UCLA
Issues in Applied Linguistics

Title
Why More English Instruction Won't Mean Better Grammar

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/3g92340w

Journal
Issues in Applied Linguistics, 3(2)

ISSN
1050-4273

Author
Faingold, Eduardo D.

Publication Date
1992-12-30

DOI
10.5070/L432005163

Peer reviewed

REVIEWS

Why More English Instruction Won't Mean Better Grammar by Charles James N. Bailey. Hawai'i: Orchid Land Publications, 1992. 36 pp.

Reviewed by
Eduardo D. Faingold
State University of New York at Stony Brook

Bailey has written extensively on foreign language teaching and applied linguistics, as well as on linguistic theory and the interface between all these areas (e.g., Bailey, 1982, 1985, 1987). Why More English Instruction Won't Mean Better Grammar (WMEIWMBG) is an important contribution to the areas of English language and grammar teaching because it presents a systematic analysis of a wide range of grammatical phenomena where none has previously been apparent and applies modern linguistic concepts and devices to grammar construction (e.g., developmental linguistics, generative grammar, and sociolinguistics). WMEIWMBG is addressed primarily to teachers of English (and to grammarians) and has recently been added to the ERIC list of the U.S. Department of Education. A number of the issues discussed in this work are dealt with in greater detail and from a more linguistic perspective in Bailey's (forthcoming) book.

WMEIWMBG is divided in four chapters followed by one appendix. Chapter 1 presents a systematic account of a wide range of English grammatical phenomena which, according to Bailey, are neglected by most grammarians. He does not mention which grammars he has in mind. The structures discussed by Bailey include (not necessarily in this order): (i) rules governing the use of prepositions, including those for placing prepositions before relative and interrogative pronouns; (ii) rules for the use of interrogative and personal pronouns, as well as for the deletion of non-demonstrative *that*; (iii) a systematic characterization of the English verb, including present, past and timeless tenses, infinitives, participles, and gerunds, as well as the pragmatic (rather than grammatical) use of *go* and *get*, the elided and unelided forms of *have*, *do*, and *got*, and *here's*, *there's*, *where's* with plural predicates; (iv) principles for

distinguishing adverbs having and not having the ending -*ly*, and the genitival forms '*s* and *of*; and (v) a clear and systematic analysis of mass nouns, abstracts, collectives, and generics, as well as substitution and deletion rules changing lexical forms in various ways.

Chapter 2 discusses Bailey's concept of grammatical system with particular reference to the English verb. Rather than the loosely connected lists of unrelated tenses found in many grammars, the English verb is analyzed here as a structure of forms derived with explicit principles from a common, but small, set of primes. Bailey's grammatical system is similar to Saussure's (1962) where "tout se tient"—it all hangs together.

Chapter 3 applies modern linguistics concept and devices to the construction of grammars. These include: (i) writing the formal empty form e̲ to replace deleted forms—making grammatical phenomena more transparent and intelligible—as well as the use of generative linguistic concepts such as raising and other types of movement (Chomsky, 1981, 1986); (ii) grammatical devices employed in developmental linguistics such as markedness-reversal in marked environments, e.g., reversals in negative contexts with auxiliaries, modals, passives, etc. (Bailey, 1984; Faingold, 1991); and (iii) Labov's (1978: Chapter 8) observer's paradox, showing that speakers who deny using get-passives, as well as other structures, do in fact produce these forms in unmonitored speech.

Chapter 4 discusses the issue of grammatical correctness in the English-speaking world and elsewhere. As Bailey shows, grammatical correctness in English is determined by fashionable (typically young) speakers, while other countries (e.g., Spain, France, Germany) have language academies or other authorities who determine the grammaticality of language structures. English dictionaries are replete with "errors" because they record, rather than define, what is acceptable; in contrast, the dictionaries produced by language academies or other authorities are by definition free of errors because they legally define language form.

The appendix defines Bailey's use of concepts such as modal verbs, verbids, aspectuality, modality, and marke(re)dness.

WMEIWMBG makes an invaluable contribution to the teaching of English grammar. It applies modern linguistic models, reduces terminological and structural chaos, and provides a systematic analysis of a wide range of phenomena. Specifically, (i) spurious grammatical categories (e.g., adverbial nouns, pronominal demonstratives, the "genitive" case, etc.) are reduced to the recognized parts of speech based on the more fundamental

grammatical categories of case, predication, and modification with apposition; (ii) current categories such as subjunctives are seen as processual modalities, anteriors as distinct from perfects, and timeless verbal forms (e.g., present perfect) as separate from real presents (e.g., present continuous); and (iii) seemingly chaotic patterns of the English verb are systematically handled with developmental devices such as markedness-reversal--whereby systematic and predictable reversals occur in marked categories and environments (e.g., in timeless, anterior, posterior quasi-temporal categories, and modals under negation, interrogation, and comparison).

REFERENCES

Bailey, C. J. N. (1982). A Program for teaching English as a foreign language. *Indian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 7*, 42-50.

Bailey, C. J. N. (1984). Markedness-reversal and the pragmatic principle of 'reading between the lines' in the presence of marked usages. *Papiere zur Linguistik, 31*, 43-100.

Bailey, C. J. N. (1985). Untapped principles of foreign-language teaching. *Journal of Literary Semantics, 14*, 56-70.

Bailey, C. J. N. (1987). Native accent and learning English as a foreign language. *IRAL, 26*, 229-240.

Bailey, C. J. N. (forthcoming). *Variation in the data: Can linguistics ever become a science?* Hawai'i: Orchid Land Publications.

Chomsky, N. (1981). *Lectures on government and binding.* Dordrecht: Foris.

Chomsky, N. (1986). *Barriers.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Faingold, E. D. (1991). Evidence of seventeenth-century uses of shall and will compatible with markedness-reversal. *Papiere zur Linguistik, 44/45*: 57-63.

Labov, W. (1978). *Sociolinguistic patterns.* Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell.

Saussure, F. de (1962). *Cours de linguistique generale.* Paris, FR: Payot.

Dr. Eduardo Faingold is an adjunct professor of Hebrew and a visiting scholar in the Department of Linguistics at the State University of New York at Stony Brook. He received his undergraduate degrees at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem in English linguistics and French language and literature, and did graduate studies in English and general linguistics at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, the Technische Universitat Berlin, and Tel-Aviv University. Faingold has been a visiting scholar at the Institut fur Linguistik of the Technische Universitat Berlin and the Department of TESL/Applied Linguistics of the University of California, Los Angeles.

An Introduction to Second Language Acquisition Research by Diane Larsen-Freeman and Michael H. Long. London and New York: Longman, 1991. xvii + 398 pp.

Reviewed by
Charlene G. Polio
Michigan State University

Over the past few years, applied linguistics has been trying to answer the question: what is applied linguistics? (See discussions on this question in *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 1990, 1992.) Second language acquisition (SLA) has avoided the potentially polemic question: what is SLA? While there is little doubt that SLA is a field in its own right (see Gass, in press; Larsen-Freeman, 1991), what constitutes mainstream SLA, or the core of the field, may not be agreed upon. As the field grows and fragments, this issue needs to be addressed. Nowhere is the issue of defining the field of SLA as pertinent as in the writing of an introductory SLA textbook. Ten years ago, such a task would not have been as formidable. Today, one must first ask what should be included and in what depth should it be covered?

The most recent effort to introduce newcomers to the field of SLA is Larsen-Freeman and Long's *Introduction to Second Language Acquisition Research*. In evaluating such an effort, one must consider what the authors chose to include and what to exclude. Were any essential research or concepts omitted and/or was any research on the fringes made to seem part of the field? Will students who use this book have a perspective, consistent with others in the field, on what SLA is? Have the authors fulfilled their responsibility to those using the book to present a balanced view of a field that is fast finding researchers disagreeing on basic issues and theoretical frameworks? I believe that Larsen-Freeman and Long's book can be evaluated quite positively with regard to these questions. A summary of the book, with attention to these issues, follows.

The book consists of eight chapters. The first is a lucid introduction, explaining, very briefly, what the field is and that, while teachers' expectations from SLA must, at this point, be "modest" (p. 3), there is some relation to language teaching. They take an appropriate middle ground, saying neither that SLA research must serve only to benefit language teaching, nor that those ties should be severed (see Newmeyer and Weinberger, 1988 for this latter view).

The second chapter discusses research methodology, including characteristics of both qualitative and quantitative research, in a manner accessible to new students of SLA. The authors are fair to both sides, showing which paradigms can be used for which purposes. Of the qualitative and quantitative paradigms, they say, "Rather than seeing them as competing paradigms, we see them as complementary, implying that it is unnecessary to choose between the two" (p. 24). They also discuss different types of data collection without advocating one over the other.

The third chapter provides a historical view of methods of analysis in the field of SLA. In a field that is only 20 years old, it is appropriate to provide a comprehensive history, particularly for students to see how the field evolved and to keep them from repeating past errors. In keeping with trends in the field, they appropriately criticize contrastive analysis, error analysis, and morpheme acquisition studies. They say that discourse analysis (very broadly defined) has subsumed previous methods of analysis. While this is true in relation to the other methods of analysis discussed, those working in a Universal Grammar (UG) framework might take issue with this characterization.

Chapters four, five, and six deal comprehensively with various findings about interlanguage, the linguistic environment (input and interaction), and explanations for differential success among SLA learners.

Chapter seven is a good introduction to theories and theory construction. The authors begin by comparing the set-of-laws form, and the causal-process form, clearly showing their preference for the latter. At the end of the chapter, they say, without reference to any work, that not all in the field share their views. (For opposition to their view see Klein, 1990 and Markee, 1991.) They present and critique several theories of SLA, classifying them as nativist, environmentalist, or interactionist. Any book claiming to be an introduction to the field cannot ignore the fact there is no consensus on SLA theory and thus Larsen-Freeman and Long state at the end of the chapter:

> The rise of a single dominant theory which discourages competing points of view, given our present limited state of understanding, would be counter-productive. We must guard against overzealousness on the part of theorists or their devotees who feel that they have a monopoly on the truth. While SLA research and language teaching will benefit from the advantages of theoretically motivated research which

we have spelled out in this chapter, it would be dangerous at
this stage for one theory to become omnipotent. (p. 290)

Even Beretta (1991), who argues that multiple theories are
problematic for SLA, states that it is not necessary "for theory
choice to be made *now* "[emphasis in original] (p. 507). And as the
choice has not yet been made, it is essential to provide students of
SLA with all possible theories.

The book ends with a chapter on instructed SLA, showing
that the authors are truly concerned with the relationship between
instruction and SLA. Research on, for example, how instruction
does or does not affect developmental sequences should be of
interest to any student or researcher of SLA, not only to language
teachers.

Despite the fact that the authors' biases can often be seen
throughout the book, they clearly try to present all sides of issues
and at times explicitly state their biases. Furthermore, they include
work which has become part of SLA that they themselves have not
been active in (e.g., UG, connectionism). Larsen-Freeman and
Long admit that they have omitted work on lexical acquisition and
pragmatics. Also missing is much reference to cognitive theory
including issues such as restructuring and automaticity.
Furthermore, Larsen-Freeman and Long, with one notable
exception, do not overemphasize issues in SLA that are not
mainstream. The exception is the 18 pages devoted to the
Multidimensional Model of SLA. Although worth including,
particularly because of its potential application to cross-linguistic
SLA research, I doubt it is as widely-cited as Larsen-Freeman and
Long's book might suggest, at least now. (Other SLA textbooks
(Ellis, 1986; McLaughlin, 1987; Gass and Selinker, in press) give it
little or no attention at all.) Nevertheless, this book is, without a
doubt,the most comprehensive review of SLA research to date. It is
extremely dense, but in a classroom setting beginning students of
SLA with a background in linguistics should find it accessible.

With regard to the book's format, at the end of each chapter
there are excellent comprehension and application activities. The
lack of an author index is, however, extremely frustrating. Upon
finding an interesting reference in the bibliography, one has no way
to find out where in the book an author's work is cited, thus
hindering its use as a reference.

Earlier I mentioned the authors' responsibilities to present a
balanced view of the field. While one may not agree that such a
responsibility exists, one cannot argue with the fact that an

introductory text with two such notable authors will be widely used. I believe that instructors using the book can feel confident that their students will have a balanced mainstream view of the core issues in SLA.

REFERENCES

Beretta, A. (1991). Theory construction in SLA: Complementarity and opposition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 13*, 493-511.

Ellis, R. (1986) *Understanding Second Language Acquisition.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Gass, S. & L. Selinker. (in press). *Introduction to Second Language Acquisition..* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Issues in Applied Linguistics. (1990). Defining our field: Unity in diversity. *1*, 149-166.

Issues in Applied Linguistics. (1992). Preparing applied linguists for the future. *3*, 131-172.

Klein, W. (1990). A theory of language acquisition is not so easy. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 12*, 219-231.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (1991). Second language acquisition research: Staking out the territory. *TESOL Quarterly, 25*, 315-350.

Markee, N. (1991). Toward an ethnomethodological respecification of second language acquisition studies. Paper presented at Theory Construction and Research Methodology in Second Language Research. Michigan State University, East Lansing.

McLaughlin, B. (1987). *Theories of Second-Language Learning.* London: Edward Arnold.

Newmeyer, F. and S. Weinberger. (1988). The ontogenesis of the field of second language learning research. In S. Flynn and W. O'Neill (ed.), *Linguistic Theory in Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 34-45). Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Charlene Polio recently completed her dissertation on the acquisition of Chinese as a second language at UCLA. She is now an assistant professor in the Department of English at Michigan State University.