irregular stems: caber, decir, hacer
poder, poner, querer
saber, salir, tener
valer, venir

Conditional tense:

Regular, all forms (infinitive +) -ía -íamos
-ías -íais
-ía -ían

Irregular: (Same as for future tense and uses the same stem)

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
-ando

Regular -er and -ir
-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.
Hacía tres meses que vivía ahí. I lived there three months.
Hace mal tiempo hoy. The weather is bad today.
SER and ESTAR:

One of the more difficult problems for English speakers to master in Spanish is the distribution of *ser* and *está*. There are a few constructions in which only *ser* 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 *está* can be used, *ser* 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.

*Ser* is used to indicate a permanent characteristic; the norm; part of the subject's essence of being; a general classifying property. Conversely *está* 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 *ser* or *está* 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 unarguable 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 some-
times 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 mujer. (... mujeres.)
(2) No habló al hombre. (... hombres.)
(3) Estudian del país. (... países.)
(4) Hablamos de la crisis. (... 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, ñ, ñ)
(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 _____ libra. (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) Los hombres corrian al patio. (aquello, este)  (2) El 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) Maria busca esa revista. (your)
(3) Los gatos estan aqui. (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 ninfa quiere dos gatos. (más)

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

Ex. (1) Todo el dia trabajo aqui. (all day long)
(2) Todos los dias trabajo aqui. (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 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 cualquiera.

(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. (primer)
(3) Ese ______ hombre es ______ amigo mío. (grande, bueno)
(4) Llegaron a la iglesia de ______ Tomás. (Santo)
(5) ______ Cristóbal 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 destruirían ________.

(3) Hablé con la hija mía.
_______ me escuchó.
(4) Hay una camisa blanca y hay otra camisa azul. ¿Quieres _______ o _______? _______ por favor.
(5) Voy a leer este libro. Me gusta ______.
(6) Esa cosa 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)

Pronominalization:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object pronouns:</th>
<th>Direct Object</th>
<th>Indirect Object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>me</td>
<td>nos</td>
<td>me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>te</td>
<td>vos</td>
<td>te</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>la, lo, las, los</td>
<td>le</td>
<td>les</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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.
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) Maria 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) Llegará ___ 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 después 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 Chapultepec 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 underlined, 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 los papeles a los estudiantes.
Response: ¿Qué pidió el profesor a los estudiantes?
(2) El profesor pidió los papeles a los estudiantes.
(3) El profesor pidió los papeles a los estudiantes.
(4) María vende flores rojas en el mercado.
(5) María vende flores rojas en el mercado.
(6) Las flores son $1.00 la docena.
(7) Ella las vende el lunes.
(8) Ellas son muy bonitas.
(9) Son las flores de María.
(10) Manuel hace viaje a la capital para verlas.
(11) El viaja para verlas.
(12) No se puede decir si esto o eso 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.
(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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regular -ar</th>
<th>Regular -er and -ir</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-e</td>
<td>-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-es</td>
<td>-as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-en</td>
<td>-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-an</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All verbs</th>
<th>*Alternate form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-ra</td>
<td>-se</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ras</td>
<td>-ses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ran</td>
<td>-se</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

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.

(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 decírmelo 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.
Commands:

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 lluvia.

Complements:

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 María 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.

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 until 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 ascertain 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 contrast 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.
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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, transportation, time and simple directions.
S-2 **Limited Working Proficiency** Use of the language sufficient for most social situations and limited military requirements.

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

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

S-5 **Native or Bi-Lingual Proficiency** 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. Describame la sala en que estamos ahora. (30 seconds)
   Gracias
8. Cúal día sigue al viernes? (15 seconds)
   Gracias
9. Qué hacía Ud. durante las vacaciones? (30 seconds)
   Gracias
10. Dónde quiere vivir después 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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Prompt</th>
<th>Appropriate</th>
<th>Fluent</th>
<th>Pronun</th>
<th>Gramm</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grading Scale:
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

Grader's Comment:
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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.