

Kielikeskus uutisia

LANGUAGE CENTRE NEWS N:o 2 / HELMIKUU - FEBRUARY 1981

SISÄLTÖ - CONTENTS

RAPORTEJA - REPORTS

- David B. Bullivant - Pirkko Jylhä: "The cart
before the horse?" 4
- David Marsh: Reading skills - Room for improve-
ment 11

TIEDOTUKSIA - INFORMATION

- Lingvistiikan 5. kesäseminaari 16
- AFinLAn uutisia 17

KIELIKESKUSUUTISTEN ARTIKKELIT v. 1980

- Index to articles in Language Centre News 1980 22

ENGLISH SUMMARY

26

VIRKALÄHETYS JYVÄSKYLÄN YLIOPISTOSTA

Osoite / Address:

Korkeakoulujen kielikeskus /

Language Centre for Finnish Universities

Jyväskylän yliopisto / University of Jyväskylä

SF-40100 JYVÄSKYLÄ 10

FINLAND

ISSN 0358-2027

KORKEAKOULUJEN KIELIKESKUS

JYVÄSKYLÄN YLIOPISTO

E D I T O R I A L

Koska Suomen kielikeskukset joutuvat jatkuvasti käyttämään suuren osan energiastaan puhtaasti käytännön opetusjärjestelyistä aiheutuvien ongelmien ratkaisemiseen, tuntuu siltä että aikaa ei mitenkään riitä erityisaloiden kielenopetuksen metodisiin ja teoreettisiin ongelmiin perehtymiseen.

Vaikka erityisaloiden kielenopetus on tavattoman läheisesti sidoksissa käytännön elämään, on tärkeitä luoda sille vankka teoreettinen pohja, jonka avulla opetus voidaan saattaa todella tarkoituksenmukaiseksi. Maailman lisääntyvät ratkaisuaan odottavat kieliongelmat, joita aiheuttavat ammatillinen ja tieteellinen kanssakäyminen yhtä hyvin kuin pakolaiset ja siirtolaisetkin, ovat aiheuttaneet lisääntyvää mielenkiintoa LSP -opetusta kohtaan. Onpa jopa ehdotettu vietettäväksi kansainvälistä kielen opettamisen ja oppimisen nimikkovuotta.

LSP tunnustetaan jo omaksi erityiseksi kielenopetusalueekseen, ja innokasta keskustelua käydään alan metodisista ja teoreettisista ongelmista. LSP on konferenssien aiheena ja uusia nimenomaan erityisaloiden kielenopetukseen erikoistuneita lehtiä on perustettu.

Suomen kielikeskusten antaman erityisaloiden kielenopetuksen teoreettisia kysymyksiä ei ole vielä paljontaan ehditty tutkia. Siksi on tärkeitä ja ilahduttavaa, että käytännön opetustyössä toimivat opettajat ovat innostuneet tuomaan esiin ideoitaan ja näkemyksiään omalta opetus-alaltaan. Tästä ovat esimerkkinä mm. tämän numeron artikkelit - lisäksi on tulossa.

Liisa Korpimies

Vastaava toimittaja / Managing Editor: Liisa Korpimies

Toimituskunta / Editorial Staff:

Eva May
Sirkka Laihiala-Kankainen
Liisa Ruuska
Timo Sikanen
Helena Valtanen
Sinikka Lampinen

Puh. / Tel. 941-292880 Korpimies

292881 Lampinen, Korpela

292882 Laihiala-Kankainen

292883 Nikko

292884 May, Utriainen, Valtanen

292885 Ruuska, Sikanen

292886 Koponen

RAPORTEJA - REPORTS

David B. Bullivant and Pirkko Jylhä
Helsinki University Language Centre

"THE CART BEFORE THE HORSE?"

Problems with getting learners' response to language exercises in the language laboratory (L.L.) has often been discussed. The latest comments about this subject would appear to be those by Paul Kostera in *Tempus*, 5/80.

First, perhaps we should consider our phraseology. By using the more usual term, in Finland, "kielistudio", we are, it is felt, misnaming the exciting place which these authors feel should be likened to a laboratory, a place where experiments and thrilling things can happen. Accordingly, "L.L." will be used in this article and not "K.S.". The other benefit of using the chosen short form is that it lends itself perfectly to the other description of the L.L. - namely "learning laboratory". In a laboratory, learners have the chance to experiment, find out how things work, what makes the world of, say, language, tick: in this context language is the thing "to be proved".

Secondly, it is felt that the learner is far too hedged about with restrictions. When asking a friend to tell you about an Irwin Goodman song you have just heard, you would not provide him with a period of three minutes in which he has to answer your question before you fire another question at your friend - you would not peer at your watch and even when he has finished telling you what the song was about you would not then leave him waiting in silence while the prescribed three minutes have passed. No, we do not give "response time" in real life so why is it given in the L.L.? Why subject the language learner to this barbaric method? This leads quite naturally to the amount of trust a teacher is prepared to give the learner. Using language needs confidence and confidence is not created by giving learners a "timed response period" in the L.L. or in the language classroom.

It has been found that very much confidence can be built up in the L.L. and the language classroom by giving the learners trust, by allowing the learner to move at his own ability speed. In the classroom this is fostered by arranging the room so that learners can work together in pairs, threes,

fours and small groups. The teacher is then able to circulate and give personal help where and when needed. It allows the learner to try among his fellows and to share the thrilling experience of producing language without the fear of making mistakes. Mistakes must be allowed to occur. But, removal of the fear of making a mistake will only engender more output from the learner. The method is as described by Kalevi Vainioranta & David Bullivant (2) and can be used successfully with the youngest of learners all the way up to adulthood and beyond, with variation.

In the L.L. application the learner does not work with his friends, instead each learner is faced with a "private teacher" - the pupil machine - and the learner must be encouraged to work with his personal teacher on this wonderful "one-to-one" basis. The learner must, by definition, be provided with the chance to give the best he can. If the "personal teacher" suddenly advises his charge that three minutes of silence will follow during which time the learner must say something about a song he has just heard we are straight away taking over complete control of the learners' output. It is not natural.

It would appear that something is wrong with the current methodology: which came first - the chicken or the egg?

Are L.L. programmes, the software, being prepared to satisfy the available technology, the hardware, or the actual learner, the liveware? This, surely, is where the teacher worthy of that title should be concentrating his thoughts.

Producers of L.L. programmes, commercial outlets as well as those producing "in house" materials, are often guilty of working down to the lowest common denominator instead of aiming higher. So long as teachers remain satisfied with a simple "listen and repeat" formula the makers of the hardware will not need to develop their product. It would appear that the teacher gets the hardware he deserves, but all too often this is not what the end user of the L.L., namely the learner, needs. On the other hand, some currently available hardware allows total involvement by the learner, but it is clear that advantage is not taken of these facilities by the majority of teachers. In this sort of environment, the "problem" will remain: it will not go away on its own.

It has been found (2) that better response can be obtained from the learners when they are allowed to "run their own show" but this can only

happen if the learner is given:

- a pre-recorded programme to work on in the L.L.;
- the chance to use his own channel for "open ended" response;
- confidence and trust in using the combined "software/hardware" provided which will enable him to develop his own self-confidence in the target language.

The first of these basic requirements can be met by either having available a battery of pre-recorded tapes so that each learner can be given a complete programme to use on his "private teacher", or, in the case that the hardware has a "hi-speed pre-record facility", the programme should be ready on the learners' tapes when they come into the L.L.: in each case a complete and ready programme is advocated so that the learner can move forward at his own "ability speed" and not at some convenient speed thought of by the teacher.

These two points are considered to be very important. If "learning time" is used by the teacher to transmit the programme on to the "M" channel of the learners' machines it is time wasted, the learner is too pressurised by the oncoming programme and is, in consequence, under undue stress and his performance is restricted - like a performing tiger in a circus at the beg and call of the trainer's whip and poking stick.

The first of the three requirements mentioned above will clearly create the need for having thousands of tapes bought, pre-recorded and stored ready for use. If the L.L. in use is a twenty-place setup, then it simply means that there should be 20 pre-recorded tapes for each and every programme used in that institution. The logistics of this is daunting. The cost in materials and pre-recording time is also immense.

The alternative is preferred - that of having a "hi-speed" pre-record facility built into the hardware. But how many teachers working in the L.L. have this facility provided? It would appear that currently available hardware is so equipped, but there are still a lot of teachers using antiquated equipment to the detriment of their learners. And to the detriment of the teacher's skills.

It should also be remembered that all too often the buyer of the hardware has little or no idea of the end users' requirements, although in this the buyer today is presented with machines that go some way to allowing better end user use, and the actual makers state that they take into account the comments made by their "consultant teacher". However, although this is a

hesitant step taken in the right direction, it is still felt that there should be more use made of end user requirement.

Already the problem has grown: no longer can the basic question, "which came first, the chicken or the egg?" be used. Today we have non-L.L. users, non-language teachers actually buying the equipment the teacher has to use and for which commercial programmes may, or may not, be available. A whole chain has been created. And who suffers? The learner, because today, in spite of technological progress, so many L.L. activities are based on ye olde formula, "listen and repeat". Any wonder thinking teachers admit to problems!

"Hi-speed" pre-recording here means the transmission of a Master programme from the teachers' unit simultaneously to the learners' units so that the transmission time is dramatically shortened. This means that a 30-minute working programme can be transmitted in a quarter of that time, i.e. seven and a half minutes. Modern technology allows all this to happen at the touch of a button - little physical effort needed on the part of the teacher. Naturally, transmitting equipment and receivers must be synchronised. When the learners come in, the equipment is switched to "normal speed" and each individual learner has his private teacher programmed and can get down to work. But the software should be of the type that enables the learner to grow in the target language: it should not be "teacher dominated" but should allow the learner to move at his own pace so that those basic requirements of confidence in the target language can be realised. This whole question of pre-recording has been covered and examples of better programming mentioned previously (3).

The hardware should also be provided with a facility so that the learner can switch off the sound coming from the Master channel and there should also be a method of switching off the Student channel so that the learner can individually select the channel or channels. The benefits of being able to switch off the teacher's channel and vice versa are manifold. The principal idea of language learning is to allow the learner to express himself in that target language, but all too often teaching methodology when allied to the "LABORATORY" facility only inhibit the learner from expressing himself. Is this where the "problem" starts?

The sometimes timed, or more often randomly provided spaces of silence provided on the Master channel for the use of the learners' responses is a basic demonstration of a 'teacher dominated' environment. Not only that, the spaces are wasteful of tape, prerecording time, and the rest. The timed res-

ponse capsule will only lead the learner into a "panic stations" situation which is far from allowing the learner to build up his confidence in the language. It may succeed in building up confidence in DEALING with the teacher-provided programme while in the L.L. - what is your aim? Reverting to the previously mentioned example - the learner listens to a song in Finnish on the tape and then their English friend, who was also listening to the same song, asks, "Well, and what was that song all about then -- nice melody, but what was it all about?" An adult native speaker could jump straight in and fill three minutes of provided silence with the required information, so why should learners of another language be subjected to this sort of teacher-induced torture? Instead, the answer should be recorded by the learner on to his own channel in his own time and at his own speed, with the possibility of going back and checking out how it sounds so that the whole response can be built up using the latent skills the learner undoubtedly has.

The song should be provided on the "M" channel, along with the question from the friend who wanted to know what it was all about. The learner should then be able to switch from the "S + M" situation to the purely "S" channel, noting at the same time the meter reading, and then giving a report of what the song was about, building it up as necessary. The learner can then back-track to the noted meter reading and check his answer out very carefully, even going back to re-listen to the song on the "M" channel as required. When the answer has been checked and corrected to the best of the learners' ability, the learner can then back-track to the noted meter reading and select the "M" channel (so silencing the "S" programme) and listen to the next thing there is to do.

In the quoted example, the answer which would be regarded as "natural" would perhaps start like this: "well, er, yes - let me see now - well, you see the singer is telling us about, what do you call it, now?, well, sort of" but the response the "programmed silence" requires is something unnatural, something from a computer! Is this where the problem of learner-response comes from?

Using this methodology, it is possible to provide a programme which occupies but a few minutes of "real time", a lot less time when transmitted at "hi-speed", but which will provide the learner with a full hour of real work. And, no matter if the learner never reaches the end of the programme because in this methodology we are getting away from the "teacher dominated" learner. A "faster" learner might have reached the end of the programme and he will ask his friends if they reached the same programme ...

this will also encourage the "slower" learner to develop his skills more so that he too can reach the interesting programme at the end of the tape. In short, confidence and ability can be built up naturally and at the learner's own pace. Thinking of the given example above, if a verbal translation is what you want you are not really giving your tigers a good run in a more natural environment, instead you are forcing them to jump through a hoop of your own making. Keep cracking the whip and the problems will never be overcome.

This approach to L.L. sessions allows the teacher so much more freedom to listen to learner production, to help and guide individual learners with their personal problems - work starts from the word "go" and not when the teacher has finished transmitting a "sort of" programme under the teacher's perfect control, at the teacher-induced speed. Or looked at another way, language drills should not be like parade square drills with the whole squad marching and countermarching all in perfect step. Such rote can be used in the classroom - the L.L. should be the place where fantasy can take wing, where real production can be allowed to happen, where exciting discoveries can be made.

There is no doubt that the L.L. is a wonderful tool for teachers and learners. However, like any other tool, it needs careful use and its uses need investigating and developing. And the actual buyers need to be told what is needed and such requirements should also be made known to the manufacturer so that development can go forward to the ultimate benefit of the usually overlooked learner: the end user.

It is understood that many schools in Finland today have language laboratory facilities but they are purely "AP" or at best, "AA" orientated. What a shameful waste! How much more beneficial it would be to have children speaking the "new language" onto their own tapes so they can hear their own voices - what a thrill it is for a child to "play with a tape recorder" but it would appear that the buyer, or is it the teacher, wants to deny the children this pleasure. How dull to sit and listen - how much more fun to be able to take part! And language learning should be fun. There is available hardware which has the learners' actual machines stacked behind the teacher and the learner has remote control over his own machine from his booth. In this case, the teacher can easily "pre-load" the learners' machines with pre-recorded cassettes as required. This hardware removes the actual moving bits from the fingers of the eager junior mechanic in most small children. And, it provides the children with the chance of enjoying their foreign language learning.

Having grown up with proper L.L. learning the young person will have also grown up in language ability, so enabling further education to follow naturally along familiar, well-known paths. At the present we are producing generations of passive listeners who then become language computers who then find that that sort of ability is not appreciated in university language studies when facing the native speaker teacher for the first time. It is our contention that the "native speaker" should be presented to the learner at the earliest possible time in his life in the form of a "private teacher": a personal tape deck properly programmed.

If teachers were to develop their own presentations and tell other teachers about their "tricks of the trade" we may yet be able to apply some pressure on the makers of the hardware to meet our needs and those of our learners and, even more importantly, we may be able to persuade the buyer what is best rather than what is cheap and restrictive. This would also extend to the makers of commercially available software so that together, end user, teacher, buyer and programme maker, hardware, software and live-ware could all combine to make L.L. learning what it should be.

Trying to "solve problems" based on the present parameters is to approach the whole question from the wrong end - a simple case of putting the cart before the horse.

References:

- Paul Kostera: *Tempus* 5/80, "Puheohjelmat eli kielistudion kommunikointiharjoitukset".
- Kalevi Vainioranta & David Bullivant: *System* Vol. 2, No. 3, Oct. 74, "Group Working in the Language Classroom".
- David Bullivant: *System* Vol. 7, pp. 117-124, 1979, "Games People Play in the Language Laboratory or 'The Punch and Judy Show'".

David Marsh
Oulu University Language Centre

READING SKILLS - ROOM FOR IMPROVEMENT

There can be little doubt that reading-efficiency is of foremost importance for the learner of predominantly technical language. Yet commonly used curricula rarely cater for the teaching of "reading skills", as opposed to general reading proficiency. The former being equally relevant for an overall improvement of reading-efficiency in L_1 and L_2 . A similar problem exists with teaching the learner the specific skills required for "listening" efficiently and economically. Does one assume that

- a) students at university level have already acquired reading/listening skills through their years at school?
- b) that such skills are certain to be increasingly developed as the student is exposed to L_2 ?

If the answers to a and b are affirmative, is there room for improvement? Does the language teacher bear any responsibility for the possible improvement of these techniques? If negative, can we hypothesize that one particular education system may fail in this area as opposed to another?

The aim of this article (Part 1) is to act as a stimulus for discussion, offering a logical basis and suggested approach for improvement of technical L_2 learners' reading skills. Part 2 will concentrate on aspects of listening, exploring the possible vacuum existing within the curricula allied with suggestions for practical exercises to overcome this void.

The demand for various language skills may draw heavily on both oral/aural and writing abilities at different times. The need for efficient reading is likely to be the most consistent during involvement with L_2 . It would appear from my own experience at Oulu that students with about eight years of English tuition at school are able to cope with a rather limited silent reading intake (approx. 50-140 words per minute). The English curriculum followed in schools fails to provide for the needs of a student entering the technical sciences by omitting studies of technical discourse.

If the study-procedure to which he is reintroduced at university level (Technical sciences) involves the reading, memorising and repetition of specific "factual" technical data/material, then this is likely to be

of conflicting interest to the teaching of reading in itself. That is, skills of deduction, evaluation and reasoning may be neglected in the L₁ situation (lectures, seminars, reading materials). This should be the focus of attention in the L₂ situation in which a more critical approach may be crucial towards a fuller understanding of texts.

Technical material is usually prepared with only L₁ readers in mind. Such material certainly lacks elements of textual simplification, offering little prior warning of the style(s) used (e.g. Structural versus Functional). Technical students have indicated that for them the aim of learning L₂ is to broaden vocabulary and extend their oral abilities. If the teacher shares this view, then it is likely that focus on rhetorical functions may be further neglected. Equally lacking may be the consequent low level of overall conceptualisation in the academic area of L₁. The danger of a student generalising from the specific to the general or using prior knowledge to answer a question which he has not fully understood is all too common. The ability to read a text quickly (300 wpm silent reading) and to acknowledge the amalgamation of the various rhetorical acts and overall cohesion of a text should be taught in our language lessons. I am therefore assuming that these skills do not only depend on a learner having a high general standard of L₂ proficiency but also on his being taught how to read efficiently. As employed-graduates, L₂ learners may constantly be coming into contact with texts ranging from technical manuals to quasi-technical advertising/promotional material. Therefore our L₂ learners should have the ability to approach and read specialised English written material with discerning minds.

It is quite evident that technical English shows a higher frequency of certain grammatical, lexical and overall rhetorical features, resulting in a deviation from standard English. A wide range of textbooks clearly exploit these differences as do researchers and writers concentrating in this field. Unfortunately too many of these coursebooks either over-simplify the text or adopt non-specific "sciences" material (e.g. New Scientist extracts) which do not represent the kind of language common to hard-core technological texts. It would appear that the textbook either may often alter certain rhetorical features which are complex, even though they are common in "untreated" material.

The communicative function of textual material could be introduced to the learner at an early stage, using the following criteria¹⁾:

- A) non-specialist
- B) specialist; informal (e.g. Laboratory notes)
- C) specialist; semi-formal (e.g. Lecture notes)
- D) specialist; formal (e.g. written notes)

combined with material extracted from these possible sources -

- A) Advertising/Promotional
- B) Technical manuals
- C) Formal reports
- D) Hypothetical academic
- E) Discursive writing
- F) General Informational material

Once identification and understanding of the function of such categories has taken place, the appropriate "reading skills" can be explored in class. These could be defined in the following way:

- 1) Discipline-specific skills, concerned with data extraction and patterning in a particular area.
- 2) General organisational skills, concerned with overall presentation and manipulation of data in many areas.
- 3) Linguistic skills.

One major hindrance preventing improvement in reading proficiency which affects the L₂ learner stems from allowing lexical inadequacies to block overall comprehension - which in turn results from a step-by-step approach solely aimed at increasing vocabulary range with some emphasis on grammar. Yet the Finnish L₂ learners' familiarisation with technical terminology is often extensive, especially considering the number of "borrowed" words incorporated into Finnish technical language. It is the use of rhetorical terms that is so often neglected in both textbook and classroom. And it is ignorance of these factors which seriously interferes with both efficient reading and accurate understanding of texts.

This poses a major deviation from teaching EFL to approaching specific idiomatic or rhetorical organisation as it relates to the subject area (ESP). The function of cohesive and organisational elements in any of the texts typified above, should perhaps be introduced in a well-structured

1) Straker Cook 1977

way. For example one could adopt a progressive approach, as follows:

TEXT

Concerned mainly with:¹⁾

"factual information"	"hypothetical/experimental information"
Definition	Problem-solving
Classification	Hypothesis
Description	Experimental procedure
Instruction	Consolidation
Consolidation (summary)	Induction and Generalisation
	Deduction and Generalisation

- NOTING - tense usage (e.g. continuous vs simple tense forms)
 use of relative/demonstrative pronouns and demonstrative adjectives etc.
 use of relative clauses; choice of articles
 logical connectors/boundary markers
- PREPARING - sub-division of text (into physical paragraphs)
 sub-division of text (into conceptual paragraphs)
 short summary of paragraphs/text
 distinction between information-bearing and reference statements.
- DEFINING - Rhetorical Techniques
 expression of cause and effect
 analogy
 exemplification
 comparison
 contrast
 illustration
 space order
 time order

Having established this basis of reference, recognition of common rhetorical functions can be taught through a series of exercises. Any comprehensive list would include examples of: antonym, classification (implicit and explicit), description (physical, function process), explication, definition (formal, operational implicit, explicit), one-to-one correspondence, one-to-more-than-one correspondence, partition, presupposition, stipulation, synonym including recognition of the core generalisation of paragraphs, criterion of difference and acknowledgement of what acts as "supporting information".

¹⁾ A. Dudley-Evans et al

It is not necessary to define the above-mentioned rhetorical functions, techniques and terms in this article. An improved understanding of rhetorical terminology demands teaching time if our L₂ learner is to complement his L₁ specialist skills. This type of sequence is only intended to indicate one possible example of rhetorical hierarchy. It is the introduction to these features that can enable the learner to acquire a more profitable and economical ability to read technical texts. It would seem that concentration on simplified or other forms of "treated" material, focusing only on grammar and vocabulary may constitute a grave disservice to the technical sciences language learner.

References:

- Straker Cook R.H.: A rhetorical-communicative approach to syllabus design in ESP in English for Academic Purposes 1977.
- Higgins J.C.: Study skills course 1974. EAP 1977.
- Clearly J.: Science teaching in a second-language situation. ELT Documents 75/2.
- Dudley-Evans A. et al: Aspects of the writing and teaching of EST courses. ELT Documents 75/2.
- Trimble R. & L.: Presuppositional information in EST discourses. TESOL Quarterly September 1976.

TIEDOTUKSIA - INFORMATION

LINGVISTIIKAN 5. KESÄSEMINAARI

Lingvistiikan kesäseminaari järjestetään Jyväskylän yliopistossa 1.-5.6.1981, jos seminaariin järjestämiseen saadaan tarpeelliset varat. Seminaari on tarkoitettu ensisijaisesti yliopistojen ja korkeakoulujen kielten ja kielitieteen laitosten opettajakunnalle ja jatko-opiskelijoille. Lingvistiikan kesäseminaarin tavoitteena on edistää kieliaineiden ja erityisesti ns. uusien kielten jatko-opetusta ja tutkijakoulutusta.

Opetus koostuu koti- ja ulkomaisten luennoitsijoiden pitämistä kielitieteen eri tutkimusalueita käsittelevistä luentosarjoista. Luennoitsijoiksi ovat lupautuneet *Christopher Brumfit* Lontoon yliopistosta (soveltava kielitiede), *Per Linell* Uppsalan yliopistosta (teoreettinen kielitiede) ja *Robert J. DiPietro* Delawaren yliopistosta (teoreettinen ja soveltava kielitiede). Luentojen lisäksi järjestetään erityisaloilta seminaarityypistä työskentelyä pienryhmissä kotimaisten ja/tai ulkomais-ten asiantuntijoiden johdolla.

Jotta järjestäjät saisivat tiedon osanottajamäärästä ja siitä, minkä alojen pienryhmiä on tarpeen järjestää, pyydetään seminaarista kiinnostuneita lähettämään alustava ilmoittautuminen s. 27 olevalla lomakkeella 20.3. mennessä osoitteella Lingvistiikan kesäseminaari, Englannin kielen laitos, Jyväskylän yliopisto, 40100 Jyväskylä 10. Lisätietoja antaa tarvittaessa Salme Vaaraniemi, puh. 941-291626.

Lopullinen ilmoittautuminen tapahtuu toukokuun alussa. Ohjelma lähetetään kaikille alustavasti ilmoittautuneille.

AFinLAn UUTISIA

AILAn kongressi Lundissa 9.-15.8.1981

Lundin kongressista on nyt tullut kolmas yleistiedote, jonka yhteydessä on myös varsinainen ilmoittautumislomake. Sen ovat jo saaneet kaikki ennakolta ilmoittautuneet suoraan Lundista. Muut kongressista kiinnostuneet voivat pyytää ilmoittautumislomakkeita AFinLAn sihteeriltä Anne Räsäselältä, puh. 941-254314 (os. Emännäntie 23 D 23, 40740 Jyväskylä 74). Tässä poimintoja tiedotteesta:

Scientific Programme

AILA Lund 1981

The theme of the Congress is *Language and Society* and the scientific programme focuses on practical language problems and the linguistic methods and theories which may help to solve them. Language teaching is an old and important area, but the modern world also faces several other problems for applied linguistics.

Keynote address

The keynote address will be given at the Official Opening on Sunday evening, August 9, by Bertil Malmberg, former president of AILA and Professor of the University of Lund.

Lectures

The morning programme includes plenary and special lectures where invited specialists treat problems of general or specific interest. Special lectures run parallel to satisfy the different interests of the audience.

The preliminary programme for plenary and special lectures includes

- Gillian Brown:** *The teaching of spoken language*
- Aaron Cicourel:** *Language and the structure of belief in medical communication*
- Eva Gärding:** *Phonetic research and language teaching*
- Hans Karlgren:** *Computer-aided translation*
- Stephen Krashen:** *Language acquisition and language pathology*
- Thomasz Krzeszowski:** *Quantitative contrastive analysis*
- Jürgen Meissl:** *Variation in learners' interlanguages*
- Wilga M. Rivers:** *Apples of gold in pictures of silver: Where have all words gone?*
- Merril Swaine:** *Bilingual education for majority and minority language children*

Symposia

The morning programme will also feature two symposia (panel discussions):

Evelyn Hatch (moderator): *Discourse analysis and language learning*

Charles Ferguson (moderator): *International languages and the vernaculars*

Workshops

Workshops are being planned on the following topics:

Interlanguage,

The language of public documents,

Language projects of the Council of Europe.

Sections

The AILA 81 Second Announcement distributed in March, 1980, included a call for papers. The deadline for submission was August 1, 1980.

Some 350 papers will be presented at the Congress on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday between 2 and 5 p.m. The authors have 25 minutes at their disposal, including discussion. After each session, 5 minutes are allowed for moving between different locations.

The section papers will deal with the 14 topics, as listed in previous announcements:

- 1 **FIRST LANGUAGE LEARNING AND TEACHING**
Development and learning of the first language (the mother tongue); child language; teaching the spelling, vocabulary and grammar of the mother tongue to children and adults.
- 2 **METHODS IN SECOND LANGUAGE TEACHING**
Classroom methods and approaches to second and foreign language instruction termed direct, indirect, natural, functional, explicit, communicative, etc.
- 3 **PROGRESSION IN SECOND LANGUAGE LEARNING**
The process of language acquisition, the learners' interlanguages or approximative systems.
- 4 **ERROR ANALYSIS AND CONTRASTIVE LINGUISTICS**
Qualitative and quantitative aspects of errors in pronunciation, morphology, vocabulary, syntax and text-building; explanation of errors by reference to the source language; comparative and typological language studies deriving from pedagogical problems.
- 5 **EVALUATION AND TESTING**
Measurements and tests of first and second language proficiency, written and oral production, perception and comprehension, vocabulary, grammar, discourse; testing techniques; diagnostic methods; statistics.

- 6 **TEACHING MATERIALS, TEXT BOOKS AND PEDAGOGICAL GRAMMARS**
Presentation of languages for pedagogical purposes, choice of progression, vocabulary and grammar, design of pedagogical grammars; curriculum design; teacher training.
- 7 **LANGUAGE TEACHING AND TECHNOLOGY**
Design and development of language laboratories, computerized teaching systems.
- 8 **LANGUAGE FOR SPECIFIC PURPOSES**
Pedagogical problems in teaching sublanguages, languages of restricted fields, linguistic performance in certain practical situations, language games in instruction.
- 9 **TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETING**
Practical and theoretical problems of translation between languages, comparative studies of languages with a view to translation, studies of the process of interpreting, the use of computers in translation.
- 10 **TERMINOLOGY AND LEXICOGRAPHY**
Practical and theoretical problems of terms, dictionary projects, word and text processing by computer.
- 11 **PRODUCTION AND COMPREHENSION**
Psycholinguistic production and comprehension models, discourse and text linguistics, the readability of texts, language disorders.
- 12 **COMMUNICATION PROBLEMS IN SOCIETY**
Sociological aspects of verbal and non-verbal communication; problems related to social class, profession, cultural background, sex; problems of communication between authorities and the public; consumer linguistics; communication in organizations.
- 13 **BILINGUALISM AND IMMIGRANTS' LANGUAGE PROBLEMS**
Psychological and sociological advantages or disadvantages of bilingualism, the language problems of migrants, teaching of immigrants.
- 14 **LANGUAGE PLANNING AND POLICY**
International problems of languages, national languages, the choice of alphabets and official languages, problems of standardization, language variation, language loyalty, language imperialism, auxiliary languages.

Registration

All participants of the Congress must register by filling in the registration form and paying the registration fee, including those who have already sent in a preliminary registration form or in other ways have expressed interest in participating. Registration forms are distributed with the Third Announcement and additional copies can be obtained from the Congress Office.

Registration fees

The registration fees vary according to the date of registration as follows:

	before March 1, 1981	after March 1, 1981
Active participant:		
AILA member	600 SEK	750 SEK
non-AILA member	700 SEK	850 SEK
Accompanying person (over 16)	200 SEK	300 SEK

Payment should be made by bank transfer to AILA 81, PK-banken, Box 1055, S-221 04 Lund, Sweden, to the credit of account number 3029 36 43 180 with clear indication of participant's name and address. Please add bankers' charges. The current rate of exchange is approximately four Swedish crowns (SEK) to one US dollar.

The registration fee for active participants includes:

- The Proceedings, including both *AILA 81: Sections and Workshops*, i.e. abstracts of section and workshop papers, and *AILA 81: Plenary Lectures, Special Lectures and Symposium Papers*.
- The Congress Programme
- Admission to the scientific programme
- Box lunches on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday
- Invitation to the social programme including
 - the Official Opening and Reception, Sunday
 - the Get-Together Party, Monday
 - some activities on the evening devoted to the arts, Tuesday
 - the Farewell Dance, Friday.

The registration fee for accompanying persons includes:

- Invitation to the social programme (see above)
- Visits to local museums, industries and institutions.

Cancellation

For cancellations reaching the Congress Office before June 1, the registration fee minus 100 SEK will be refunded. For cancellations received later, the amount to be refunded will be decided and returned after the Congress.

Publications, including the Congress Programme as well as the Proceedings, will be distributed also to those who have cancelled their participation.

Accommodation

A large number of hotel rooms in the Lund-Malmö region have been reserved for the Congress participants. The frequent local bus and train service provides convenient transportation to and from Malmö (about 15 minutes each way). Some transport to and from Congress events will be provided for participants accommodated in Malmö.

All participants are advised to reserve rooms in advance through the Congress Office, since there will be very few other possibilities available. A deposit of 250 SEK per person must be paid for the reservation to be effected. This amount will be deducted from the final bill. No refund can be made for late cancellations.

Preferences for accommodation should be indicated on the registration form and will be handled on a first-come-first-served basis. Please note that double rooms can only be booked if clear indication of the name of the roommate is given. For participants registering after June 1, no guarantee concerning accommodation can be given. Special efforts will be made to find inexpensive accommodation for student participants. Proof of student status will be required. The following alternatives will be available:

	Price per room in SEK excl. breakfast	
	Single	Double
A. First class hotel	260-300	330-390
B. First class motel (requires car)	190-220	240-270
C. Tourist class hotel	130-170	175-240
D. Student halls of residence (Lund only)	125-150	175-225
E. Private accommoda- tion (Lund only)	80-100	130-150

Address for all correspondence:
 AILA 81, University of Lund,
 Box 1703, S 221 01 Lund, Sweden.

HUOM! AFinLAN jäsenet ovat myös AILAn jäseniä.

xx

KIELIKESKUSUUTISTEN ARTIKKELIT v 1980

Index to articles in Language Centre News 1980

<u>I Raportteja</u>	N:o/No. s/p
Rolf Ehnert: Jahrestagung Deutsch als Fremdsprache	6/15
Stephen Evans: Something new under the sun: spoken English for teacher trainees	2/7
Maarit Hakkarainen: Suggestopedia kielten opettajille	6/9
Ritva Korhonen: Recension av projektrapporten optimering av svenskt uttal	5/13
Liisa Kurki-Suonio: Korkeakoulujen kielikeskusten koulutuspäivät 3.-5.9.1980	6/17
Liisa Kurki-Suonio: Tampereen yliopiston kielikeskus	8/4
Leena Kuure - David Marsh: On the increased manipulation of diagrammatically informational material in the teaching of a language for specific purposes	8/9
Arja-Liisa Kyyrönen: Kuopion korkeakoulun opiskelijoiden asennoitumisesta vieraan kielen opetukseen	4/8
Lea-Liisa Lahti: Ei mitään uutta auringon alla - ei edes ääntämisen opetuksessa	1/3
Lea-Liisa Lahti: Makuasioista ei kannata kiistellä - Eli mitä keinoksi keskustelunopetuksessa	5/3

	N:o/No. s/p
Matti Leivo: AFinLAN 10-vuotisjuhlasymposium "Mitä odotan kielentutkimukselta ja/tai -opetukselta"	8/16
Pirkko Lindqvist: Kielistudioamanuenssipäivät Lappeenrannassa 21.-22.8.1980	6/17
Irma Majander - Terttu Nevalainen: Kokemuksia itseopiskelutoiminnasta: raportti mielipidetiedustelusta	6/3
Mary McDonald-Rissanen and John Clarkson: Impressions of the Lammi conference, March 24-25, 1980	4/3
Tony Melville: Further impressions of Lammi	5/7
Mikä on korkeakoulujen kielikeskus	7/4
Anna-Liisa Mäenpää: Kirjallisen viestinnän kurssi: keskeiset oppisisällöt ja opetusalojen mukainen eriyttämisen tarve	2/3
Anne Räsänen: AFinLA symposium 23.-25.11.1979 Hanasaarella	1/8
Anne Räsänen: Raportti AFinLAN asiantuntijaseminaarista: Koulujen kielenopetuksen tuloksellisuus ja tulosten mittaaminen	4/6
Kari Sajavaara: Psykolingvistiikan seminaari	1/12
Leena Sopenlehto - Anita Ros - Leena Kreutzman: Suullisen kielitaidon opetus tutkinnonuudistuslain puitteissa	5/16
Ritva Stark: Neuvottelu viestinnän yleisopinnoista	1/9
Suggestopedia Unkarissa	5/12
Marjatta Vanhala-Aniszewski: Venäjän kielen kevätseminaari	5/9
Marjatta Ylönen: Ruotsin kielen taitovaatimukset uusissa korkeakoulututkinnoissa	3/3
<u>II Katsauksia - Reviews</u>	
Michael Pickering: Anna-Liisa Leino: Kielididaktiikka	8/20
<u>III Tiedotuksia - Information</u>	
AFinLAN johtokunta 1980	4/12
AFinLAN tiedotuksia	6/24 7/24 8/23

	N:o/No. s/p
AFinLAn uutisia	
AFinLAn vuosikokous 1980	1/16
AFinLAn symposium 1980	1/16
6th AILA World Congress, Lund, August 9-15, 1981	1/17
Call for Papers on "Empirical Research on Language Teaching and Language Acquisition"	1/17
AFinLAn uutisia	2/14
AILA Summer Institute in applied linguistics	4/16
British Council Courses for Teachers of English	
Colloquium on Language Laboratories	6/23
English Language Research Journal	3/9
Institute for English Language Education Courses, Lancaster	6/22
8. Jahrestagung Deutsch als Fremdsprache	3/8
Jahrestagung Deutsche als Fremdsprache 1980	4/10
Kielikeskukseen saapunutta kirjallisuutta - Publications received by the Language Centre for Finnish Universities	1/18 2/14 4/18 5/21
Kielikeskusuutisten artikkelit v. 1979 - Index to articles in Language Centre News 1979	2/15
Korkeakoulujen kielikeskuksen koulutuspäivät	1/13
Korkeakoulujen kielikeskuksen koulutuspäivät 4.-5.9.1980	4/18
Korkeakoulujen kielikeskuksen syksyn koulutuspäivät	5/21
Korkeakoulujen kielikeskuksen tiedotuksia	6/25 7/27
Koulutuspäiväraportti	5/21
Lexicography Summer School	1/15
Lingvistiikan 4. kesäseminaari	2/11
M.A. in Applied English Linguistics	3/9
Muutos kielikeskusuutisten julkaisupolitiikassa	1/14
Pergamon Institute courses	4/18
Puhetta korvaavia kieliä käsittelevä seminaari	3/7
Puškin-instituutti tiedottaa	5/19
RELC Regional Seminar, Singapore	7/23

	N:o/No. s/p
Stilistiikan päivät Oulussa	6/21
Suomen kielistudionyhdistyksen toiminta uudelleen käyntiin	3/7
Suomen kielistudionyhdistyksen vuosikokous	2/11
The British Council Courses	4/17
The Training of Foreign Language Oral Skills	3/8
Uusia nauhoja	5/25
Vacation courses at the University of Cambridge	2/12
Äänite- ja kopiointipalvelun tiedotuksia	1/14
6th AILA world congress, Lund, August 9-15, 1981	4/13

ENGLISH SUMMARY

The practice and theory of LSP is discussed in the editorial. It seems evident that language teaching for specific purposes has become increasingly important in today's world with its many unsolved language conflicts. Although LSP has close ties to practical life, it should not be forgotten that a sound theoretical background is needed to make language teaching successful.

INFORMATION

The Fifth Summer School in Linguistics

The Fifth Summer School in Linguistics will be held at the University of Jyväskylä 1.-5.6.1981, provided that necessary funding will be obtained. The seminar is primarily intended for the members of language and linguistics departments in universities and university-level institutions as well as for post-graduate students.

The programme of the seminar consists of series of lectures covering various fields in linguistics. Lectures will be given by Christopher Brumfit of the University of London (Applied Linguistics), Per Linell of the University of Uppsala (Theoretical Linguistics) and Robert J. DiPietro of the University of Delaware (Applied and Theoretical Linguistics). In addition to lectures, special fields will be covered by small-group work under the supervision of native and/or foreign experts.

In order to get information about the number of participants and their special areas of interest, the arrangers hope that those interested in the seminar will use the preliminary entry form on p.27 and send it by 20.3. to Summer School in Linguistics, English Department, University of Jyväskylä, 40100 Jyväskylä 10. Final registration will take place in the beginning of May. The programme will be sent to those who have returned the preliminary entry form.

For further information, please contact Salme Vaaraniemi, English Department, tel. 941-291262.

AFinLA Announcements

AILA World Congress in Lund, August 9.-15.8.1981. For further details see p. 17-22. For entry forms and further information, please contact Anne Räsänen, AFinLA Secretary, tel. 941-254314

Please note: The members of AFinLA are also members of AILA.

ALUSTAVA ILMOITTAUTUMINEN

Lingvistiikan 5. kesäseminaariin

Ilmoittaudun alustavasti Lingvistiikan 5. kesäseminaariin

Nimi _____

Oppiarvo tai virka-asema _____

Toimipaikka tai jatkokoulutuspaikka _____
(yliopisto ja laitos) _____

Jatko-opintokieli _____

Haluaisin osallistua pienryhmätyöskentelyyn, jonka aihe on _____

Voin alustaa pienryhmässä aiheesta (mielellään oman tutkimuksen aine): _____

Osoite _____

Alustava ilmoittautumislomake palautettava 20.3. mennessä
osoitteella: Lingvistiikan kesäseminaari
Englannin kielen laitos
Jyväskylän yliopisto
40100 Jyväskylä 10

Korkeakoulujen kielikeskuksen johtokunta 1.8.1980-31.7.1982

Varsinaiset jäsenet

Korkeakoulujen kielikeskuksen
vt. esimies Liisa Korpimies
puh. 941-292880

Prof. Kari Sajavaara, pj.
Jyväskylän yliopisto
puh. 941-291620

Kielikeskuksen johtaja Ola Berggren
Lappeenrannan teknillinen korkeakoulu

Apul.prof. Viljo Kohonen
Tampereen yliopisto
Opettajankoulutuslaitos

Apul.prof. Jaakko Lehtonen
Jyväskylän yliopisto

Prof. Lauri Lindgren
Turun yliopisto

Apul.prof. Muusa Ojanen
Joensuun korkeakoulu

Esittelijä Leena Pirilä
Opetusministeriö
(virkavapaa kesään -81)

Apul.siht. Eija Uimonen
Helsingin yliopiston kielikeskus

Johtaja Pauli Roinila
Savonlinnan kieli-insituutti

Tutkija Sauli Takala
Jyväskylän yliopisto

Apul.prof. Jorma Vuoriniemi
Helsingin kauppakorkeakoulu

Tutk.ass. Eva May
Korkeakoulujen kielikeskus

Opisk. Arja Lappalainen
Suomen ylioppilaskuntien liitto

Siht. Aman. Liisa Ruuska
Korkeakoulujen kielikeskus
puh. 941-292885 (ohivalinta)
941-291211 (vaihe)

Varajäsenet

Prof. Kalevi Tarvainen
Jyväskylän yliopisto

Kielikeskuksen esimies
Marja Renkonen
Teknillinen korkeakoulu

Kielikeskuksen johtaja
Liisa Kurki-Suonio
Tampereen yliopisto

Leht. Matti Leiwo
Jyväskylän yliopisto

Amanuessi Pirkko Lindqvist
Turun yliopiston kielikeskus

Leht. Ulla Summala
Oulun yliopisto

Esittelijä Leena Luhtanen
Opetusministeriö

Leht. Anders Nygård
Abo Akademi

Johtaja Leena Lehto
Kouvolan kieli-instituutti

Apul.prof. Teuvo Piippo
Jyväskylän yliopisto

Apul.prof. Mirja Saari
Helsingin yliopisto

Filolog.maist. Maarit Hakkarainen
Korkeakoulujen kielikeskus

Opisk. Tiina Blom
Suomen ylioppilaskuntien liitto

