0645-1

The Scope of a Spanish Grammar for Minimal Communicative Competence[1]

William I. Miller
The University of Akron

ABSTRACT *Foreign language teachers have long recognized that it is neither possible nor necessary to teach a complete grammar of Spanish in a course designed to develop communicative competence. Studies of colloquial usage show that even a native-like command of the grammar can consist of far fewer verb forms than are traditionally thought necessary. Basing himself on these studies, the author proposes a minimal grammar of verb forms for correct active use. More tentative suggestions are made for the development of an easily expressed and understood simplified Spanish for beginners. The paper considers briefly the order of presentation of grammatical forms and concludes with a review of some other aspects of a communicative course in Spanish.*

For at least the past decade an increasing emphasis has been placed on oral communication as an activity as well as a goal for the language class.[2] The need for this new emphasis was indicated by the failure of most students to attain simple "survival skills" even after extensive study of the necessary vocabulary and grammar. The reason for the failure to speak and understand seems to be that students learn by doing. They do not learn to communicate their own thoughts by doing grammar exercises and quasi-communicative activities involving only a response to someone else's utterances. When students practice communication, they learn to communicate, albeit with individual differences in accuracy and fluency. Moreover, the tremendous increase in motivation which results from the students' perception of their ability to use the language can be even more valuable than the practical skill acquired.[3]

William I. Miller (PhD., University of Florida) is Assistant Professor of Modern Languages at the University of Akron; Akron, OH.

The Problem

The limits of time available for learning place serious constraints on the ability to develop communication skills. Attaining proficiency in communicating with native speakers in their own environment—what has come to be called *communicative competence*—implies a great deal beyond knowledge of grammar and vocabulary. Besides knowing *how* to say something in a foreign language, one must decide *what* to say depending on when, where, to whom, and why one is talking. In order to communicate effectively, one must be aware of the assumptions which a native speaker brings to the performance or the interpretation of a particular speech act. This "shared universe of discourse" is often as important, or more so, than features of a purely linguistic nature.[4]

The acquisition of a native-like communicative competence is therefore a goal beyond reasonable expectations for a one- or two-year course sequence.[5] The concept of a "minimal communicative competence" is a more appropriate goal for the beginning language learner. Minimal communicative competence consists of the knowledge of what to say and how to say it in a restricted number of situations in which the student would be found as a foreigner in another culture.[6] Ob-

viously, even a goal of such limited scope is not realistic if one must also learn a complete grammar of the language as it is commonly presented in college-level beginning texts. Experts have suggested, however, that the amount of grammar in a textbook can be drastically reduced without reducing the ability to communicate effectively.[7] The practical problem for the teacher is how to limit the grammatical structures presented in the textbook. In the past the usual solution has been to cover sequentially whatever amount of material can be mastered. However, aside from the dubious validity of the mastery approach, textbooks do not order the material according to communicative criteria. The student is likely to have learned many items of little use and not to have covered other more useful ones.[8] In the following sections, I shall offer criteria which will enable the teacher to select the most essential structures to teach in a beginning course. These structures will constitute a grammar for minimal communicative competence in Spanish.

Reduction of Scope

The criteria for selection depend primarily on the teacher's goals. Let us assume the major goal is to have the students acquire something approaching a native-like ability to communicate informally in situations requiring minimal communicative competence. Almost all textbooks pretend to incorporate this goal, but their objectives also encompass the linguistic competence of all educated native speakers, including the ability to read expository prose. Such an extensive competence is totally unrealistic for a beginning course. The following paragraphs will define a goal of reduced scope and determine some of its grammatical requisites.

Studies in dialectology and sociolinguistics have shown how varied language is from region to region, from class to class, and, in the individual speaker, from situation to situation.[9] A reasonable goal for a first-year Spanish course is to cover the grammatical structures normally used by a member of the middle class from one region speaking in informal and semiformal public situations (omitting both intimate and very formal styles). I have chosen Mexican Spanish for three reasons. Descriptive material is readily available; it seems a useful choice for American students; it is closer to an average "standard" Spanish than is that of some other countries.

Learning the Spanish verb system is without a doubt the most time-consuming task for the student. A look at Professor Juan Lope Blanch's article, "La reducción del sistema verbal en el español de México," shows that not all the thirteen tenses (not including progressives and passives) found in beginning texts are really necessary.[10] Professor Lope Blanch first cites those forms which are not in current use anywhere, future subjunctive and preterite perfect, and those forms which have almost disappeared from spoken American Spanish, second person plural verbs and the past subjunctive in *-se*. He then analyzes phenomena characteristic of spoken Mexican Spanish. The reader will realize, however, that many of them are characteristic of other countries as well.

The second person imperative, Professor Lope Blanch notes, is often avoided as somewhat impolite. Grammatical questions or statements such as *quieres callarte, podías callarte, favor de callarte, ahora te callas,* or *vas a callarte,* are frequent substitutes for the command form, *cállate* (be quiet). This observation is largely true of formal commands as well.[11]

As in the rest of Spanish America, the future tense is falling into disuse in the spoken language of Mexico in favor of periphrastic constructions with *ir a, pensar, querer, haber de,* etc., or the simple present.[12]

The conditional tense, although not disappearing, is, according to Lope Blanch, "en desventajosa competencia con otros tiempos," often being replaced by the past subjunctive.[13] Speakers frequently prefer the subjunctive in desiderative *yo lo ayudara* (I would like to help him), hypothetical *nunca hiciera eso* (I would never do that), and dubitive *quizás fuera bueno irnos* (perhaps it would be good for us to go) sentences. Subjunctive is often used in conditional sentences where the "if" clause is not expressed, as in *En tu lugar yo hiciera igual* (In your place I would do the same), and it is not rare even when the "if" clause is expressed—especially if the result clause precedes: *No tuviera miedo si Ud. me acompañara* (I would not be afraid if you went with me).[14] The conditional as a "future-past" in indirect discourse is normally replaced by the imperfect indicative or the periphrastic *iba a* (was going to): *Dijo que venía (iba a venir) dentro de poco* (He said that he was going to come in a little while).

Like English, colloquial Mexican Spanish makes considerably less use of the perfect or compound tenses than does the written language. The preterite tends to replace the past perfect wherever the sequence of events is evident: *Lo encontré donde lo dejé* [for *había dejado*] (I found him where I left him [for I had left]). The future perfect is extremely rare. It is often paraphrased with the simple future. *Lo voy a mandar antes del viernes* (I am going to

send it before Friday), means very nearly the same as *para el viernes lo habré mandado* (I shall have sent it by Friday).[15] The principal use of the conditional perfect is in the result clause of conditional sentences; even here, the *-ra* form of the past perfect subjunctive regularly replaces it: *Si lo hubiera visto, te lo hubiera dicho* (If I had seen it, I would have told you so).[16] Finally, the present perfect subjunctive is normally replaced by either the present or the past (imperfect) subjunctive, depending on the time reference. Instead of *Cuando lo hayas leído, me lo devuelves* (When you have read it, return it to me), one says *Cuando lo leas* (When you read it)...or, to emphasize the perfective aspect, *Cuando lo acabes de leer...* (When you finish reading it). Referring to a past action, *No creo que hiciera eso* (I do not believe he did that) replaces *No creo que haya hecho eso* (I do not believe he did [has done] that).

Discarding the commonly replaced forms, one is left with four indicative tenses: present, preterite, imperfect, and present perfect; and three subjunctive tenses: present, imperfect, and past perfect. Some observers have also noted the frequent replacement of the present perfect with the preterite. Professor Lope Blanch shows, in another article on Mexican Spanish, that this phenomenon is not a simple substitution of tenses but rather a restructuring of the temporal and aspectual values of the preterite and present perfect. This restructuring results in a much more limited use of the present perfect in comparison to its frequency in peninsular Spanish.[17]

The studies cited both above and in the notes show that a native-like command of Spanish grammar can involve far less than what is traditionally considered necessary. This point should be emphasized since it is frequently misunderstood: a drastic reduction in forms entails no reduction in what can be naturally expressed. The forms retained in the syllabus provide a colloquial and usually more common way of saying everything expressed by the forms discarded. The grammatical scope described thus far does not constitute what Valdman calls a "little language," i.e. a reduced system which enables the foreigner to communicate but is far less than the native speaker normally uses.[18]

Further Simplification

If the goal is to communicate as soon as possible in a wide range of situations, it seems advisable to lighten further the grammatical load. The basic assumption of a notional-functional syllabus provides a clear way to do this: one organizes the syllabus first according to what the learner must do with the language, and then one decides what structures are necessary (rather than deciding what grammar to study and then what use to make of it).[19] The past subjunctive, for example, is indispensable only in expressing past contrary-to-fact conditions. If we eliminate the expression of counterfactual hypotheses from the repertoire of functions for beginning Spanish, the forms become superfluous. Likewise the conditional tense is mostly used in explicitly conditional sentences. It would be practical at first to limit the learner to the description of actual situations and exclude hypothetical expressions. A case can also be made against the present perfect indicative since, in most of its functions, it can be replaced with a preterite or a present construction.

An analysis of function should be used also to limit the range of uses of the forms which are taught. Teaching the subjunctive does not entail teaching all its uses. The present subjunctive is most frequent in spoken Spanish in adverbial clauses, commands, and noun clauses after verbs of volition. Its use after verbs of denial and in adjective clauses is far less important simply because the ideas expressed thereby occur less frequently. Finally it should be noted that, for many Spanish speakers, clauses following expressions of emotion do not require the subjunctive.[20]

Another criterion which has been suggested for simplifying the task of communication is reduction of variance.[21] A notional-functional analysis is the key to reducing the number of ways to say something: if more than one form expresses a certain function, the student should learn only the easiest or most typical one at first and get on with communication. The Spanish progressive tenses, for example, unlike their English counterparts, are only optional alternatives to non-progressive tenses for expressing action in progress at the time referred to. The passive voice in Spanish is a much less used alternative to a reflexive construction or a transitive active expression.

Even where two forms do not express exactly the same function, an analysis of the social functions of language may indicate that one form should be chosen to replace the other. One can command, and one can request. Although students must learn to follow commands from the beginning, it will almost always be more appropriate for them, as newcomers to the foreign culture, to express a request than to give a command. *¿Me hace el favor de...?, ¿Podría Ud....?,* and *¿Quiere Ud....?* plus infinitive are both socially more appropriate and easier than the complicated command forms of

Spanish. The social implications of language use should also be taken into account in deciding whether or not to teach the familiar form of address. The adult who expects to have more formal contacts with Spanish speakers will have much less use for *tú* forms than will the younger learner.

Amount of Grammar Needed

The limitations on grammatical form imposed by considerations of the language functions the learner needs to handle, together with the reductions typical of colloquial native usage, now suggest a specific characterization of a grammar for minimal communicative competence, one which permits a natural expression of ideas with only slight limitations of content and variety of form. It consists of the structures needed to make statements and ask questions in the first and third forms, singular and plural, of the present, imperfect, and preterite indicative, and the present and past subjunctive.

In fact it is debatable whether any tenses of the subjunctive should be part of beginning students' active grammar. When expressing themselves freely in Spanish, English-speaking students tend to avoid constructions requiring the subjunctive.[22] When they do use them, they are more likely to use the indicative even though they have learned the correct usage of the subjunctive. If, as many linguists hold, the subjunctive is the automatic result of the use of certain words and structures, the subjunctive form itself carries no information, and failure to use it does not affect the message.[23] There seems to be a natural strategy of communication which tells the learner to concentrate on the features of grammar and vocabulary which convey the message and ignore those which do not.[24] The use of this strategy explains the large number of errors in agreement of verbs and modifiers with nouns even where, as in the case of noun-verb number agreement, the lack of corresponding features in English is not a possible explanation.

Simplification and Errors

Further simplification would produce wide-ranging patterns of errors or, even worse, highly unnatural utterances. One could, for example, avoid using conjunctions and object pronouns by speaking only in simple sentences and constantly repeating noun phrases. Certainly some errors would be preferable. Although the assumption that errors are an inevitable and necessary part of language acquisition is widely accepted now,[25] it is still a matter of contention to what extent a teacher should accept errors as a legitimate simplification of grammar for communication.

Researchers have hypothesized that second language acquisition normally goes through a simplified pidgin-like stage, that pidginization is the effect of universal language-acquisition strategies.[26] If this is the case, the teacher would do well to become aware of the phenomenon and exploit it as a quick way to produce simple yet effective communication while working toward correct grammar as a long-range goal. The use of object pronouns, for example, is second only to verb forms as a source of difficulty for the learner and is unavoidable in natural speech. In creolized forms (supposedly derived from earlier pidgins) of Romance languages, the unstressed preverbal pronouns are replaced with stressed pronouns placed after the verb. This is in fact a very frequent occurrence when English-speaking students communicate in Spanish. A common error like *Visité ellos* can be immediately and correctly interpreted by the native speaker, apparently as a reduction of *Los visité a ellos* (I visited them) by omission of the unstressed words.

In a natural language-acquisition situation most errors seem to be self-correcting in time. Where exposure to the language is limited (as in the classroom), development may stop, the forms being "fossilized" at the pidgin stage. Correction of errors by the teacher seems to have little or no effect. Even with adequate exposure, a pidginized version of the language may develop when the learner's only goal is to get a message across.[27] In order to achieve the natural self-correction process in the classroom, the teacher needs to give the students as much exposure to the target language as possible. Equally important, the goal of communication must go beyond the literal message to include the affective features necessary for self-correcting acquisition to take place spontaneously. In other words, "integrative motivation" is needed as well as "instrumental motivation."

The reaction of native speakers has been proposed as a criterion for the acceptability of learners' mistakes.[28] Although results of tests conducted so far have been somewhat inconclusive, the studies show that messages are almost always perceived in spite of the mistakes. Moreover, it seems that the attitude of the learners and the content of what they say matter far more to the native speakers than grammar mistakes.[29]

A Question of Order

After determining which structures are necessary for active communication, the teacher must decide on the order in which they should be presented. In

a notional-functional syllabus, the order in which the uses or functions of language appear determines the order of the grammar. Since so many forms are used in the commonest situations, most of the basic grammar would need to be presented very quickly near the beginning of the course and continually reviewed in what has been called a "cyclical" approach.[30] It seems more practical in the early stages to introduce language functions in an order based to some extent on a graduated presentation of grammatical forms.

One way of deciding the order of presentation is to observe the order in which native speakers acquire language structures. According to a study of the acquisition of verb forms by native speakers of Spanish, children master the present tense by the age of two.[31] After six more months they have mastered the preterite, present progressive, and the periphrastic future (*voy a*). At three they actively use the present subjunctive, and three months later they add the imperfect indicative. At four the use of the imperfect progressive and the present progressive with *andar* become established. They add the use of the present progressive with *ir* and the imperfect subjunctive at four years and six months. Other tenses are not mastered before the age of five.

The results are what one would expect, given the assumption that children are learning to fulfill communicative needs.[32] They learn how to refer to the present, then to the past and future, and subsequently acquire modal and aspectual distinctions. In view of the belief that children acquire all the basic grammar of their native language by the age of five,[33] it is interesting to note that the simple tenses cited in the above paragraph are precisely those which have been shown to constitute a minimal communicative grammar (of verb tenses) in Spanish, based on Lope Blanch's study of adult usage. The early appearance of a variety of progressive constructions may point to the desirability of learning them earlier than a minimal grammar would require. Acquiring progressive forms would make the learner's grammar more natural and would be easy to learn given the similarity between English and Spanish progressives.

Comprehension and Other Factors

In adopting a grammar for minimal communicative competence the teacher must also consider how other aspects of the course will be affected. How will the proposals offered above fit into the total course framework, and, more specifically, what course components must be given increased or changed emphasis when the amount of grammar is reduced? Three components to be considered are listening comprehension, vocabulary, and testing.

The practical value of knowing a second language is severely limited if learners do not have skill in listening comprehension which exceeds their speaking ability. We still know very little for sure about how language is understood; however, evidence is accumulating that contextual clues, background knowledge, and the like, play a major role.[34] Foreign language learners apparently pay little or no attention to grammatical signals in a communicative situation; they rely mainly on perceiving the words and using contextual clues to get the meaning. The evidence suggests that it is not necessary to study and practice tenses which are not included in the minimal grammar. At most, irregular future/conditional stems and irregular past participles can be taught as vocabulary. The necessary conditions for developing listening comprehension are that the learners be exposed to a large amount of spoken Spanish (appropriate for their level and with abundant contextual clues, e.g. gestures, visual aids, previous summary of the content, use of proper names, etc.) and be motivated to want to know what they hear. The teacher, visitors, and recordings can supply the spoken language. The topics must be intrinsically interesting, but they should also be followed by testing for comprehension.

Vocabulary is much more at the center of communication, speaking as well as comprehension, than is grammar. It is a common experience of linguists and travelers that they can perform far more effectively in languages in which they have learned a little grammar and an extensive vocabulary than in those in which they have studied a lot of grammar but little practical vocabulary. Although learning words is often thought to be pure drudgery, recent experience with Suggestopedia and other affective learning techniques has shown that vocabulary acquisition can, under the right conditions, be rapid, enjoyable, and lasting.[35] Decisions on what words to use are largely determined by the topic or situation. The teacher should, however, facilitate a wide range of active communication in the early stages by avoiding most synonyms and nearly synonymous expressions, thus reducing the number of non-communicative choices the student has to make.

Appropriate testing is one of the most critical factors in the implementation of course objectives. For students, the goals of a course are defined by the tests, no matter what the teacher says. A traditional discrete-point grammar test will negate much

of the motivational effect of communicative practice in class. (It will also be increasingly difficult to construct within the limits of a minimal grammar.) An oral interview, rating the students' global competence in communication, will better tell the teacher what the students have accomplished, and will show the students that they have been working to attain the real objectives of the course.[36]

The components just discussed do not exhaust the list of considerations involved in designing a communicative course. The teacher must make many creative adaptations of any current textbook. This is not always easy since most authors consider it a virtue to integrate the grammar as much as possible into the readings, dialogues, and other activities of the chapter. The students, with the teacher's guidance, should often create their own language situations. The references made previously to the notional-functional syllabus can provide a framework for planning class objectives and activities.[37] There also exists a fairly abundant literature giving practical suggestions for language acquisition activities.[38]

Conclusion

I have made some specific suggestions for greatly reducing the grammatical load of a beginning Spanish course and have shown that this can be done without abandoning the traditional objective of conversing with nearly native grammatical patterns on some range of topics. This is not to say that all students reach this goal. There is wide variation in accuracy due to differences in their rate of learning. But, by severely limiting grammar content, concentrating on oral responses, self-expression, and the development of listening comprehension, the teacher will find that all students do learn to respond appropriately, express themselves intelligibly, and comprehend what they hear.

Whatever success students achieve in actually communicating in Spanish is a very strong motivating force. Not least among the benefits of having more motivated students is that the teacher's task is more enjoyable.

NOTES

[1]The present article is a revised version of a paper given in Spanish at the third Conference for Foreign Language Teachers at Youngstown State University (Youngstown, Ohio) on November 3, 1979.

[2]Sandra J. Savignon, *Communicative Competence: An Experiment in Foreign-Language Teaching* (Philadelphia: Center for Curriculum Development, 1972), p. 9.

[3]Personal experience has convinced me of the truth of these assertions. They are also Savignon's major conclusions.

[4]For a discussion of the factors which affect our decisions on what to say, see Chapter 5, "The Ethnography of Speaking," in Malcolm Coulthard, *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis* (London: Longman, 1977), pp. 30-51.

[5]Helen P. Warriner, "High School Foreign Language Texts: Too Much Between the Covers to Cover," *Foreign Language Annals,* 11 (1978), 551-57. The problem exists just as much in college texts.

[6]A minimal communicative competence is much the same as the "threshold level" of competence described in the first chapter of J.A. van Ek's *The Threshold Level for Modern Language Learning in Schools* (London: Longman, 1977), pp. 5-13.

[7]Tracy Terrell, "A Natural Aproach to the Teaching of Verb Forms and Function in Spanish," *Foreign Language Annals,* 13 (1980), 129-36. See also Albert Valdman "Communicative Use of Language and Syllabus Design," *Foreign Language Annals,* 11 (1978), 567-78.

[8]For a comparison of the grammar-based syllabus and one designed for a communicative course, see Chapter 1 of D.A. Wilkins' *Notional Syllabuses: A taxonomy and its relevance to foreign language curriculum development* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1976), pp. 1-20.

[9]For further information see Chapter 3, "Varieties of Language," in Muriel Saville-Troike, *The Ethnography of Communication: An Introduction* (Baltimore: University Park Press, 1982), pp. 51-107.

[10]Juan Lope Blanch, "La reducción del sistema verbal en el español de México," in his *Estudios sobre el español de México* (Mexico: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 1972), pp. 141-55. A very useful study by José G. Moreno de Alba, *Valores de las formas verbales en el español de México* (Mexico: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 1978), comes to essentially the same conclusions and includes statistical data on frequency of occurrence of the tenses and frequency of various usages of each tense.

[11]Moreno de Alba finds that two-thirds of the uses of the familiar imperative are attention-getting clichés, such as *mira* (look), *oye* (listen), *fíjate* (note) (p. 116). The imperative, familiar or formal, in Spain as well as in Spanish America, is much less polite, even with *por favor* (please), than in English and other languages; see the discussion by Emilio Lorenzo, "La expresión de ruego y de mandato en español," in his *El español de hoy, lengua en ebullición* (Madrid: Gredos, 1971), pp. 94-107. Lope Blanch also notes that the hortative subjunctive, *entremos,* is frequently replaced by a paraphrase, *vamos a entrar,* or a simple interrogative, *¿entramos?* (p. 143).

[12]According to Moreno de Alba, the future tense has a low frequency of occurrence in spoken Spanish, 0.8% (it is found by William Bull to be over three times more frequent in written sources; see Bull's "Modern Spanish Verb-form Frequencies," *Hispania,* 30 (1947), 451-66). In a study of the expression of future time with indicative forms, the future tense is used only 23% of the time, pre-

sent tense 26%, and *ir a* plus infinitive 51% (Moreno de Alba, p. 92). Lope Blanch observes that the future tense is used most often as a future of probability (p. 145); however, Moreno de Alba finds that the future tense is used in a temporal, not a conjectural, sense 78% of the time (p. 95).

[13]Lope Blanch, pp. 141-55.

[14]Lope Blanch, p. 148, states that the imperfect indicative is sometimes used in all the above circumstances, but especially in the result of conditional sentences; in Moreno de Alba, p. 108, however, only the conditional tense is used in the result clause of conditional sentences.

[15]In order to express the perfective aspect of the latter version, the colloquial language often avails itself of the preterite. In this use, the preterite conveys not its past tense meaning but rather its definite, perfective value by which it contrasts with the imperfect. Thus, in a context of future reference, speaking of something sent by Friday, one can say *para el viernes, ya lo mandé,* or use the paraphrase, *para el viernes, ya lo tengo mandado* (Lope Blanch, p. 143). In Moreno de Alba's study the future perfect occurs only 6 times (out of 15,880), 5 of them with conjectural meaning (p. 100).

[16]The present indicative is also frequent here, *Si yo hubiera estado allí, no pasa nada,* as well as other less common substitutes. The frequency of occurrence of the conditional perfect is only 0.01% according to Moreno de Alba and to Bull.

[17]Juan Lope Blanch, "Sobre el uso del pretérito en el español de México," in his *Estudios sobre el español de México* (Mexico: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 1972), pp. 127-39.

[18]Valdman, p. 578.

[19]Wilkins, p. 18.

[20]James P. Lantolf, "The Variable Constraints on Mood in Puerto-Rican-American Spanish" in ed. Margarita Suñer, *Contemporary Studies in Romance Linguistics* (Washington: Georgetown Univ. Press, 1978), pp. 193-217. Studies on Mexican and Mexican-American varieties of Spanish are also discussed.

[21]Valdman, p. 577.

[22]The use of avoidance as a communication strategy explains why mistakes involving subjunctive do not occur as often as one might predict. See J. Schachter, "An Error in Error Analysis," *Language Learning,* 24 (1974), 205-14.

[23]There is some evidence,however, that subjunctive forms are semantically significant, according to Lantolf, pp. 209-10.

[24]Jack C. Richards, "Error Analysis and Second Language Strategies," in ed. John H. Schumann and Nancy Stenson, *New Frontiers in Second Language Learning* (Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1974), p. 45.

[25]This assumption is basic to the techniques of "error analysis." See, for example, Heidi C. Dulay and Marina K. Burt, "You Can't Learn Without Goofing: An Analysis of Children's Second Language 'Errors'," in ed. Jack C. Richards, *Error Analysis: Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition* (London: Longman, 1974), pp. 95-123.

[26]Derek Bickerton, "Pidginization and Creolization: Language Acquisition and Language Universals," in ed. Albert Valdman, *Pidgin and Creole Linguistics* (Bloomington: Indiana Univ. Press, 1977), pp. 49-69.

[27]John J. Schumann, "Implications of Pidginization and Creolization for the Study of Adult Second Language Acquisition," in ed. John H. Schumann and Nancy Stenson, *New Frontiers in Second Language Learning* (Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1974), p. 140.

[28]For a review of studies see Jeanette Ludwig, "Native-Speaker Judgments of Second-Language Learners' Efforts at Communication: A Review," *The Modern Language Journal,* 66 (1982), 274-83.

[29]Vicki Galloway, "Perceptions of the Communicative Efforts of American Students of Spanish," *The Modern Language Journal,* 64 (1980), 428-33.

[30]See references and discussion in Valdman, "Communicative Use...," p. 575.

[31]Gustavo González, "The Acquisition of Grammatical Structures by Mexican-American Children,"in ed. Eduardo Hernández-Chávez, Andrew D. Cohen and Anthony F. Beltramo, *El lenguaje de los chicanos* (Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1975), pp. 220-37. A form is mastered, or established, when there is a productive rule for it; the form may have been used correctly before, but limited to certain verbs or set expressions.

[32]The thesis that syntax evolves out of conversational (discourse) structures is discussed by Evelyn Hatch, "Discourse Analysis, Speech Acts, and Second Language Learning," in ed. William C. Ritchie, *Second Language Acquisition Research: Issues and Implications* (New York: Academic Press, 1978), pp. 137-55.

[33]Paula Menyuk, *The Acquisition and Development of Language* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1971), p. 6.

[34]See Carol A. Kates, *Pragmatics and Semantics: An Empiricist Theory* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell Univ. Press, 1980), p. 134, for a discussion of studies showing that "the contextual factor is of such fundamental importance that some utterances are virtually unintelligible when taken out of context."

[35]Particularly interesting in this regard are the observations of Earl W. Stevick, *Memory, Meaning and Method: Some Psychological Perspectives on Language Learning* (Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1976).

[36]On the motivational value of proper testing, see Elana Shohamy, "Affective Considerations in Language Testing," *The Modern Language Journal,* 66 (1982), 13-17. See also Savignon, p. 47, for student evaluation of communication tests.

[37]Concerning student imput on syllabus design, see Linda L. Harlow et al., "Student-Perceived Communication Needs: Infrastructure of the Functional/Notional Syllabus," *Foreign Language Annals,* 15 (1982), 11-22.

[38]A recent article is Stephen A. Sadow, "Creative Problem-Solving for the Foreign Language Class," *Foreign Language Annals,* 16 (1983), 115-20. See references cited there for further sources.