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ABSTRACT

ESL FOR FOREIGN-BORN PROFESSIONALS

by

Ardis Anne Flenniken

Master of Arts in Linguistics

The purpose of this thesis is to suggest guidelines for an English as a Second Language (ESL) curriculum designed to develop the communicative competence of foreign-born professionals residing in the United States. Empirical descriptions of language from the fields of the ethnography of communication, discourse analysis, and English for Specific Purposes (ESP) have been chosen for review because they focus on the description of contextualized language. Such descriptions are needed to inform the decisions of curriculum designers in their efforts to meet the needs of students, whose English proficiency level is generally high intermediate or advanced.

Ethnographers of communication define communicative competence and provide insights into intercultural communication. Discourse analysts describe the grammatical forms and communicative functions...
of sentences in combination. Applied linguists in ESP describe the specialized uses of English in various registers, such as in science or business. The context emphasized in this study is that of the American-business speech community since skills in business communication are vital for professional success in any organization. The advice of business communication experts is presented wherever relevant. Aspects of the English for Business and Economics (EBE) register are therefore described on the levels of lexicon, syntax, and discourse.

The curriculum guidelines suggested in this study focus on the productive language skills of speaking and writing. For speaking, the contextualization cues, speech acts, conversational moves and routines needed for telephone talk, job interviews, group discussions, and everyday interaction are identified. For writing, features of the EBE register, frequently performed speech acts, and devices of textual cohesion and rhetorical coherence are identified for business letters and reports.

In conclusion, the most general recommendation is that the curriculum prepare foreign-born professionals for effective participation in real situations of language use as members of the American-business speech community and help them to incorporate their knowledge of grammatical form with communicative function. Furthermore, the curriculum should expand students' knowledge of English structure by presenting the interrelationships between sentence-level grammar and the discoursal patterning which occurs beyond the sentence level.
ESL FOR FOREIGN-BORN PROFESSIONALS

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Foreign-born professionals in the United States have unique needs for English language learning. They are generally well-educated and have acquired professional skills and experience in their native countries before coming to the United States. Yet the greatest obstacle to their professional success in this country may be their lack of communicative ability in speaking and writing English. It is the responsibility of the English as a Second Language (ESL) curriculum designer to analyze the speaking and writing needs of these students and to construct the best possible curriculum for them. He or she must pose the question: What do foreign-born professionals need to know and do in order to communicate effectively in business and professional contexts in the United States? The chief objective of this study, therefore, is to suggest guidelines for an ESL curriculum designed to develop the communicative competence of foreign-born professionals residing in the United States on the basis of empirical descriptions of language from the fields of the ethnography of communication, discourse analysis, and English for Specific Purposes (ESP). Selected literature from each of these fields is reviewed in the body of this thesis.

The ethnography of communication, discourse analysis, and ESP have been chosen as sources of curriculum content for foreign-born
professionals because these three fields share the common purpose of describing the rules of contextualized language. Thus, they are interrelated by their mutual concern for speech act theory, conventions of language use and usage, definitions of communicative competence, processes of interpretation, rhetorical patterns of expression, and the interplay of form and function. The descriptions of contextualized language from these three areas form a pool of resources from which the ESL curriculum designer can draw to construct learning objectives. In the investigator's opinion, it is better for the curriculum designer to be eclectic and synthesize information from various sources than to cling to one set of precepts or a single narrow methodology.

The research in these three fields is based primarily on an empirical method of investigation. This method of scientific observation allows data on the nature and characteristics of contextualized language to be collected and analyzed systematically and objectively. The descriptions of language which result guarantee the authenticity of the items in the curriculum designer's pool of resources. Thus, the possibility of forming erroneous misconceptions based solely on introspection and subjective speculation can be minimized, and curriculum designers can inform their decisions with reliable descriptions of actual language use.

Perhaps the most important reason for investigating these three fields involves the linguistic needs of the foreign-born professionals themselves. As high intermediate and advanced learners of ESL, they often have a firm command of the basic grammatical structures of English since it is not unusual for them to have studied
English formally for six to ten years in their native countries. However, knowing the grammatical system of English is not equivalent to communicating fluently in it. Because they may not be accustomed to using English in interactive settings with native speakers, they may be unaware of the communicative functions these structures perform in social contexts in the United States. Even if they have been residing in this country for several years and have taken ESL courses, they may only have been exposed to a type of language pedagogy that focuses on linguistic form to the neglect of the communicative functions it performs. An integrated approach to form and function insures that the instructional objectives are immediately applicable to students' responsibilities at work. Foreign-born professionals may not only be sophisticated enough to manage such an approach but also more motivated because of it.

Then what specifically do these high-intermediate and advanced ESL students need to learn in addition to and in conjunction with the grammatical system of English? The three areas which are emphasized in this study provide several answers. Each area will now be briefly introduced.

The ethnography of communication is the first area to be examined. Ethnographers of communication study the interrelationship of language and social meaning. They are able to do this by observing and describing the 'rules of speaking', or the way that mode, topic, and form associate with setting and activity in various speech communities (Hymes 1972a:36). Native speakers of a language learn social meaning from birth as a natural part of language acquisition; non-native speakers of a language, on the other hand, have not
benefited from years of experience with the language as it is used for communicative purposes. Knowing the rules of speaking allows one to participate fully as a member of a speech community. Such knowledge gives a speaker 'communicative competence'. The notion of communicative competence, which originated with Dell Hymes, is of key importance to this study because designers of curriculums for foreign-born professionals must describe what constitutes communicative competence in the American-business speech community. Hymes' concept has generated discussion of many other sorts of competence in ESL literature, several of which are mentioned throughout this study.

Perhaps the most persuasive reason for selecting the ethnography of communication as a resource for developing an ESL curriculum for foreign-born professionals is the insight it provides into the processes of intercultural communication. John Gumperz's studies are particularly important because he applies the ethnography of communication directly to work situations in urban settings and has thus identified many of the rules of speaking for this context.

The second area to be reviewed is discourse analysis. Like the ethnography of communication, it is concerned with the description of contextualized language, both spoken and written. While ethnographers of communication analyze the social and cultural contexts of sentences (or utterances), discourse analysts study the form and meaning of sentences in combination with other sentences. Discourse analysts may take either of two approaches in describing sentences in relation to their surrounding text by
analyzing: 1) the formal, explicit linguistic features of the language code, or 2) the intended, implicit meanings which texts convey through rhetorical acts. The former is often referred to as 'text analysis' and the latter as 'speech act theory'.

The review of the literature for spoken discourse in this study comprises two areas of investigation: conversational analysis and conversational routines. Conversational analysts observe the structural elements of conversation by transcribing tape recordings of authentic interactions. These structural components are either too obvious or subconscious to concern native speakers of English, but an awareness of these components will enable non-native speakers to follow and participate in the interaction more effectively.

Conversational routines are those prefabricated, formulaic expressions which frequently recur in conversations because of the communicative functions they perform in social interaction. Routines range from tactful politeness formulas to expressions regulating the flow of conversation. The user of conversational routines also signals the members of a speech community that he or she is eager to join that community. Both conversational routines and conversational analysis, then, are rich sources of course content for foreign-born professionals.

Analysts of written discourse are especially concerned with its hierarchical structure. Once the interrelationships of linguistic and rhetorical elements in a text are described, ESL curriculum designers can utilize the information to help foreign-born professionals master difficult aspects of discourse such as
rhetorical patterns of organization, types of grammatical cohesion, and verb tense continuity.

English for Specific Purposes (ESP), the final area discussed, has been selected as a source of curriculum content for this study because it applies pedagogically much of the research in the ethnography of communication and discourse analysis. The fundamental assumption underlying ESP is that there are special varieties, or registers, of English used in particular disciplines, fields, or vocations which can be differentiated from the 'general core' of the language. These registers are analyzed for their distinctive features in lexical, syntactic, discoursal, and rhetorical patterns. Register analysis, then, creates a bank of linguistic items from which an ESL curriculum designer can draw.

In addition to specifying course content on the basis of register analysis, ESP practitioners focus on the communicative needs and purposes of the students themselves. They predict the situations which students are likely to encounter at work or in a specific field or academic discipline. The more homogeneous the needs and purposes of the students for communicating in English, the more specific the course content can be. While a group of foreign-born professionals in an ESL class may represent a variety of professions, thus prohibiting a narrow specification of their needs, a curriculum designed for foreign-born professionals can be given a more specific focus than a general English course because it emphasizes English as it is used in professional contexts.

Many of the speaking and writing tasks which foreign-born professionals perform at work indicate the use of the register of
English for Business and Economics (EBE); therefore, its linguistic features are presented in detail in Chapter V. However, the primary reason for selecting the EBE register as a source of curriculum content is that a knowledge of business communication is vital to any professional's success no matter how technically qualified he or she is. For this reason, the advice business communication experts give to native speakers of English is considered where relevant to the approaches taken in the ethnography of communication, discourse analysis, and ESP.

This study also includes a consideration of issues in curriculum design because there are several controversial questions that the curriculum designer must consider in order to decide which items to include in a syllabus, the appropriate sources for these items, and how to sequence them. Syllabus design itself is not central to this study but is included here to establish some criteria for the future refinement of the curriculum guidelines to be suggested.

In the final chapter, the researcher suggests curriculum guidelines for the productive language skills of speaking and writing on the basis of descriptions of contextualized language. A discussion of the limitations of this approach follows, as well as recommendations for further research.
CHAPTER II

The Ethnography of Communication

The all-encompassing, panoramic perspective on language that the field of the ethnography of communication provides is rich in possibilities for developing ESL curriculum guidelines for foreign-born professionals. Its empirical method of investigation, its underlying theoretical principles, the model it uses to collect data, its descriptions of communicative competence, and its insights into processes of intercultural communication contribute greatly to our understanding of what it means to know a language and, therefore, what foreign-born professionals, as advanced learners of ESL, need to acquire.

The empirical method of investigation that ethnographers of communication employ stems from the field of anthropology. The term 'ethnography of communication', or 'ethnography of speaking', was coined in the early 1960's by two anthropologists with sociolinguistic leanings, namely, Dell Hymes and John Gumperz. These two ethnographers make use of the same techniques of observation and inductive reasoning that anthropology does. This empirical method allows data on the inter-relationships of language, culture, and society to be collected and analyzed systematically and objectively. Thus, with a scientific approach, subjective speculation and intuitive guesswork about the use of language in social contexts can be minimized.
Several fundamental theoretical principles underlie the research techniques employed by the ethnographers of communication in their studies of the social meaning of language. Their primary assumption is that the relationship between language and social life is a systematic one; therefore, observable verbal behavior can be described, classified, and compared within a sociolinguistic system. Moreover, they assume no separation between the linguistic form and the communicative use of language as it functions in social interaction. Message form and message content are explored and described in an integrated manner. Hymes (1972a:59) states:

It is precisely the failure to unite form and content in the scope of a single focus of study that has retarded understanding of the human ability to speak, and that vitiates many attempts to analyze the significance of behavior ... It is a truism, but one frequently ignored in research, that how something is said is part of what is said.

Hymes' statement reveals that, to some extent, the ethnography of communication is a reaction to the approach taken in autonomous linguistics, which deals with meaning and form abstracted from context without reference to the parameters of the situation, such as speakers' attitudes towards each other and their topics or the purposes for which a particular utterance is made. It is here that Noam Chomsky's concept of linguistic competence contrasts with Hymes' notion of communicative competence.

In an oft-quoted passage, Chomsky (1965:3) explains his view of linguistic competence and performance as two separate entities:

Linguistic theory is concerned primarily with an ideal speaker-listener, in a completely homogeneous speech community, who knows its language perfectly and is unaffected by such grammatically irrelevant conditions as memory limitations, distractions, shifts of atten-
tion and interest, and errors (random or characteris-
tic) in applying his knowledge of the language in
actual performance.

Chomsky's statement shows to what extent he has abstracted and
idealized the study of language, limiting linguistic competence to
the knowledge a speaker has of its grammatical system. Communicative
competence, on the other hand, entails knowledge of the contextual
appropriacy of an utterance. It must not only be appropriate
syntactically to its surrounding text, but also be socially accept-
able in a given situation with given participants. Here the
speaker's linguistic competence, or knowledge of language usage, is
linked to an awareness of the social aspects of language use.
Linguistic competence and performance should, in Hymes' view, be
studied as an integrated whole.

Communicative competence, then, encompasses at least four types
of knowledge about language (Hymes 1972b:281-3). The first deals
with linguistic competence, i.e. whether or not an utterance is
formally possible. This knowledge enables us to judge the
grammaticality of an utterance. If it is grammatical, the second
parameter comes into play: whether or not it is feasible given the
limitations of human memory and perception (e.g. the effects of
nesting, embedding, and branching). The third consideration deals
with the appropriacy of the utterance to its context, both syntactic
and social. An utterance is appropriate if it can be evaluated as
adequate, felicitous, and successful in relation to a context in
which it is used and evaluated. The final parameter concerns knowing
whether or not an utterance is actually performed; it may be
grammatically correct, feasible, and appropriate but rare. These
four types of knowledge serve not only as measures of grammaticality but of social acceptability as well.

Another aspect of Chomsky's statement prevents its complete acceptance, especially as a foundation upon which to develop an ESL curriculum for foreign-born professionals. That is that we are not dealing with perfect linguistic competence in a homogeneous speech community. The foreign-born professionals who are the focus of this study lack a perfect command of English and live in a cosmopolitan, ethnically heterogeneous urban center. In this context, communication problems are compounded. Even with a strong command of English grammar, a person may, according to Hymes (1972a), be ignorant of what constitutes a coherent sequence, how speech acts are realized, what kinds of statements require answers, taboo topics, emphatic or ironic tones of voice, etc. Such aspects of language make up communicative competence as much as knowledge of grammar does. Under communicative competence, therefore, are subsumed several other types of competence which reflect the many facets of human social relationships. Thus a speaker with 'interactional competence' understands the turn-taking process, how long pauses should be, what volume and tone of voice are appropriate for the situation, and what speech act can or should follow another. A speaker with 'interpretive competence' understands the belief system of the speech community and the underlying conventions and logical processes which allow him or her to imply and infer meaning in the language. Finally, a speaker with 'differential competence' is able to recognize and select the specialized varieties or registers of a language which are preferred or obligatory in certain situations.
Achieving differential competence is especially challenging to non-native speakers of a language because they must associate lexicon, syntax, and rhetoric with contextual norms.

From another perspective, communicative competence is knowing all of the 'rules of speaking' that the members of a speech community share for the conduct and interpretation of speech. These rules of speaking underlie all communication between members; nevertheless, members usually possess only a 'tacit knowledge', or intuition, about them. With their expertise, the ethnographers of communication can ferret out the subtle relationships between linguistic form and social meaning. The means for discovering this presuppositional information, or shared background knowledge, is provided by Hymes in his model for the comparative sociolinguistic description of the rules of speaking.

The main purpose of Hymes' model is to develop a tool with which to describe and collect data on the rules of speaking, which are 'the ways in which speakers associate particular modes of speaking, topics or message forms, with particular settings and activities' (Hymes 1972a:36). The term 'speaking' is not limited to oral expression only; it should be taken as a synonym for all forms of language, including writing. Hymes' model also enables ethnographers of communication to conduct comparative studies in order to identify both universals and distinctive features in the rules of speaking.

The basic social unit of analysis in Hymes' model for the description of the rules of speaking is a 'speech community', which is 'a community sharing rules for the conduct and interpretation of speech' (Hymes 1972a:54). There is a common misconception that
people who speak the same language belong to the same speech community simply because they frequently interact. On the contrary, more important than the frequency of contact is the definition of the situation in which the interaction takes place and the degree to which the participants identify with one another.

The minimal unit of analysis that must be considered in a sociolinguistic description is the 'speech act', which Hymes (1972a:56-7) defines as:

a level distinct from the sentence, and not identifiable with any single portion of other levels of grammar ... That an utterance has the status of a command may depend upon a conventional formula ..., intonation ..., position in a conversational exchange ..., or social relationship obtaining between two parties ... The level of speech acts mediates immediately between the usual levels of grammar and the rest of a speech event or situation in that it implicates both linguistic form and social norms.

The value of speech act theory is that it attempts to show clearly the relationship between form and function and how they are united in language use. According to this theory, every utterance bears three kinds of meaning: propositional or referential content; illocutionary force—what the speaker intends or implies; and perlocutionary effect—how the utterance affects the listener.

Speech act theory will be discussed more fully in Chapter III.

The most extensive part of Hymes' descriptive model is his explanation of the 'components of speech'. These components allow for a more precise description of speech acts and their rules than the traditional threefold division of speaker, hearer, and the something talked about. Hymes (1972a) groups the components mnemonically as SPEAKING, as shown in Figure 1 below.
Since the components of speech provide insights for ESL curriculum design, each one will be briefly defined.

The mnemonic 'S' stands for 'act situation' and has two components: setting and scene. Setting refers to the physical situation (i.e. time and place) in which a speech act occurs. Scene, on the other hand, accounts for psychological setting. Scenes may change from formal to informal, serious to festive, etc. Types of scenes are defined culturally by the speech acts which frequently occur in them. Thus a speech act can be judged as appropriate or inappropriate for a given scene. The interrelationship of setting and scene may also be evaluated for appropriacy.

The most universal dimension of Hymes' model is 'participant' (mnemonically, 'P'). Hymes identifies types of participant relations as speaker or sender, addressee, hearer or receiver or audience, and addressee. A wider range of types may be found once more
ethnographic work has been completed. The participant relations specified in any ethnographic research depend on the particular rules of speaking being analyzed. Some situations require the simple dyadic model of speaker-hearer; others require the specification of three participants, e.g. speaker, addressee, and audience. For example, if a child is present, adults in Germany will often use forms of address with each other that are appropriate for the child (Hymes 1972a:61).

'Purposes--outcomes' and 'purposes--goals' together form the mnemonic 'E' for 'ends' in Hymes' SPEAKING model. The chosen variety of a given speech event often depends on the purpose which it performs. For example, the Waial of Venezuela select a different variety of oho-chant for a marriage, a trade, a work task, a feast, and so on (Hymes 1972a:61). The goals of individual participants also enter into the performance of a speech event.

The 'A' in the SPEAKING model refers to 'act sequence' since speech acts occur syntagmatically, or in sequence, in discourse. The two aspects of act sequence, message form and message content, are central in creating discourse coherence. Message form is important in describing the rules of speaking because it is the only component of the model that is involved in all rules. Even if the relation between only two of the model's components requires specification to define a rule, one of them is always message form. Message form involves how things are said; it is that part of language for which rules can be explicitly stated and features defined.

'Message content', on the other hand, is synonymous with topic. This component refers to one's ability to perceive coherence in
discourse and, as such, is similar to Henry Widdowson's concept of illocutionary or communicative act, which is discussed in Chapter III. Hymes' notion of message content as topic, change of topic, and maintenance of topic, is also closely related to the analysis of conversational routines, which are presented in Chapter III as well.

Hymes (1972a:62) defines 'key' (mnemonically, 'K') as 'the tone, manner, or spirit, in which an act is done. It corresponds roughly to modality among grammatical categories.' Key is also a salient topic in business communication textbooks, for NS's of English, where using a conversational tone in business letters is often recommended. Without an understanding of key in English, non-native speakers would not be able to choose the appropriate tone. The business communication experts Menning and Wilkinson (1967:42-3) state:

The advice to 'write as you talk' can be taken too literally, however. You would have an extremely hard job trying to write just as you talk; and even if you could, the informal style appropriate to letters is more precise and concise than good conversation. What the advisers really mean is that you should not stiffen up, use big words and trite expressions, or get involved in complicated and formal sentences when you write letters. Rather, let the words flow out naturally and informally in phrases and sentences with the general tone and rhythm of the language actually used by men rather than stuffed shirts.

If a non-native speaker is to avoid writing like a 'stuffed shirt', he or she needs command of subtle features of style. Jean Johnston (1980) illustrates how the tone of American business letters at times seems blunt and offensive to Japanese businessmen. Johnston includes an English translation of a conventional Japanese business letter with some revealing contrasts in key. Raja Ram Mehrotra (1982:166) discusses the use of tone in business letters written in Indian
The influence of the Indian speech community is clearly at play here in the elaborate use of honorifics, the expression of humility, and profuse politeness formulas. In business correspondence, for example, one might find this statement: 'Your esteemed order has been duly noted.' When giving a speech at a business meeting, one Indian speaker of English began: 'I feel greatly honored in speaking to this august audience.' The use of 'august' in such a context is appreciated in India, but in contemporary British usage it would have a joking or ironic meaning.

A knowledge of formal and informal styles probably interfaces with an awareness of the differences between speaking and writing, and relates to another component in Hymes' model: Instrumentalities.

'Instrumentalities', the 'I' in the SPEAKING model, is the cover term for the subcomponents 'channels' and 'forms of speech'. Both are means or agencies of speaking, in analogy to the instrumental case in grammar. The channels component is 'the choice of oral, written, telegraphic, semaphore, or other medium of transmission of speech' (Hymes 1972a:62-3). The subcomponent 'forms of speech' refers to the fact that no speech community in the world today, even if it uses a single language, has a single form of that language. That is, within a single language there are dialects (the historical and geographical aspects), codes (the degree of mutual intelligibility), and varieties or registers (the specializations in use). It is the existence of language varieties or registers that justifies the English for Specific Purposes (ESP) approach.

According to Hymes, all rules governing speaking have a normative character since they depend partly on conventions of the
speech community. 'Norms of interaction' and 'norms of interpretation', then, jointly form the mnemonic 'N' in Hymes' model. Norms of interaction are 'the specific behaviors and properties that attach to speaking' (Hymes 1972a:63). They cover such knowledge as whether or not (and when) one participant can interrupt another, when to use normal volume or to whisper, how turns are allocated, etc. Role relationships also affect these norms. Norms of interpretation, on the other hand, involve the belief system of a community. All of the forms of interaction above can also be invested with cultural meaning. Even proxemics has cultural meaning in that it indicates how spatial distance is interpreted in different societies. For this reason, Gregory Barnes (1982:12) is careful to mention proxemics in explaining how to enter the boss's office:

The person who stands in the doorway, or barely enters the room, is considered too timid or deferential. The person who hustles in and rushes too close is considered too aggressive. The 'proper' behavior is to walk in firmly and stop about 2 feet from the boss's desk.

The last component of the SPEAKING model is 'genres' (mnemonically, 'G'), which are categories such as proverbs, poems, lectures, commercials, form letters, etc. The notion of genre is advantageous since, as Hymes (1972a:65) notes:

> It implies the possibility of identifying formal characteristics traditionally recognized. It is heuristically important to proceed as though all speech has formal characteristics of some sort as manifestation of genres; and it may well be true.

Even unmarked, casual speech has formal features. We are able to recognize it in a context where we least expect it or when it is exploited for some effect. We may view it as unmarked speech merely
because of our orientation to it; in reality, however, 'its profile may be as sharp as any other, once we succeed in seeing it as strange' (Hymes 1972a:65). ESL students may be in a better position to recognize the characteristics of casual speech than native speakers since they have a more objective perspective from outside of the speech community.

Much work is needed to map out the interrelationships of these components of speech. So far in ethnographic research no rule of speaking has been found to require specification of all of them simultaneously. Only message form is involved in all rules. For any given rule, any component may come into play; therefore, each one must be recognized in the model.

One of the most persuasive reasons for applying the ethnography of communication to ESL curriculum development is that it provides insights into the processes of intercultural communication. The existing research of ethnographers of communication suggests that different speech communities vary significantly in the ways that they use language in social contexts. Ethnographers of communication hypothesize that cross-cultural differences in the rules of speaking can be investigated as rigorously as linguistic form. The range of this variation is not yet known, and much more research is needed. John Gumperz, however, has already pioneered studies of the interactions between native speakers of English and foreign-born professionals in job-related contexts. From his anthropological perspective, Gumperz believes that the life styles of ethnic groups in large cities are becoming increasingly standardized because of the demands of modern industrial settings. Since people live and work
together under conditions that require them to interact, ethnic
groups are less isolated today than in the past. Such social change
has had a profound influence on interethic communication. Gumperz
(1978:13) states:

Communication is power in modern postindustrial society. Control of one's life in all arenas depends on the ability to communicate effectively; private life increasingly involves dealings with public agencies, and effectiveness in business, employment, and public administration is a function of the ability to justify opinions and settle differences. Human relations everywhere entail enlisting support and approval, but nowadays people must deal with others whose social and communicative backgrounds differ significantly from theirs and who consequently do not share their basic assumptions.

The ability to participate in such a setting depends on one's proficiency in the 'rhetoric of public negotiation', which has its own rules of speaking. Negotiation occurs at all levels of the work-setting, such as meetings in boardrooms and labor unions, citizen-advisory groups, boards of education, etc., and in everyday situations such as explaining one's absence at work or clarifying a mishap.³

Success or failure at work often depends on an employee's performance in 'gatekeeping' situations. The 'gatekeepers' are people, usually native speakers, with inside knowledge of public rhetoric, such as social workers, job supervisors, personnel representatives, teachers, etc. Their function is to allot various opportunities and entitlements in the speech community. The 'gate' itself often has the format of an intensive conversation or interview. In this exchange, both sides must communicate effectively in order to have proper and equitable results (Gumperz, Jupp, and
Immigrant professionals, however, often have difficulty passing occupational tests and interviews and are rarely promoted to managerial positions which require proficiency in formal English. In his study of Indian and Pakistani immigrants working in London factories, Gumperz (1978:17) observes:

On almost every shop floor one finds cases of individuals who were relatively well educated in India, are technically highly accomplished, and are well respected among their peers, but who somehow never gain recognition from supervisors.

Gumperz wants to explain why this is so. His findings point beyond the most commonly given explanations, such as racial prejudice and stereotypes, foreign accent, or differences in cultural values, beliefs, and attitudes. It is not simply a matter of insufficient control of English grammar or vocabulary. Difficulties persist even when workers know the language well. Of course these communication barriers exist, but Gumperz (1976:274) feels that 'a large portion of misunderstandings are traceable to subtle processes of inference which underlie all communication and which are affected by cultural differences.' He has found that communication breakdowns often result from the misinterpretation of 'contextualization cues', which are the discourse features that signal a speaker's meaning and attitude in conversation. The problem arises when the participants in the interaction assume that these cues do not vary cross-culturally. Because the use of such discourse features is largely intuitive and unconscious in one's native language, a participant may jump to the false conclusion that a speaker's intentions are purposefully malicious. This in turn may reinforce negative racial stereotypes.
Gumperz's comparative studies give empirical support to the existence of contextualization cues and the role they play in inferential processes in conversation. He has tape-recorded numerous interactions between Indian or Pakistani workers and native English speakers, who often hold gatekeeping positions. In all of these encounters, talk has been the basis for evaluating a speaker's abilities and attitudes. Therefore, an awareness of contextualization cues is especially crucial for participants to communicate effectively in these situations.

Gumperz (1978:23-4) has found the following types of contextualization cues to be particularly important in these interactions: paralinguistic and prosodic features, deictic pronouns, and interjections such as yes and no. Prosodic cues in language, such as tone of voice, rhythm, stress, intonation, and sentence speed, function not only to express key or attitude, but also for semantic purposes, e.g. to show contrast or emphasis. In Gumperz's research, one instance of miscommunication occurred when an Indian worker used increased loudness and pitch to reclaim the floor after being interrupted, a conventional device in his speech community. The native English speaker, however, interpreted this as an outburst of angry shouting. Gumperz (1978:27) explains that "a native English speaker will try to regain the floor by a more direct verbal means, such as "I didn't finish." The native speaker in the conversation was also surprised when the worker seemed to agree with her by saying yes only to contradict her moments later. In conversational Indian English, yes conventionally means 'I've heard you' rather than agreement.
Delictic pronouns, which point out or specify an individual person, thing, or idea and which create cohesion in language, may also cause confusion for native English listeners when omitted in reported speech. In this sentence (Gumperz et al. 1979:12), a second or third person pronoun has been omitted before said: 'I think there was time, but said there wasn't.'

A major function of contextualization cues is that they help to convey the illocutionary force of direct and indirect speech acts. In Crosstalk (Gumperz et al., 1979) there is an excellent illustration of the difficulties non-native speakers may have in interpreting illocutionary force in a stressful situation, such as a job interview. In the Crosstalk interview, a Mr. Sandhu is applying for a job as a librarian at a college. He is asked and answers several questions successfully, but he is unable to infer the illocutionary force of this question: 'Why are you applying for this particular type of job in a college?' The indirect purpose of this question is to find out the applicant's professional interests and what special abilities or skills he believes he can bring to the position. Mr. Sandhu, however, interprets it to mean: 'Why do you want a job?' and is rather insulted. He does not share the native English speakers' assumptions about the type of response expected here, so his answer misses the mark. There are two consequences of his answer: the native-speaker interviewers think that he is not really motivated about the job, and they misconstrue much of what he says after this point. Even though they rephrase the question, he still fails to perceive its intended meaning. Non-native speakers evidently need inferential strategies to interpret illocutionary
force. Writing about indirect speech acts, John Searle (1975:60-1) indicates what the nature of interpretive ability involves:

In indirect speech acts the speaker communicates to the hearer more than he actually says by way of relying on their mutually shared background information, both linguistic and non-linguistic, together with the general powers of rationality and inference on the part of the hearer.

To further complicate matters, Searle notes that indirect speech acts are often idiomatic. The request 'Can you pass the salt?' has no relation to one's real ability to perform this act, yet the use of the modal verb can to perform this function is very common. According to Searle, the syntactic forms of indirect requests are not universal, but rather a matter of convention in a given speech community.  

In addition to contextualization cues, Crosstalk deals with cross-cultural differences in rhetorical patterns for structuring information and arguments. This field is now known as contrastive rhetoric. Rhetorical conventions help a listener to judge whether a speaker is constructing logical, relevant, and concise ideas. However, rhetorical patterns may differ linguistically and culturally. Gumperz et al. (1979:12-3) have observed three instances of rhetorical differences between Indian/Pakistani speakers of English and native speakers of English. First, native English speakers often repeat a key word or phrase to maintain immediate relevance from one speaker to another, while Indian/Pakistani speakers of English rarely do this. Second, Indian/Pakistani-English speakers do, however, sometimes repeat what a speaker has just said but not necessarily because they wish to make a relevant comment.
about it. Third, Indian/Pakistani speakers often avoid a direct response, starting instead in a very general way which only gradually becomes specific. As a result, a native English listener may 'turn off' before the speaker makes an important point, especially if this occurs in conjunction with the first two points, i.e. with the lack of repeated key words and phrases or with the different interpretations of their repetition. Much more research needs to be conducted in contrastive rhetoric although Gumperz's work is a strong beginning.

In summary, there are several advantages in developing ESL curriculum guidelines for foreign-born professionals from the field of the ethnography of communication. One benefit is its scientific, empirical approach to a sociolinguistic description of language. By documenting their findings, ethnographers of communication can draw more reliable conclusions. This in turn minimizes the guesswork involved in the curriculum designer's task. Another advantage is that the ethnography of communication investigates the relation between language and social life in an integrated manner. The implication of this approach for curriculum design is that it can potentially help ESL students attain a fully fluent communicative competence in the language. A third advantage of the ethnography of communication is that it attempts to define what communicative competence is, both in general terms as including several other types of competence, and, in more specific terms, for any given speech community. The foreign-born professional who wishes to become a member of the American-business speech community needs access to its rules of speaking. The ethnography of communication makes it possible to describe and
therefore to include these rules in an ESL curriculum. A final advantage of the ethnography of communication is that it supplies valuable information about processes of intercultural communication. Foreign-born professionals can learn to increase their opportunities for successful communication at work if they are aware of Gumperz's contextualization cues. By learning how these cues function in discourse, ESL students will be a step closer to attaining interpretive competence. By improving their performance in gatekeeping situations such as job interviews, ESL students will have better access to promotions and even managerial positions. Gumperz's studies, however, have only scratched the surface of the problem. Much more research needs to be conducted in areas such as contrastive rhetoric and in the description of business speech communities in various cultures. Until this is done, another field, that of discourse analysis, will supply the curriculum designer with more information for the present. Discourse analysis is discussed in the following chapter of this study.
NOTES TO CHAPTER II

1. The studies of Tannen (1979) and Erickson (1976) support this view.

2. Akinnaso (1982) summarizes several recent studies in the area of spoken and written register differences.

3. Jupp and Hodlin (1978) have carefully analyzed such encounters for ESL course design in industrial settings.

4. The job interview in Crosstalk was filmed and presented as one of several real job interviews which were set up for training native speakers of English working in gatekeeper positions to become aware of differences and difficulties in intercultural communication. The participants were not actors nor did they read scripts. Instead, they freely improvised situations that they had actually experienced. When the filmed interviews had been analyzed linguistically, the participants were asked to give their impressions of certain 'key points of meaning' to confirm their intentions and reactions.

5. Searle (1975:76) notes the possibility of translating Can you help me? into French (Pourriez-vous m'alerder?) and German (Können Sie mir helfen?), but not Czech.
CHAPTER III

Discourse Analysis

The field of discourse analysis supplies a great deal of valuable information which has the potential to improve the communicative competence of foreign-born professionals in English. By consulting studies of language based on discourse analysis, the ESL course designer can extract guidelines for curriculum development. The purpose of this chapter, then, is to describe the general nature of discourse and the approach which discourse analysts take in their investigations. First, certain similarities between discourse analysis and the ethnography of communication are noted. Then the relationship between discourse analysis and speech act theory is explained by focusing on the distinction between literal and intended meaning. Finally, selected discourse studies of both written and spoken English are reviewed in order to identify appropriate curriculum content for foreign-born professionals. For writing, certain characteristics of planned discourse are identified in terms of rhetorical modes as patterns of discourse organization, rhetorical conventions as indicators of presupposed information, and the contrastive study of rhetorical structures found in various languages. These features of written discourse have been derived from research in the field of English for Science and Technology (EST), which is conducted for pedagogical purposes, as well as from business communication texts for native speakers, especially where they relate the formats and organization of letters and reports to
speech act theory and rhetorical modes. For speaking, the conversational moves and routines needed for telephone talk, job interviews, group discussions, and everyday interaction are identified from studies in the fields of conversational analysis and conversational routines. Business communication experts are again consulted for information on speaking when their approach is congruent with that of discourse analysts.

Both discourse analysts and ethnographers of communication approach the description of language through the common perspective that language, even contextualized language, is rule-governed behavior. Contextualization is the impetus that has motivated researchers in both fields to focus on the interplay of form and function in the communication process and to discover how meaning is interpreted. Gumperz's contextualization cues, discussed in Chapter 11, exemplify one type of discourse analysis, even though he is an ethnographer of communication. Just as ethnographers of communication place sentences (or utterances) into their social contexts, discourse analysts consider the form and meaning of sentences in the context of other sentences.

Discourse rules have been studied in very broad terms by Harris (1963), Christensen (1967), Kaplan (1972); with tagmemics by Young, Becker, and Pike (1970); and via stratificational grammar by Gutwinski (1976), among others. More focused studies of discourse have dealt with the semantics of conjuncts (Arapoff, 1968; Greenbaum, 1969; Lakoff, 1971). It is obviously difficult to describe the general nature of discourse since the scope of available studies is so varied and since there seems to be no
standard method of investigation. Terms are used interchangeably, and there is little agreement as to the appropriate size of units of analysis.\textsuperscript{1} Despite the confusion, discourse analysts do agree on one fundamental principle: discourse analysis involves speech act theory. In speech act theory, an essential distinction is made between literal, explicit meaning and implied meaning, or the function of an utterance in a situation, i.e. what is actually accomplished when spoken (or written). The former aspect of meaning is referred to as 'propositional content' and the latter as 'illocutionary force'. Propositional content is realized overtly, and propositional links between sentences or utterances can be traced formally through such cohesive devices as anaphoric pronouns, syntax, semantics, and verb-tense continuity. On the other hand, illocutionary force is the intended meaning of a sentence or utterance. The meaning of a message may be indirect and therefore inferred by the hearer from his or her knowledge of the situational context. In any utterance, the identification of these two aspects of meaning, i.e. propositional content and illocutionary force, 'lies at the heart of discourse analysis and emphasizes the distinction to be more generally drawn between semantics and pragmatics' (Candlin 1981:167).

Henry Widdowson's explanation (1979:52) of the distinction between propositional content and illocutionary force is so lucid that it has been taken up by several other applied linguists.\textsuperscript{2} From a deceptively simple definition of discourse as 'the use of sentences in combination', Widdowson derives two separate approaches which characterize macrolinguistic inquiries: text analysis and
discourse analysis. Text analysis deals with the operation of the language code above the sentence level, i.e. with propositional content. In contrast, discourse analysis studies how the interpretations of a sentence depends on the speaker/hearer's background knowledge of the situation outside of the text and on his or her familiarity with the conventions of the speech community. In Widdowson's definition, then, discourse analysis refers to the communicative use of sentences to perform social acts and accounts for their illocutionary force.

Widdowson further elaborates on the dichotomy between text and discourse by labeling the formally explicit connections between sentences as grammatical cohesion and their illocutionary value as rhetorical coherence. To illustrate, both the following exchanges (Widdowson 1979:56) are coherent, but only the first one is a cohesive text in English since the response exhibits formal cohesive ties with the question:

1. A: Can you go to Edinburgh tomorrow?
   B: Yes, I can.

2. A: Can you go to Edinburgh tomorrow?
   B: B.E.A. pilots are on strike.

Despite the lack of a cohesive textual tie in the second exchange, the rhetorical coherence still comes across clearly. This is so because we understand that B has a reason or an obligation for going to Edinburgh. Moreover, we infer that B probably will not go since he prefers to go there by plane. We use the knowledge of the situation to gather the meaning of B's response through a process of interpretation. We are able to do this because of the preconditions
that must hold for an utterance to count as a particular communicative act, even when no explicit, cohesive textual ties are apparent.³

In another example, Widdowson (1978:25) shows how it is possible for the relationship between two sentences to be askew if the overt, formal ties which connect them lack grammatical cohesion:

3. A: What did the rain do?
   B: The crops were destroyed by the rain.

The syntax of B's response violates the general expectation that the new information will come last in the the sentence. Thus Widdowson's notion of grammatical cohesion is similar to the Prague School of linguists' concept of 'functional sentence perspective' whereby a sentence is often based on the pattern 'theme-transition-rheme' (James 1980:109). The theme is presupposed in some earlier sentence while the rheme presents the new information.

In summary, the general nature of discourse may be viewed as incorporating both saying and performing, i.e. both propositional content and illocutionary value. The propositional content of a discourse is developed through grammatical cohesion, and its illocutionary values are developed through rhetorical coherence. This is true of both written and spoken discourse. Each of these channels, however, has unique characteristics, making it advantageous to discuss each separately in order to determine what information is useful for ESL curriculum development.

**Analysis of Written Discourse**

The primary feature of written discourse which makes its
analysis valuable for the ESL curriculum designer is that it is planned discourse. Writers generally have more time to arrange and revise their thoughts than speakers do. Written discourse therefore more clearly exhibits sequential and hierarchical patterning than spoken discourse (Candlin 1981). Patterns of written discourse are consequently easier to describe than those of spoken discourse.

On one level, written discourses are somewhat easy to characterize. Such obvious discourse types as definition, explanation, exemplification, conclusion, cause and effect, chronological procedures, classifying, etc., are relatively simple to identify because of the perceptively logical form of edited expository writing. (Palmer 1981:75)

The discourse types Palmer refers to are actually rhetorical functions and modes, which Widdowson equates with illocutionary or communicative acts since the ways in which functions and modes are sequenced and interrelated in a written discourse create rhetorical coherence. Because of the stability of these patterns in written discourse, then, their study can give ESL students access to the discoursal conventions and rules of use, which are essential to the interpretation of language in any speech community.

Fortunately for the ESL curriculum designer, several analyses of written discourse for pedagogical purposes have already been conducted, since it is written discourse that most ESL students most often confront in higher education in their own countries. Analyses of EST texts are especially available, perhaps because the need to teach it has been more pressing than for other specialized uses of English. The analysis of specialized varieties of English such as EST is called 'register analysis' and is explained more fully in
connection with ESP in Chapter IV. The following discussion will therefore present some of the findings of discourse analyses of EST because they are useful to ESL curriculum designers. In addition, the advice of a few selected business communication experts regarding rhetorical organization and speech act theory is discussed. Even though their comments are not based on an empirical discourse analysis of the EBE register, they provide support for the recommendations to be made in this study.

Analysis of EST

John Lackstrom, Larry Selinker, Louis Trimble, and Mary Todd-Trimble are one group of discourse analysts whose work stems from an awareness of the linguistic needs of international students majoring in science and technology. They have developed several useful concepts of rhetoric for the analysis of written EST discourse. Their basic unit of discourse is the 'conceptual paragraph' which is 'a group of organizationally related concepts which develop a given generalization in such a way as to form a coherent and complete unit of discourse' (Lackstrom, Selinker, and Trimble 1973:130). The conceptual paragraph may contain several physical paragraphs (i.e. indented paragraphs) but it is unified by one sole 'core generalization'. Each physical paragraph has a 'sub-core' of its own. In other words, these terms represent the next level up in a hierarchy from the topic sentence in a physical paragraph.

Another important notion in the work of Lackstrom et al. is 'presupposition', or the information shared by the speaker/writer and listener/reader. They have found that the presuppositions
shared by the technical writer and reader in EST affect surface syntax, at least in article and tense choice. For example, a writer who is employing the rhetorical function 'describing apparatus' in an experiment will use past tense only if the apparatus was devised solely for the particular experiment; present tense will be used if the apparatus is used for other purposes besides the given experiment (Lackstrom et al. 1973:134). Such rhetorical conventions make it difficult for ESL students to infer meaning.

Perhaps the greatest contribution Lackstrom, Selinker and the Trimbles have made to discourse analysis is their 'Rhetorical Process Chart'. This chart is reproduced in its most recent form in Figure 2. These rhetorical objectives, functions, and techniques are arranged in a hierarchy; each level (i.e. A, B, C, and D) is constrained by the one which precedes it. The chart shows the relational principles by which EST conceptual paragraphs are commonly developed, especially when the writer's objective is 'detailing an experiment' (level A, example 1). This objective automatically commits the writer to 'presenting information on apparatus' (level B, examples 8 and 9). In order to do this, he or she must also define and classify (level C, examples 1-4). Furthermore, to describe the apparatus and its function (level C, example 5), the technical writer must resort to time and space orders (level D, examples 1 and 2).
A The Objectives of the Total Discourse

EXAMPLES
1. Detailing an Experiment
2. Making a Recommendation
3. Discussing Experimental Methodology
4. Presenting New Hypotheses or Theories
5. Presenting an 'Environmental Impact Statement'
6. Presenting a 'Survey Article'
7. Presenting a 'Descriptive Catalogue' (e.g. of electronic parts)
9. Presenting 'Known' Information in Textbooks

B The General Rhetorical Functions Employed to Develop the Objectives of Level A

EXAMPLES
1. Stating Purpose
2. Reporting Past Research
3. Discussing Theory
4. Stating the Problem
5. Reporting Results
6. Reporting Conclusions
7. Justifying Experimental Procedures
8. Presenting Information on Apparatus: Description
9. Presenting Information on Apparatus: Operation
10. Presenting Information on Experimental Procedures
11. Referencing an Illustration
12. Relating an Illustration to the Discussion
13. Presenting Information on Data Gathering

C The Specific Rhetorical Functions Employed to Develop the General Functions of Level B

EXAMPLES
1. Definition
2. Reference to known Definitional Information
3. Classification
4. Reference to known Classificational Information
5. Description: Physical and Function
6. Description: Process
7. Instructions
8. Information Transfer

D The Rhetorical Techniques that Provide Relationships Within and Between the Units of Level C

EXAMPLES
1. Time Order
2. Space Order
3. Causality
4. Result
5. Comparison
6. Contrast
7. Analogy
8. Exemplification
9. Conditionality

Figure 2
Rhetorical Process Chart: English for Science and Technology (EST) (Selinker et al. 1978:312-3)
The extensive literature on EST discourse analysis, only a fraction of which has been presented here, has no counterpart in EBE. Ann Johns (1979, 1980) has investigated grammatical cohesion in EBE; her studies are discussed in Chapter V of this thesis. However, Johns has conducted a text analysis and does not deal with rhetorical coherence. Until the paucity of information on the rhetorical structure of written EBE is remedied, the ESL curriculum designer can consult the advice of business communication experts.

Rhetoric in Business Letters and Reports

Writing effective business letters requires a great deal of tact. The writer must be sensitive to the reader's probable reaction to the propositional content of the letter. To borrow a term from speech act theory, the writer must predict the likely perlocutionary effect the letter will have on the reader. Business communication experts often classify letters according to these effects and give explicit instructions for their rhetorical organization. The three most common types are 'good news,' 'bad news,' and 'persuasive' letters, all of which employ specific psychological strategies. Persuasive letters are especially delicate since the reader is often suspicious of exaggerated claims made on the writer's part. This danger can be avoided if the persuasive-letter writer follows the maxims of H. Paul Grice shown in Figure 3, which, although originally intended to describe conversational implicature, are equally relevant to business writing.
1. Quantity
   a. Make your contribution as informative as is required (for the purposes of the exchange).
   b. Do not make your contribution more informative than required.

2. Quality
   a. Do not say what you believe is false.
   b. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

3. Relation--Be relevant.

4. Manner--Be perspicuous.
   a. Avoid obscurity of expression.
   b. Avoid ambiguity.
   c. Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity).
   d. Be orderly.

Figure 3
Grice's Cooperative Principle (Grice 1975:45-6)

Finally, to avoid triteness and maintain goodwill in a business letter, the writer must carefully shape the illocutionary value of the discourse so the reader will infer sincerity from it. Discussing the possible applications of speech act theory to business writing, Madeline Hamermesh (1981:18) relates the well-known 'C' qualities, i.e. the desirable traits of business writing, to illocutionary and perlocutionary effect. They are arranged here in two columns for convenience:
With the perspective which speech act theory provides, Hamermesh (1981:19) believes that students will better be able to master the two necessary goals of business writing: 'to achieve understanding and to evoke a reaction'.

In general, business reports are more complex than business letters because they must incorporate a greater amount of information. They therefore make use of larger rhetorical structures. This statement should be qualified, however, by recognizing that there is a vast variety of report types because of the many purposes they serve. The rhetorical structures employed will vary depending on whether the report is formal or informal (e.g. letter and memo reports), and on the report type, e.g. complete analytical reports, informational reports, periodic reports, research reports, justification reports, progress reports, etc. (Menning and Wilkinson 1972:490-2). The multiplicity of report types has challenged business textbook authors to define what a business report is. Raymond Lesikar (1972:322) defines a business report broadly as 'an orderly and objective communication of factual information which serves some business purpose.' The word 'objectivity' in this definition deserves elaboration because it requires a command of the 'C' qualities listed above under illocutionary effect. Report
writers emphasize perlocutionary effect less than letter writers, particularly in formal reports where an impersonal style is appropriate.

Recently, some business communication experts have favored an explicit presentation of rhetoric to teach business writing to native speakers of English. Ruth Walsh (1981:8) states that understanding rhetoric is germane to reading comprehension and writing ability. If students can learn to identify rhetorical techniques along with recognizing deductive or inductive structures, they have a leg up on understanding content. So essential is a knowledge of the relationship of rhetoric to expository writing, that upper-level business communication students are told that it is impossible to put together a piece of writing---including letters, memorandums, and reports---without using one, or a combination of, rhetorical techniques...

In Walsh's opinion, native English-speaking students should select a rhetorical pattern to follow (as suggested by the topic) because it allows them to focus their research and organize thinking much more purposefully. She also makes the helpful distinction between rhetorical modes and deductive or inductive structures. In deductive structures, the conclusion is presented first, saving the reader time. The inductive structure, on the other hand, first presents introductory material to orient the reader to the problem, then presents facts and their analyses, and finally concludes and summarizes (Lesikar 1972:328). Students need to detect both kinds of structure and should be given reading passages to do so. It will help them to know, for example, that Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB) pronouncements are 'inductively organized extended definitions of the tax codes' (Walsh 1981:11).
Gregory Barnes (1982) in *Communication Skills for the Foreign-Born Professional*, offers another presentation of rhetorical modes, shown in Figure 4. Barnes labels the modes of sequence 'natural' because their use is automatically suggested by the nature of the subject matter; for example, chronology is natural for narrating past events. The classification modes, in contrast, are 'logical' or 'analytical' because the writer is free to interpret the facts and to project onto the reader's mind the conceptual relations in the subject matter he or she wishes to emphasize. The modes of reduction are so-called because they perform small-scale functions rather than provide large scale structures for the complete coverage of a topic. Barnes also discusses complex structures, i.e. when modes combine in the actual process of writing.
**MODES OF RHETORICAL ORGANIZATION**

- **Modes of Reduction**
  - Definition
  - Generalization
  - Summary/Examples
  - Paraphrase

- **Modes of Completion**
  - Modes of Division
    - Comparison/Contrast
  - Pro & Con

- **Modes of Integration**
  - Sequence
  - Classification
    - Classificatory Description
    - Persuasion
    - Causes/Effects
  - Spatial Description
  - Process
  - Chronology

**Figure 4**

Barnes' Modes of Rhetorical Organization (Barnes 1982:66)
The final point to be made in relation to the rhetorical structure of written discourse is one often made by discourse analysts of English: that writers in the Anglo-American tradition hold an ideal standard of linear, economical, and efficient discourse development. This somewhat Whorfian view is common among researchers in contrastive rhetoric. Robert Kaplan (1972:63), for example, states that 'each culture has a paragraph order unique to itself, ... part of the learning of a particular language is the mastering of its logical system.' The question is now raised of whether or not rhetorical modes, and therefore logical thinking, are universal or culture-specific. Since the modes originated in the oral art of ancient Greece, they may be universal in the Western world. Anne Eisenberg (1982:85) states that 'the basic rhetorical patterns developed in antiquity remain today the backbone of written scientific and technical discourse', and this includes technical business reports. Widdowson takes yet another position. In his view, rhetorical modes reflect universal conceptual structures which are either inherent in or suggested by the subject matter or by a given academic discipline. Widdowson (1978:54) states:

The conventions [of rhetorical coherence] ... are not specific to any particular language. Thus, a discourse, like, for example, a technical description, will remain the same whether it is textualized in one language or another and this accounts in large measure for the possibility of translation ... The task of the foreign language teacher is to show how these conventions are realized through another language system.

The rhetorical conventions of science may be more universal than those used in business communication. Yet since businesses all over the world engage in the same purposes and activities, business
writing may employ similar rhetorical modes in parallel situations. But until more studies in the contrastive rhetoric of business letters and reports in different languages are conducted, ESL curriculum designers will be unsure of where the cultural and linguistic differences, if any, lie.

Analysis of Spoken Discourse

In order to determine which speaking skills might be included in an ESL curriculum for foreign-born professionals, this section presents the findings from discourse analyses conducted in two areas: conversational analysis and conversational routines. Conversational analysis is grounded in the empirical observation and formal description of spoken language data, made possible by audio and visual tape recordings. Studies in conversational routines, on the other hand, combine aspects of both speech act theory and conversational analysis in whatever ways necessary to account for both anecdotal and empirical data, subjectively and objectively. Finally, some materials and suggestions from business communication experts are discussed. Before proceeding, a useful distinction should be made between the two kinds of speaking that go on in professional situations, namely socializing at work and job-related speaking. Most of the following discussion is general enough to account for the linguistic aspects of both, although the major part of speech communication in business and the professions is 'task-oriented interaction' (Samovar et al. 1981:4).
Conversational analysis. In some ways, the conversational analysts Harvey Sacks, Emanuel Schegloff, and Gail Jefferson have made more progress in describing the norms of interpretation used in a speech community than have the ethnographers of communication. The latter have tended to emphasize exotic, well-defined and ritualized events, such as greetings, chanting, drinking ceremonies, etc. But conversational analysts work with banal, everyday situations as people interact with family, friends, acquaintances, and strangers. They scrutinize their data rigorously to develop conversational analysis as a 'naturalistic observational discipline' (Coulthard 1977:52). Conversational analysts, then, deal with discourse management, or the purely formal description of the structure of conversational 'moves'. The moves to be discussed here are turn-taking, adjacency pairs, repair, and overall conversational management, which includes openings, topic talk, and closings.

The most fundamental system operating in conversation is turn-taking. Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1978:7) state:

Turn taking is used for the ordering of moves in games, for allocating political office, for regulating traffic at intersections, for the servicing of customers at business establishments, for talking in interviews, meetings, debates, ceremonies, conversations, etc. ... It is obviously a prominent type of social organization, one whose instances are implicated in a wide range of other activities.

Because of 'turn-constructional units', the participants in a conversation are able to project the possible completion of a turn. The point at which a turn is actually completed is called a
'transition relevance place' (Daden 1975:19). These highly predictable patterns in conversation signal to the participants when it is appropriate to speak.

Turn taking is also governed by the norms of interaction in a given speech community. Some Asian students, for example, have told the researcher that they are not expected to volunteer information about themselves at job interviews in their countries to give the impression of being humble. Americans are expected to do just the opposite by demonstrating their initiative, enthusiasm, creativity, and resourcefulness.

The smallest and most fundamental sequencing unit in conversation is the adjacency pair. It consists of 'a sequence of two utterances (or turns), adjacently placed, and spoken by different speakers' (Daden 1975:22). The first utterance, i.e. the first pairpart, sets constraints on what can follow as the relevant second pair-part. Some examples of adjacency pairs are: question--answer; complaint--apology/denial; greeting--greeting; offer--accept/reject; request--grant/reject; compliment--accept/reject; etc. Richards (1980:421) notes that ESL teachers too often treat all questions as one sole adjacency pair, i.e. request for information--answer, as in 4 A and B below. But students should be shown and allowed to practice the rich variety of possible rejoinders, as in 5 A and B below.

4 A: Are these apples fresh?
   B: Yes they are.

5 A: Are these apples fresh?
   B: I just bought them. Help yourself.
One other type of conversational move should be mentioned, namely the 'repair'. A repair occurs whenever there is an overlap or too much of a gap between turns. It may also be used to clarify an utterance that the listener has not understood. In a sense, the participants in a conversation negotiate and collaborate through repairs to complete the meanings they intend to express. The data show that repair in English native speakers' speech follows a certain politeness strategy as to who initiates a repair. Irene Daden (1975:98) states that

the recipient of a trouble-source turn does not interrupt a speaker in order to initiate repair; rather he affords him a number of opportunities first to effect the repair himself, even if the recipient has the solution to the problem in hand.

For example, a speaker might initiate a self-repair by saying I mean ... or you know. A listener might request that the speaker make a repair (i.e. an other-initiated repair) by saying I didn't catch the part about ... or Pardon me? In special cases, such as adult-child or teacher-student discourse, other-initiated repair is used to foster learning. This is also true among ESL students engaged in conversation with each other. Joan Schwartz (1980) found that the students used a resourceful array of verbal strategies to 'come to terms' with each other. A Japanese student, for example, used collocation to associate waship (worship, the source of the trouble) with religion. Schwartz's study shows that other-initiated repair and other-correction are more common among ESL students than native speakers of English, understandably since trouble spots are more frequent. The students in her study often exchanged a teaching role to negotiate and arrive at an agreement of meaning, even at the
beginning level.

The overall process which occurs in a single conversation as a unit is called 'conversational management'. It has three very orderly parts: 1) the opening, 2) topic talk, and 3) the closing. One type of opening that is especially relevant to this study is the 'summons/answer sequence' since it is generic to the telephone (i.e. when it rings, it summons) but not face-to-face interaction. Situational constraints determine the answer on the phone, e.g. private parties say Hello, a servant often says X residence, businesses usually use their name, e.g. Teradyne Incorporated, Good afternoon, and people generally use Yeah or Yes over an intercom.

Openings in telephone conversations often cause trouble for second language learners. As an example, Jack Richards (1980) reports that Egyptians often demand to know who is calling since there are so many wrong numbers there. Unfortunately, this behavior seems rude from an American's viewpoint.

Closing sequences on the phone can also cause problems for ESL students. First, they may completely miss the intention behind 'Well, I guess you have got lots of things to do', or 'I won't keep you any longer.' Second, they may not use closings correctly, as in the case of the foreign student who said over the phone: 'I have nothing more to say so, Goodbye' (Richards 1980:423).

ESL students should also be aware of 'pre-closing techniques' in conversation. A closing section cannot be determined by what came before it since the end of a sequence is the most common place for the beginning of another, and hence a continuation of the conversation. A pre-closing technique is used, however, to indicate
the participant's desire to close the conversation. Examples are *well*, *Okay*, and *So:*\textsuperscript{5}. On the phone, it could be 'I don't want to tie up your phone' or 'This is costing you money' (Daden 1975:80).

Another move that is perhaps difficult for ESL students is the 'pre-first-topic closing offering', which means that a phone caller can allow the person called to close a prospective conversation before it begins (i.e. before there is topic talk). The caller might ask, for example, 'Am I taking you away from a client?'

Topic talk is the heart of a conversation since it occurs between the opening and closing sequences. Topics are introduced, developed, and changed in an orderly fashion. The first topic after the opening of a conversation is called the 'anchor point'. The participants can attempt to obtain or avoid it by various strategic moves in the opening (or pre-topic) sequence. These moves are not necessarily conscious, but they result in determining who gets the anchor point, when, and what goes into it. The length of this pre-topic sequence may vary considerably depending on the effect the speaker wants to create and on the urgency and importance of the topic to the speaker. Daden (1975:70) identifies two variations of the opening sequence leading up to the anchor point: upgrading and downgrading. Upgrading occurs when the anchor point is moved up by pre-empting some of the components of the opening. A speaker may use this technique when directness is desirable or to avoid 'beating around the bush'. With downgrading, the anchor point is delayed by extending the opening talk, for example, by inquiring about other members of the family. A speaker may use this technique to tactfully downplay the urgency of a topic to an interactant even
though it may have great importance for the speaker. Thus, an awareness of the downgrading or upgrading of an anchor point can help students to develop tact in business settings.

The norms of interaction in a speech community also govern the choice of topic in a conversation. Some topics are taboo in certain contexts or are acceptable in one culture but not in another. For example, asking a newly met acquaintance 'Are you married?' and 'How old are you?' may be more acceptable in Asian than in American cultures. Arabs commonly ask 'How much did that cost?' (Richards 1980:424). ESL students need to know which topics are acceptable in given contexts in American culture.

Conversational routines. Especially susceptible to discourse analysis are conversational routines, which are frequently recurring phrases or expressions in conversation. Until recently, routines had not been studied because of the emphasis in transformational grammar on a person's ability to generate an infinite number of sentences. But empirical investigations of conversation show that much of what is said in everyday interaction is far from unique. Conversational routines are particularly important for non-native speakers to master since they are learnable and give an impression of natural, fluent speech. But more essentially, the use of routines in a speech community establishes solidarity and rapport among its members (Coulmas 1982a:2). Thus, routines are tools of socialization and acculturation in helping people to relate to each other in accepted ways.

Because routines are learned during childhood as part of the
socialization process in one's native language, they are like 'tacit agreements' which all the members of that speech community presume to share. Since these agreements are tacit, non-native speakers, who have not had the advantage of learning English since childhood, must infer the meanings implied in conversational routines. Like indirect speech acts, conversational routines often cannot be interpreted literally, and non-native speakers do not always know when not to assign full propositional force to an utterance. The fact that non-native speakers may find interpreting conversational routines difficult, indicates that they should be included in a curriculum for foreign-born professionals.

The presence of certain routines and their meanings, whether direct or indirect, often correlates with the performance of certain speech acts. There is currently a growing interest in the contrastive analysis of the conversational routines used in different languages to perform similar speech acts. The results of these studies have as great a potential for application to curriculum development as did the contrastive analyses of phonetic and syntactic systems to the language pedagogy of the 1960's. Coulmas (1981b:69), discusses the relationship between two routine speech acts, 'thanks' and 'apologies,' in Japanese and certain European languages. He notes that 'the values and norms of a given speech community have a bearing on whether or not they [i.e. thanks and apologies] are to be considered as being related activities.' In Japanese, those two speech acts are more closely related than in European languages. Consequently, a Japanese learner of English is likely to transfer the underlying rules for these speech acts,
Including when they are appropriately performed, to English. For example, a Japanese speaker of English may apologize in reaction to having received a favor. Coulmas refers to this phenomenon as 'pragmatic interference'. It is apparently identical to Hymes' notion of 'sociolinguistic interference'.

In another contrastive study, Juliane House and Gabriele Kasper (1981) compare politeness markers in German and British English by identifying the 'directness levels' of various routines for requests and complaints in the two languages. Their investigation was motivated by the observation that speakers of British English view German learners of English as impolite. The authors hypothesized that this was the result of pragmatic interference which occurred when the German speakers of English transferred the underlying rules for the realizations of these two speech acts from their native language to English. House and Kasper found that German native speakers generally selected higher levels of directness for both requests and complaints than did English native speakers. Their study confirms the assumption that different social norms operate in different speech communities.

A purely descriptive study of routines in English is the one Eric Keller (1981) made of 'gambits'. Gambits are stereotyped conversational strategy signals which the speaker uses to introduce his or her utterance and to prepare the listeners for a shift or turn in the logical argument. Adept conversationalists use gambits very
skillfully. For example, when introducing an opinion a speaker might say, *The way I look at it* . . . or *In my opinion* . . . ; to mention something unpleasant, a speaker might say, *Whether we like it or not,* . . . or *To be realistic,* . . . (Keller 1981:94).

The corpus which Keller analyzed is especially pertinent to this study since about 60% of the data comes from Canadian boardroom-type discussions which were taped and then transcribed. The remaining 40% of the corpus is taken from discussions and interviews broadcast on Canadian television and radio. Thus, the corpus is a blend of semiformal professional talk and informal spoken English.7

In his analysis, Keller (1981:98-102) distinguishes four different levels at which gambits function in a conversation. They serve as semantic introducers, signal social context, show the speaker's state of consciousness, and control the flow of communication. In their function as semantic frames, gambits signal the intent of the message to follow and how it should be interpreted. They are devoid of any propositional content themselves but provide a general frame. For example, some gambits are repeatedly used to introduce an action strategy such as a suggestion: *Here's what you can do* or a plan: *What we have in mind is* . . . In addition to action strategy, Keller abstracted six other categories of semantic frames on the basis of the corpus although he recognized that the inventory is far from complete. They are major semantic field indicators (i.e. congruent: *I have a question on that*; incongruent, or digression: *That reminds me*), various aspects of a topic (e.g. transitions for chronological order, a main
aspect, a surprising aspect, an emphasized aspect), opinion, subject-expansion, subject-evaluation, and argumentation.

Gambits signal social context when the speaker uses them to indicate his or her position as a participant in a group of conversationalists. This involves allocating turns to another participant, e.g. Well, what do you think of it? or to oneself Pardon me for interrupting, but ... Such expressions are usually downgraders (i.e. mollifiers) since overt directness often appears rude. This is clear by comparing I want to have a turn with I'd like to say something. This type of gambit is rare in informal discourse between two speakers since they usually rely on non-verbal signals. However, in more formal discussions, such as debates or panels, a chairperson has the responsibility to allocate turns.

State-of-consciousness gambits signal a speaker's readiness to receive or provide new information, opinions, or emotions. In general, they express the degree of empathy a person shares towards the words expressed by another participant. Examples are I'd rather not, No way, I'd love to, or Why don't we. The more sharing that is possible, the better the rapport, and the communication to follow improves. These gambits are especially important for creating a good rapport with the listener.

Finally, gambits function as communication control signals to repair misinterpretations, e.g. What I really mean is ..., to check for comprehension, e.g. Are you following me?, and to request a repeat after not hearing, e.g. Sorry, I didn't catch the last part, and to indicate that an utterance was understood, e.g. Okay, and And so?
What rules govern the choice of gambits? The main criteria Keller uses is appropriateness, not only to social and psychological factors but also to the perceived real-world situation. Another variable is the degree of politeness called for by the context, which could be informal and familiar or not. Interestingly, most of the gambits in his corpus are expressions of politeness. It is evidently very important to give the participants in a conversation an idea of one's state of consciousness, one's intent to shift the direction of the discourse, etc. Another factor to consider is the situational context of 60% of the corpus: Canadian government employees speaking in boardroom discussions. These participants are undoubtedly very sensitive about being tactful.

Advice on speaking from business communication experts. Business communication textbooks for native speakers of English are replete with information about speech communication in professional contexts. The only text for native speakers reviewed here, however, has been selected because its authors' approach is in line with the findings of researchers in conversational analysis and routines. The ESL curriculum designer should nevertheless explore the many books and journals available in the field of business communication. Of course, the value of these references is limited for non-native speakers of English who may lack the necessary presuppositional information which most native speakers might be assumed to know. For this reason, one ESL textbook for foreign-born professionals is briefly considered here to note how the authors have approached and
focused on the unique problems of spoken discourse for foreign-born professionals.

In their ESL text *A Functional Approach to American Business English*, J.H. McCarrick and P.D. Carmichael (1979:14,16) use a non-traditional approach based on speech act theory. They have devised a dialogue between Stu Roberts, general manager of Contact, Inc., and Rip Torn, personnel manager. Roberts asks Torn why he has recently been late to work. Note, however, the indirectness of Robert's inquiry:

```
Have car trouble { coming into the office
this morning

S.R.: Morning, Rip. { Having problems with your alarm clock?
                   Late night last night?

R.T.: Hello, Mr. Roberts. No, no problems. Something wrong?

S.R.: Seems to me you've been getting in a little late these days.

R.T.: Really? I didn't realize I was expected before nine.

S.R.: Listen, Rip, this contract isn't going to be completed on time unless we're all willing to { commit ourselves.
                                           push dedicate
```

The 'register exercises' which follow this dialogue ask the student to consider the following questions:

1. Who has the more powerful position in the conversation between Rip Torn and Stu Roberts? What words indicate power?

2. When Stu Roberts asks Rip Torn if he is having problems with his alarm clock, does Mr. Roberts really think that the alarm clock is at fault?

3. In the last statement made by Stu Roberts what does he *Indirectly* say about Rip Torn? What does he *Imply* about himself?
The authors intend to guide the ESL student towards a recognition of the contextual factors and their influence on spoken discourse at work. Question 2 asks the student to identify the illocutionary force of Roberts' question about Torn's alarm clock. Question 3 is also a direct application of speech act theory to the EBE setting.

Even though intended for native speakers of English, the text *Speech Communication in Business and the Professions* by Larry Samovar, Stephen King, and Myron Lustig (1981) takes a nontraditional approach surprisingly similar to that of ethnographers of communication and discourse analysts. They emphasize the nature of the business and professional context and how to adapt one's speech communication to it. They deal with the specific speech events of the professional world—public speeches, group discussions, and interviews—and prescribe a detailed set of skills for effective performance or participation in each.

Samovar et al. identify four dimensions which significantly influence the nature of communication in business and professional contexts. They are task, activity, power, and success. In this setting, all interaction is task-oriented because of the need to meet specific objectives. The parameter of activity refers to what we do in this context, and Samovar et al. stress that any activity is a skill which can be improved. Power is involved because every interaction occurs between participants of equal or unequal rank, e.g., buyer—seller, supervisor—employee, interviewer—interviewee, etc. Finally, our success in business or in any profession depends on our ability to communicate; 'technical competence without
communication skill is not enough for success on the job' (Samovar et al. 1981:5).

The advice that Samovar et al. (1981:8) give to students for improving public speaking skills also parallels discoveries made by ethnographers of communication and discourse analysts. They recommend that this communication be purposeful, prepared and organized, based on an adequate analysis, appropriate to the task, and skillfully presented. They also discuss rhetorical patterns of organization, transitional devices to lead the listener comfortably, using conversational tone in a speech, and adapting to the feedback provided by one's audience.

The advice given for participating in group discussions recalls what Hymes and others have said about norms of interaction in a speech community. Samovar et al. (1981:107) state:

Groups have shared expectations about what each person should or should not be doing. These shared expectations, which are called norms and roles, allow the groups to coordinate their interactions by providing a set of operating procedures.

Their discussion of effective group leadership (1981:159-60) also echoes the findings of the conversational analysts. The group leader must keep the discussion on the topic, which is usually a problem to be solved. When someone's contribution does not seem relevant, the leader should probe the idea in order to determine its relationship to the discussion topic. The leader might use one of these 'gambits': Are you suggesting that our decision should somehow reflect X?; Excuse me, (person's name), but I'm not sure how this information relates to (our topic). Both of these statements are tactful and avoid challenging the contributor's face. Neither
presumes that the contributor's comment was unrelated to the topic; there really might be an important relationship. Samovar et al. also present gambits for steering the group back to the main topic, for restating a member's comment as a comprehension check, for asking for clarification and elaboration of a point, for associating a new idea with a previous one to make the relationship explicit, and for closing the discussion properly, among others.

The final speech event which Samovar et al. discuss is the interview. Because it is a gatekeeping situation, its linguistic and sociolinguistic features must be identified and included in an ESL curriculum for foreign-born professionals. Samovar et al. (1981:70) define an interview as 'a semi-structured, purposeful communication activity, usually involving two parties, who exchange ideas and information while focusing on a preconceived and specific topic.' Since the nature of any communicative task will influence the rhetorical content and coherence of the interaction, the participants in an interview need to plan strategies to involve themselves most effectively. It is therefore important for the ESL curriculum designer to consider what strategies are useful in the four most common types of interviews: employment, performance evaluation, information-gathering, and persuasion. Samovar et al. provide information for each type of interview.

The primary strategy in any interview should be a concern for the quality of one's participation, whether interviewer or interviewee. Both participants not only need refined speaking and listening skills, but also an awareness of the nonverbal messages which are constantly being exchanged. Skill in the use of
rhetorical patterns is another useful strategy since the course
interview follows is a calculated, organized sequence. Much of its
direction is based on question-answer adjacency pairs. According
to Samovar et al. (1981:184), good responses to these questions may
be characterized as valid, relevant, specific, clear, and
sufficient. The similarity of these qualities to those of Grice's
cooperative principle is striking.

Finally, the most vital component for success in an interview
is the self-image that a person projects. Samovar et al. (1981:202)
state: 'The importance of recognizing how you present yourself
cannot be overstressed. To understand what is going on and why, you
must have some notion of how people perceive you.' From a socio-
linguistic standpoint, this success depends partly on an
individual's conformance to what the speech community defines as
appropriate behavior. Native speakers of English are probably more
familiar with the conventions and norms of interaction in the
American-business speech community than are foreign-born
professionals. Furthermore, as Richards (1980:430) has observed:

Transfer of features of first language conversational
competence into English ... may have much more
serious consequences than errors at the level of
syntax or pronunciation, because conversational
competence is closely related to the presentation of
self ... The cumulative effect of differences in
principles of co-operative behavior--speech acts,
openings, closings, taciturnity, volubility, distribu-
tion of talk, and presentation of self--may be to
create a quite false impression of oneself.

Since personal success in professional contexts depends largely on
the self-image one projects to others, the curriculum must encourage
foreign-born professionals to develop a flexibility in their
communicative style that will help them to conform to the conventional norms of the American-business speech community and at the same time allow them to express their individual personalities and cultural identities.

In summary, the potential that the field of discourse analysis has for improving the communicative competence of foreign-born professionals is tremendous. The findings which discourse analysts gather from their macro-linguistic perspective can be directly applied to the needs of foreign-born professionals, who have probably studied grammar only at the sentence level. In describing the forms and functions of sentences (or utterances) in combination, discourse analysts have made a useful distinction between grammatical cohesion and rhetorical coherence. This distinction begins to describe the complexity of two systems operating simultaneously across sentence boundaries as a discourse develops. If ESL students are to understand this two-fold, dynamic process, they will need two unique kinds of competence. They will need linguistic competence to understand how the formal linguistic features of English operate to connect propositions through devices of grammatical cohesion. Secondly, they will need interpretive competence to discover how the rhetorical coherence of a discourse emerges through the illocutionary values of consecutive sentences.

Both the analysis of spoken and written channels of communication have unique advantages for the ESL curriculum designer. The spontaneous nature of conversation yields quite different results than the analysis of the more premeditated written mode. Despite its spontaneity much of conversation is regular and
predictable, and therefore discourse analysts can identify and
describe the rules which govern it.

The conversational analysts, basing their work on a philosophy
of naturalistic and objective observation, offer concrete
descriptions of the formal structure of common, everyday
interaction. Their analysis of conversational moves is analogous to
the mapping out of choreographed dance steps. In order to
participate in the conversational 'dance', a speaker has to be able
to predict the likely direction the talk will take. With a
knowledge of these somewhat mechanical, yet reliable aspects of
conversation, the curriculum designer can help ESL students to
become more confident of their performance in English conversations.

Infused with a more sociolinguistic motivation than
conversational analysts, researchers in conversational routines
point out to the ESL curriculum designer the importance of formulaic
expressions as indicators of a speaker's acculturation to and
acceptance of the new language and culture. By understanding the
functions of routines as politeness markers, discourse signalers,
and conversational regulators, ESL students can enrich their
repertoires of gambits and participate more effectively not only in
everyday conversations, but also in such job-related speech events
as boardroom discussions and interviews.

Since written discourse, especially expository writing, is
planned, it has two distinct advantages for the ESL curriculum de-
signer. First, discourse analysts have been able to identify some
of the sequential and hierarchical patterns which characterize
written discourse. Second, the fact that it is stationary on a page
facilitates ESL students' access to the conventions, rules of use, cohesive devices, and rhetorical structures of the speech community of which it is a part.

The most common discourse units discussed in the literature reviewed in this chapter are rhetorical modes. As expressions of logical order, rhetorical modes allow a writer to project onto the reader's mind certain conceptual relationships perceived in the subject matter.

Finally, studies of written discourse in the EST register are highly relevant to ESL curriculum design primarily because they have been conducted for pedagogical purposes. These studies attempt to show the hierarchical interrelationships of rhetorical objectives, functions, and techniques and the constraints which these may place on surface syntax. EST discourse analysts have also identified useful units of analysis such as the conceptual paragraph with its core generalization. But perhaps the most significant contribution is that they are investigating how discoursal features, both grammatical and rhetorical, are distributed in specialized registers of English. The study of the conventional rhetorical patterns which are associated with specialized uses of language is known as register analysis. In addition to linguistic and interpretive competence, then, ESL students will also need differential competence in order to distinguish those lexical, syntactic, and rhetorical structures which are appropriate for a given register of English. Register analysis and its application to English for Specific Purposes (ESP) are the subjects of discussion in the following chapter.
NOTES TO CHAPTER III

1 Candlin (1976) presents the various linguists' terminologies for discourse units of analysis from a pedagogical viewpoint.

2 Candlin (1981), Coulthard (1977), Palmer (1981), and others have borrowed Widdowson's distinction.

3 Such preconditions have been described by Austin (1962), Searle (1969), Labov (1970), and Gordon and Lakoff (1975).

4 For suggested formats for the rhetorical organization of good news letters, see Himstreet and Baty (1981:36) and Lesikar (1972:145). For the organization of bad news letters, see Himstreet and Baty (1981:45) and Lesikar (1972:213). Menning and Wilkinson (1972) recommend different psychological strategies for each of three types of persuasive letters: requests, sales, and collections.

5 In transcribing spoken discourse from tapes, conversational analysts use punctuation not to mark grammatical units but to indicate various characteristics of speech delivery. The colon (:) shows that the speaker has elongated the sound or syllable after which it occurs. The more colons that are used, the longer the extension of the sound, e.g. 're::ally?'

6 Although in their infancy, contrastive studies of speech acts are being conducted. Fraser, Rintel, and Walters (1980), for example, have focused on the performance of requests in Spanish and English. They identified three contextual factors (i.e., age, sex, and social status of the addressee) that are believed to influence the degree of deference speakers use for requesting in specified situations. In general, Spanish speakers were found to be more deferent than English speakers.

7 The gambits were extracted from the data by asking seven linguists to select those fixed expressions which they would themselves use or could imagine using in similar situations. For a gambit to be accepted into Keller's Inventory, 'at least three of the linguists had to have considered it as part of everyday North American English speech. Each of the gambits selected was then tabulated with its linguistic context; later the list was expanded to include other possible contexts. This data is also the basis for the series of ESL textbooks Gambits by Keller and Taba-Warner (1976, 1979a, 1979b).
The reader should note that there is a distinction between Keller's use of the term 'downgrader' as a type of routine which mollifies, or softens, the force of an utterance and Daden's reference to 'downgrading' as the lengthening of the pre-topic sequence before the anchor point in a conversation.
CHAPTER IV

English for Specific Purposes (ESP)

The field of English for Specific Purposes (ESP) is perhaps the most progressive and experimental variety of ESL today. Many of the innovations in the ESP approach are the result of the pedagogical application of the findings in the ethnography of communication and discourse analysis, which partly justifies making ESP an integral part of this study. Most importantly, the ESP approach lends itself to defining the communicative and linguistic needs of students who have specific aims in learning English, including foreign-born professionals. In this chapter, then, a taxonomy of ESP types is presented as a general introduction to the field, and two fundamental assumptions of the ESP approach are discussed; these concern needs assessment and register analysis.

ESP courses are designed to prepare students for successful performance in occupational, vocational, educational, or professional roles. The great diversity of specific purposes for which people study English is apparent in the number of ESP acronyms that have cropped up. A taxonomy of ESP types will therefore be helpful to an introduction to the wide range of literature that is being published in this field. The principle acronyms are EST (English for Science and Technology), EAP (English for Academic Purposes), EOP (English for Occupational Purposes), VESL (Vocational English as a Second Language), and EBE (English for Business and Economics).
The most thoroughly researched subtype of ESP in terms of descriptive register studies and discourse analysis has been in the area of science and technology (Chapter III of this study discusses certain aspects of EST discourse). More articles have been published concerning the characteristics and uses of EST than for any other ESP subtype, although the largest number of ESP textbooks exist for the field of business (Robinson 1981:8).

EAP courses are designed for ESL students who are preparing to enter or are already enrolled in a university whether in their native countries, where English is sometimes the language of instruction, or in a host country, e.g. Britain, Australia, Canada, or the United States. Study skills such as note-taking, listening to lectures, reading textbooks, and writing term papers are among the learning objectives of these courses.

EOP, in contrast to EAP, are courses intended for students who work as waiters, secretaries, teachers, meteorologists, air traffic controllers, etc. Of course, some aspects of EAP will apply to EOP; for example, a college student may be majoring in business and have some of the same needs as a practicing executive. EOP may be further subdivided into pre-experience and post-experience courses, depending on whether or not students are learning job skills at the same time as they are acquiring the necessary English for the job. In the United States, VESL is most commonly associated with pre-experience since they are already employed here or have already received professional training in their native countries.

EBE is the most relevant of all the ESP types to this study since foreign-born professionals are usually engaged in some form of
business communication, e.g. speaking in work-related settings such as at meetings or with clients, or writing business letters and reports. The range of EBE is wide, covering either academic or occupational purposes in international or domestic contexts. The linguistic features of EBE are presented in detail in Chapter V.

Underlying the ESP approach are two fundamental assumptions which bear out its usefulness in application to the language needs of foreign-born professionals. The first of these is the notion of needs assessment. ESP courses are ideally learner-centered because they are based on the rigorous analysis of a particular group of students' interests, language proficiency, and the context in which they will employ English. Thus, each ESP course is 'tailor-made'. No two ESP curriculums include the same tasks, topics, situations, skills, or functions. There is a distinct advantage in conducting a needs assessment. Rather than the English language itself being the goal of instruction, English is the means by which a specific body of knowledge or set of skills can be acquired. The utilitarian approach of ESP allows classroom lessons to be immediately applicable to students' purposes and roles in school or at work. Consequently, students are highly motivated.

Determining the exact needs of the students in an ESP course is itself a specialized field. In fact, methods of needs assessment are the subject of a large portion of ESP literature. Critics of ESP, however, have reservations about the validity of needs assessment. First, students are often naive about their own language needs. Nevertheless, it is important to understand and plan for their perceived needs. Second, a detailed analysis of students' needs is
difficult unless the members of the group have similarly limited purposes for studying English, as would, for instance, a group of Taiwanese secondary school principals planning to attend an educational conference in Detroit. Thus, the more well-defined the context, task, or job in which the students will use English, the more clearly language learning goals can be identified for a curriculum.

The second assumption behind the ESP approach is that restricted codes of a language exist for specialized uses in vocational, academic, and professional contexts. The terms 'language variety' or 'register' refer to the notion that the contextual constraints on language create a stable, linguistically identifiable set of features unique to that particular use of the language. The process by which the specific linguistic features are identified is called 'register analysis'.

Register analysis has benefits for curriculum design because it provides a guide for selecting the linguistic content to include in a course for students who must interpret specific kinds of texts. This analysis supplies an inventory of lexical and syntactic items which can then be emphasized in the course materials. But the fact that the linguistic features which register analysts traditionally describe have been limited to lexicon and syntax restricts the scope of its pedagogical application. By dealing only with these sentence-level features, register analysis alone cannot provide the curriculum designer with any directions for moving from sentence to text, i.e. to sentences in combination. On what type of analysis, then, can the curriculum designer rely for descriptions of sentences in
combination? A solution lies in text analysis, but, as Widdowson (1979:53) notes, both text analysis and register analysis describe only the overt, structural features of the language code, and for this reason, he subsumes register analysis under text analysis. However, Widdowson's classification is perhaps overly simplified because usually text analysis deals with the formal cohesive ties between sentences while register analysis describes only the sentence-level features of lexicon and syntax which habitually occur in a given variety. Text analysis employs a discoursal perspective; register analysis does not. Nevertheless, Widdowson's point is that neither type of analysis attempts to describe how the linguistic forms of a text function in the process of communication. Discourse analysis, on the other hand, endeavors to do this since it defines language in terms of sequences of illocutionary acts and their communicative values which develop across sentence boundaries.

Widdowson's distinction between register analysis on the one hand and discourse analysis on the other reflects past and present trends in ESP. The first group of ESP practitioners in the late 1960's, using traditional methods of quantitative analysis, concentrated solely on the frequency of selected syntactic structure (e.g. passive voice or relative clauses) and on the specialist vocabulary found in technical fields such as agriculture and engineering. The current interest in communicative competence, however, has motivated analysts to characterize scientific discourse from two added perspectives. First, they are now considering the dimension of the specific purposes the students have in learning the language and the uses to which it is put in particular circumstances. The second
dimension is to include in the description of language its character as communication as well as its formal properties, thus engaging in discourse analysis. The inventory of lexical and syntactic items derived through register analysis has greater value for teaching if it is used to insure that these formal features are emphasized in relationship to the functions they perform within larger communicative patterns such as rhetorical modes. ESP practitioners today utilize all three types of analysis—register, text, and discourse—in describing the language of a specialized variety.

The term 'register' has other more general applications in addition to those just discussed in relation to ESP. Other register studies have focused on the use of language in social contexts and therefore have much in common with the ethnography of communication. These aspects of register are important to ESP practitioners because they describe the parameters of situated meaning, including setting, purpose, and participants, which constitute part of the knowledge needed for communicative competence in a language or language variety.

Such register studies of English have proceeded along different lines in Great Britain and the United States. The basic notion of register is the same, i.e. that it is language which fits a particular context, but American applied linguists consistently use it to refer to degrees of formality in language. Martin Joos (1962) has identified five registers, or 'styles', presented here in descending order of formality: frozen, formal, consultative, casual, and intimate.
In British parlance, on the other hand, register encompasses a broader meaning. According to R.R.K. Hartmann and F.C. Stork (1972: 194), register is:

a variety of language used for a specific purpose, as opposed to a social or regional dialect (which varies by speakers). Registers may be more narrowly defined by reference to subject matter (field of discourse, e.g. printed material, written letter, message on tape, etc.), or to level of formality (manner of discourse, e.g. formal, casual, intimate, etc.).

This definition of register echoes many of the parameters which Hymes includes in his rules of speaking. The three aspects of discourse in this definition—field, mode, and manner—were originally classified by Michael Gregory (1967). Figure 5 is taken from Gregory's illustration of diatypic language varieties, i.e. the characteristics of the speaker's use of language in different contexts, as opposed to dialectal varieties, which are permanent aspects of the speaker's language use. In this sense, language varieties are synonymous with registers.

Johns (1979:16) has applied Gregory's categories of tenor, mode, and field of discourse to a business sales letter as shown below:

Tenor: Participants: salesperson-customer

Mode: Semi-formal written discourse

Field: To convince the intended customer to buy a product

Figure 6, also taken from Gregory, shows the 'user's medium relationship', which distinguishes between such language activities as conversing, the speaking of what is written (e.g. a news broadcast), reciting (e.g. a poetry reading), etc. These distinctions are similar to 'channels' in Hymes' SPEAKING model.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situational Categories</th>
<th>Contextual Categories</th>
<th>Examples of English Varieities (Descriptive Contextual Categories)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>purposive role</td>
<td>field of discourse</td>
<td>Technical English, Non-Technical English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>medium</td>
<td>mode of discourse</td>
<td>Spoken English, Written English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relationship</td>
<td>tenor of discourse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) personal</td>
<td>personal tenor</td>
<td>Formal English, Informal English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) functional</td>
<td>functional tenor</td>
<td>Didactic English, Non-Didactic English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5

Gregory's Suggested Categories of Diatypic Variety Differentiation
(Gregory 1967:185)
Figure 6
Gregory's Suggested Distinctions Along the Dimension of Situation
Variation Categorized as User's Medium Relationship
(Gregory 1967:189)
These aspects of language use, such as situation, channels, degrees of formality, and the user's purpose and relationship to a listener/reader, often cause considerable barriers for ESL students. Their lack of experience with the English language in social contexts makes them unaware of and unfamiliar with the norms of interpretation that Hymes has identified and which operate in the American-business speech community. Native speakers use these parameters of language without conscious thought, but non-native speakers may need to learn them consciously. As difficult as these distinctions are to apply in pedagogically practical ways, they must be included in ESL courses, especially for students who already have a grasp of the basic grammar.4

In summary, register may be interpreted as the characteristic set of linguistic features, i.e. lexicon, syntax, and rhetoric, which are consistently used in a particular context. Since the contexts in which foreign-born professionals are most likely to require English language skills are job-related, the most relevant ESP register for their general purposes is EBE, which encompasses business communications. Some rhetorical, or discoursal, aspects of the EBE register were discussed in Chapter III and were based partly on the advice given to native speakers of English by business communication experts. The ESL curriculum designer must also consider the descriptions of EBE which are based on the empirical observation of its linguistic features through register analysis. In the next chapter, then, Investigations Into EBE lexicon, syntax, and discourse are reviewed.
NOTES TO CHAPTER IV

1 Bernbrock (1979), Munby (1978), and Richterich and Chancerel (1977) are but a few of the many authors concerned with needs assessment.

2 Mackay and Mountford (1978:16) explain the newer approach.

3 Marquez and Bowen (1983:80) identify four registers, i.e. in descending order of formality: oratorical, deliberative, consultative, and casual.

4 Marquez and Bowen (1983) have already taken steps in this direction.
CHAPTER V

*English for Business and Economics (EBE)*

The formal linguistic description of the English for Business and Economics (EBE) register sets the parameters for the following discussion. If curriculum designers are familiar with such descriptions of EBE, they will have a pool of language items which typically recur in this variety of English. From this pool, they can draw a representative selection of those linguistic features deemed most vital to the communicative needs of any particular group of foreign-born professionals or for any individual student. Furthermore, curriculum designers can be confident in the knowledge that their decisions are informed by the empirical investigation of authentic language samples from EBE.

The EBE register has been investigated much less thoroughly than English for Science and Technology (EST), which for the last ten years has generally been recognized as a distinct register in lexicon, syntax, and discourse structures. However, research in EST has stimulated interest in conducting similar studies in EBE, which if it is to be analyzed as a distinct register, must also use these three categories—lexicon, syntax, and discourse—as the points of departure for its description. It is furthermore these three areas that foreign-born professionals need to master in order to communicate successfully in their work.

In the area of EBE lexicon, the studies of Robert W. Lynn and Rosaline K. Chiu are reviewed. In EBE syntax, the only detailed
study which this investigator was able to find is Chiu's work with verb phrases. Nevertheless, her research has identified certain syntactic features which differentiate spoken from written uses of EBE. On the level of discourse analysis, the most comprehensive study known to this researcher is Ann John's analysis of the cohesive grammatical ties occurring between sentences in written business texts. Her study is all the more valuable since it analyzes the cohesive elements used by non-native speakers of English in general expository writing. Finally, and most importantly for curriculum designers, Johns has catalogued the types of errors made in ESL students' use of cohesive devices from this intersentential perspective of text analysis.

The Lexicon of EBE

More descriptive studies have been made of EBE lexicon than of its syntax or discourse, probably because word frequency is the easiest feature to analyze. Identifying the most prominent words is pedagogically useful since teachers can help students to develop a sense of the conventional terms and phrases in the EBE register.

One project in the analysis of EBE lexicon is that of Lynn (1973) in the College of Commerce at Nanyang University in Singapore. Recognizing that little research had been done on students' lexical difficulties, he devised a method to discover what kinds of words present the greatest obstacles. He borrowed 52 of the students' business textbooks written in English and approximately 200 handouts used in class. He then recorded a list of all the terms for which students had written Chinese translations of simplified English
'equivalents'. The result was a total of 10,000 of their annotations, from which he chose 120 terms to emphasize in his EFL class. He found that there was a remarkable absence of technical terms; instead, the most difficult words were the non-technical vocabulary used in academic 'textbook' English. Commercial terms such as appraise and compensate occurred in academic phrases such as appraising the significance of and factors which compensate for. Lynn's discovery that subtechnical terms create more of an obstacle to students' comprehension than do technical terms is supported by other researchers, i.e. J. Ronayne Cowan (1974) and Marianne Inman (1979). Inman (1979:21) writes that:

the technical lexicon does not ordinarily present undue linguistic difficulty, since each term has a precise referent and generally a one-to-one correspondence with the term in the students' native language, if the term even exists there.

Ironically, most of the vocabulary in ESL textbooks for business students comprises the same technical terms with which students have relatively less difficulty. More recently, however, textbook authors have become increasingly conscious of these needs.2

Other studies of the EBE register, both lexical and syntactic since they deal with verb phrases, have been conducted by Chiu (1972, 1973a, 1973b) for the Language Bureau of the Public Service Commission of Canada. In her two-pronged project, she identifies the register characteristics of 1) government administrative writing, and 2) discussions among high-ranking public servants in the formal atmosphere of the boardroom. Thus, her research begins to chart the linguistic features that distinguish the spoken from the written channels of EBE.
The purpose of Chiu's earlier analysis of administrative writing (1972) was to make a frequency count of lexical verbs (i.e. main verbs) from which to derive the 'specialized verbs' of the administrative register for teaching Francophones working in the public service. Various government departments supplied over 1,000 pieces of correspondence dated no earlier than 1968, which formed a corpus of just over 140,000 running words, randomly sampled. The samples were then subdivided into four semantic categories: authorizing, informing, requesting, and sending. Even though the total number of verbs was 11,323, there were only 866 different verbs. Chiu then compared the 15 most frequent verbs in her data with their corresponding frequency in the more general list compiled by Kucera and Francis (1967) in order to identify the specialized verbs of the register of administrative writing. These verbs are shown in Table I.
Chiu's Comparison of the 15 Most Frequent Verbs in Administrative Correspondence with Kucera and Francis' General Word List (Chiu 1972:137)

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Correspondence (from a corpus of 140,000 running words)</th>
<th>Kucera &amp; Francis (from a corpus of about 1,000,000 running words)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>attach</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enclose</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appreciate</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>refer</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forward</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>request</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advise</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thank</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>submit</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acknowledge</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ensure</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amend</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The relative frequency of these verbs supports the hypothesis that EBE is a distinct register.

In a later analysis, Chiu (1973b) compared the administrative correspondence data (AC) with the boardroom data (BD). She expanded the corpus of AC to 250,109 running words, including a total of 17,948 verbs. The number of different verbs, however, was 1,037. The BD corpus was much smaller: 60,216 running words with a total of 8,277 verbs, of which only 560 were different. She noticed some striking contrasts between the two groups of data. First, it was obvious that native English-speaking public servants used different sets of verbs depending on whether they were writing or speaking.

Table 2 shows the 30 most frequent verbs in AC and BD:
### Table 2

The 30 Most Frequent Verbs in Administrative Correspondence and Boardroom Discussion—Reduced to Frequency per 10,000 Running Words (Chiu 1973b:35)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>AC Frequency/10,000 words</th>
<th>BD Rank</th>
<th>Frequency/10,000 words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>BE 135.28</td>
<td>(1) BE</td>
<td>366.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>HAVE 25.40</td>
<td>(2) HAVE</td>
<td>99.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>MAKE 14.68</td>
<td>(3) THINK</td>
<td>96.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>REQUIRE 11.44</td>
<td>(4) KNOW</td>
<td>59.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>ATTACH 11.04</td>
<td>(5) GO</td>
<td>49.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>APPRECIATE 9.92</td>
<td>(6) SAY</td>
<td>46.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>ENCLOSE 9.84</td>
<td>(7) GET</td>
<td>34.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>RECEIVE 8.54</td>
<td>(8) TAKE</td>
<td>26.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>PROVIDE 7.60</td>
<td>(9) DO</td>
<td>24.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>REFER 7.60</td>
<td>(10) FIND</td>
<td>19.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>TAKE 7.44</td>
<td>(11) COME</td>
<td>18.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>REQUEST 7.20</td>
<td>(12) MAKE</td>
<td>17.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>SEND 7.16</td>
<td>(13) FEEL</td>
<td>16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>FIND 6.88</td>
<td>(14) SEE</td>
<td>15.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>WISH 6.80</td>
<td>(14) SPEAK</td>
<td>15.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>SUGGEST 6.36</td>
<td>(16) LIKE</td>
<td>14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>ADVISE 6.04</td>
<td>(17) WANT</td>
<td>13.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>ASK 5.92</td>
<td>(18) LEARN</td>
<td>11.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>GIVE 5.88</td>
<td>(18) MEAN</td>
<td>11.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>FORWARD 5.84</td>
<td>(19) TALK</td>
<td>10.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>INCLUDE 5.64</td>
<td>(20) USE</td>
<td>10.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>NOTE 5.32</td>
<td>(21) WORK</td>
<td>9.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(23)</td>
<td>USE 5.28</td>
<td>(22) AGREE</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(24)</td>
<td>THANK 4.84</td>
<td>(23) UNDERSTAND</td>
<td>8.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(25)</td>
<td>INDICATE 4.80</td>
<td>(24) START</td>
<td>7.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(26)</td>
<td>CONSIDER 4.68</td>
<td>(24) TRY</td>
<td>7.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(27)</td>
<td>LIKE 4.68</td>
<td>(25) GIVE</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>APPEAR 4.36</td>
<td>(26) SEEM</td>
<td>6.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(29)</td>
<td>FEEL 4.36</td>
<td>(27) HEAR</td>
<td>6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(30)</td>
<td>PREPARE 4.04</td>
<td>(28) PUT</td>
<td>6.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chiu's findings indicate that the pragmatics of the situation clearly constrain the frequency and choice of the verbs. For example, the complete absence of verbs such as *enclose* and *attach* in BD may be
explained by the fact that no letters or envelopes are involved. It should also be noted that of the 50 most frequent verbs in AC and BD, only 18 are shared by both registers. These 18 verbs, shown in Table 3, are more context-free and less situation-bound than the other 32. Nonetheless, even in this list, the high-frequency verbs of AC generally have a much lower rank in BD and vice versa.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lexical Verb</th>
<th>AC Rank</th>
<th>BD Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAKE</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAKE</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEND</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIND</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUGGEST</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASK</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIVE</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>(25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USE</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>(20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIKE</td>
<td>(25)</td>
<td>(16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEEL</td>
<td>(26)</td>
<td>(13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>(22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO</td>
<td>(29)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDERSTAND</td>
<td>(35)</td>
<td>(23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNOW</td>
<td>(38)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BELIEVE</td>
<td>(40)</td>
<td>(40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEE</td>
<td>(41)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THINK</td>
<td>(41)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COME</td>
<td>(42)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3
Lexical Verb Types Common to Administrative Correspondence and Boardroom Discussion—Considering the Most Frequent Types (Chiu 1973b:38)

The second striking difference between the two corpuses is that AC uses a greater variety of lexical verbs than does BD. In BD, the 30 most frequent verbs account for slightly more than 75% of the total number of verbs, whereas the 30 most frequent verbs in the AC corpus account for only 50% of the total. This finding supports the theory that the vocabulary of spoken language is more limited than
written language.

The third difference is that the meanings of the high-frequency BD verbs are less specialized; that is, they have more dictionary definitions than do the AC verbs, indicating that the spoken register is relatively less precise. Note in Table 3 the frequency in BD of the verbs do and take, for example.

Chiu therefore concludes that the register characteristics of administrative writing include more precise diction and a greater variety of lexical items. Furthermore, educated native English speakers have apparently learned to recognize the specialized verbs of this register and are able to use this set whenever the need arises. ESL students, on the other hand, if unaware of the conventions of the EBE speech community, may lack the presuppositional knowledge required to use the verbs appropriately in business letters. Any EBE curriculum, should therefore familiarize students with the conventional distribution of these verbs.

The Syntax of EBE

Very little research into the grammatical structures characteristic of the EBE register has been conducted with the notable exception of Chiu (1972;1973a,b) whose work in identifying the specialized verbs of EBE is mentioned above. She has also analyzed the structures of these verb phrases and found that they have distinct patterns of distribution in both the spoken and written registers.

To code the verb phrases in her data, Chiu used a binary distinction grid based on Martin Joos' The English Verb: Form and
Meanings (1964). The grid was set up to differentiate between marked and unmarked verbs and allowed the rapid coding and processing of the data by computer. This grid, presented in Table 4, refers only to form and not meaning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>TENSE</th>
<th>MOOD</th>
<th>PHASE</th>
<th>ASPECT</th>
<th>VOICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unmarked</td>
<td>non-past</td>
<td>non-modal</td>
<td>non-perfect</td>
<td>non-progressive</td>
<td>non-passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marked</td>
<td>past</td>
<td>modal</td>
<td>perfect</td>
<td>progressive</td>
<td>passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markers</td>
<td>-D</td>
<td>CAN</td>
<td>HAVE+</td>
<td>BE+</td>
<td>BE+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MAY</td>
<td>-n</td>
<td>-ing</td>
<td>-n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WILL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SHALL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Code for Marked Category

Table 4
Verb Phrase Types
(Chiu 1973b:42)

In order to understand the following tables, some explanation of symbols is necessary. The symbol 'C' in Tables 5 and 6 means that the verb phrase is complex. A verb phrase is complex when it contains more than one lexical verb, e.g. *became acquainted* or *I'd have dared to speak*. Simple verb phrases have only one lexical verb and possibly modal or auxiliary verbs accompanying them, e.g. *has been appointed* and *can answer*. Italics show the lexical (or content)
verb, and asterisks signify the second lexical verb in a complex phrase. The word 'subscripts' in Table 6 means that the verb phrase is marked negatively or includes an adjunct such as an adverb. Table 5, then, shows the 10 most frequent verb phrase types in administrative correspondence (AC) out of the total of 66 unique verb phrases found in the corpus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>VERB PHRASE</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>4,525</td>
<td>makes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>1,644</td>
<td>is made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1,614</td>
<td>can make</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>TM</td>
<td>1,367</td>
<td>should make</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>1,132</td>
<td>made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>has made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>MV</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>can be made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>UC</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>request the consultant to *attend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>TMV</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>could be made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>TV</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>was made</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5
The 10 Most Frequent Verb Phrase Types in Administrative Correspondence (Chiu 1973b:44)

The first five verb phrase types accounted for more than 50% of the total number of verb phrases (about 18,000) in AC. Some verb phrase types occurred very frequently while others were extremely rare; that is, 32 of the total 66 types represented only 1% of the total verb phrases.

Table 6 shows the 10 most frequent verb phrase types in the boardroom discussion (BD) corpus.
In contrast to the AC data, the BD verb phrase types occurred with less variety. The first two types alone accounted for over 50% of the total of 8,000 verb phrases, and the first five types represented over 70% of the verb phrases. Again, the same tendency for certain verb phrase types to be extremely rare was seen: of the 49 unique verb phrase types in BD, 30 of them accounted for only 3% of the total.

Chiu's figures indicate that the verb phrase types of AC are more varied than those of BD, a finding that corresponds to the greater diversity of lexical verbs found in AC as compared to BD. Not only does the channel of speaking evidently employ fewer lexical verbs but also fewer syntactic patterns for those verbs than does the written channel. It would be helpful to know the contexts in which the frequent and rare verb phrase types occur in order to associate
them with their communicative functions. Chlu did not do this; however, her research team devised a cross-referencing system between each individual lexical verb and its verb phrase types (shown in Table 7) so that the structural contexts for any given verb could be seen. For example, Table 7 shows the distribution of the verb 
\textit{appreciate} as it occurred a total of 148 times in the first 10 samples of the AC corpus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>VERB PHRASE</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>appreciate(s)</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>TM</td>
<td>would appreciate</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>TMV</td>
<td>would be appreciated</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>is appreciated</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>will appreciate</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>MV</td>
<td>will be appreciated</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textbf{Table 7}

\textit{Distribution of the Verb \textit{Appreciate}}

(Chlu 1973a:66)

Interestingly, the most common structural context for \textit{appreciate} is the highly deferent \textit{would be appreciated}. Obviously, politeness is of utmost importance in business letters when making a request, so it is necessary to mollify the reader by using the modal \textit{will} in its past tense and to remove the agent by using the passive voice.

Chlu's cross-referencing system also made it possible to contrast the written (AC) registers. In Table 8, the verb \textit{find}, for example, occurs predominantly in phrases marked with modal in AC, but in BD the frequency of this phrase type is low. \textit{Find} is also marked in AC by higher incidences of passive voice and complex phrase types. For the verb \textit{feel}, passive voice is still more frequent in AC than
BD; however, BD uses slightly more modals, tense and mood, and complex verb phrases. Again, without any idea of the illocutionary acts these verbs were performing in context at the time they were recorded, one can only speculate on the reasons for their distributional patterns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIND</th>
<th>AC</th>
<th>BD</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarked phrases U</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>27.91</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrases marked with T</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16.28</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrases marked with M</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>45.35</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrases marked with P</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.98</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrases marked with A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrases marked with V/VB</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16.28</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrases marked with TM</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.56</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrases marked with C</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>37.71</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FEEL</th>
<th>AC</th>
<th>BD</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarked phrases U</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>77.06</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrases marked with T</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17.43</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrases marked with M</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrases marked with P</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrases marked with A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrases marked with V/VB</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrases marked with TM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrases marked with C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8

Comparison of the Distribution of the Verbs Find and Feel In Administrative Correspondence and Boardroom Discussion (Chiu 1973b:46)

To summarize, Chiu's study indicates that administrative correspondence generally contains more passive voice, a wider variety of verbs and verb phrase types, and more complex verb structures than does boardroom discussion. These findings are useful guidelines for
the development of EBE materials and suggest that the difference between spoken and written EBE can be clearly stated and therefore included in a curriculum for foreign-born professionals.

**The Discourse Analysis of EBE: Ann Johns' Study**

There are, to the knowledge of this investigator, only two sources of empirical research into the discourse analysis of the written EBE register: the work of the Prague School of linguists in the language of commerce and Ann Johns' (1979) text analysis of the cohesive elements in American-business written discourse. The Prague linguists' research is not reviewed here because the bulk of it is inaccessible, not having been translated from Czech.3

Johns' dissertation 'A Comparison of Cohesive Elements In American Business and Non-Native Speaker Written Discourse' (1979) supports the hypothesis that 'there is an English for Special Purposes register of business which includes letters and reports, among other forms of written and spoken discourse' (Johns 1979:19). Her study also compares the patterns of grammatical cohesion characteristic of the EBE register with those found in ESL students' general expository writing. Finally, it describes the common errors non-native speakers of English make in the use of cohesive devices between sentences, which makes it especially valuable to ESL curriculum designers.

Noting that linguistics has focused primarily on the analysis of sentence elements, Johns chose to describe the written register of EBE from the perspective of discourse analysis. From a wide scope of
literature describing the rules that exist to explain the systematizable features of discourse, Johns selected the coding scheme devised by Halliday and Hasan in *Cohesion in English* (1976) as the basis for her analysis. There were two reasons for this. First, their coding scheme may be the foremost attempt to explain all the cohesive elements in English. Second, little has been done to apply their scheme to ESP or to the cohesive patterns or incidence of error in the writing of non-native speakers (Johns 1979:2). Since the Halliday and Hasan scheme allowed Johns to describe certain discoursal features of the EBE register systematically, a brief review of its five types of cohesion will be presented.

**Haliday and Hasan's categories of cohesive elements.** How does a text form a unified whole? It is given unity, or texture, by the cohesive relations that occur across sentence boundaries. Halliday and Hasan (1976:4) state:

Cohesion occurs where the INTERPRETATION of some element in the discourse is dependent on that of another. The one PRESUPPOSES the other, in the sense that it cannot be effectively decoded except by recourse to it. When this happens, a relation of cohesion is set up, and the two elements, the presupposing and the presupposed, are thereby at least potentially integrated into a text.

To account for such dependent elements in a text, Halliday and Hasan have worked out a classification of five categories: reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical cohesion (or lexical reiteration).

1. **Cohesion through reference.** Like all cohesive elements, reference items indicate that information must be retrieved from
somewhere else in order to be interpreted. In other words, they do not carry autonomous semantic values in themselves, but form cohesive ties with the same referent when it appears in the discourse a second time. Sometimes a cohesive tie is made between a text and its accompanying context of situation; this is termed exophoric reference. Endophoric reference, on the other hand, is reference within the surrounding text; it can be anaphoric (referring to the preceding text) or cataphoric (referring to the following text).

There are three kinds of reference items in English: pronominals (personals), demonstratives, and comparatives. Pronominals operate through the category of person and use all the nominal and possessive pronouns. In the following example, the *he* in the second sentence, interpreted by retrieving *Bruno* from the first, is an instance of anaphoric pronominal reference:

Bruno is studying computer information systems.
He wants to apply it to business.

Demonstrative reference items (including the definite article *the* and the adjunct pronouns *here* and *there*, *then* and *now*, *these* and *those*) operate on a scale of proximity in reference to location and time. For example, two people at an art gallery might say:

A: I like the Monet and Matisse paintings best.
B: *Those* are my favorites, too.

The second speaker has a greater distance from the paintings than the first speaker, who initiated the comment.

Comparative reference items refer directly to identity or degree of similarity in two respects: general and particular comparison. General comparison means that the things compared are alike or unlike without specifying how they are the same or different. Particular
comparison, however, identifies the quality or quantity of the items that are similar or different. The example below is one of general comparative reference showing identity:

You're going out to dinner tonight, aren't you?
I'd like to do the same.

The following example, cited in Halliday and Hasan (1976:81), illustrates particular comparison, in this case of superior quantity with the word more:

"Take some more tea," the March Hare said to Alice, very earnestly.
"I've had nothing yet," Alice replied in an offended tone, "so I can't take more."

2. Cohesion through substitution. Halliday and Hasan (1976:89) state that the distinction between substitution and reference as cohesive devices is fairly clear:

Substitution is a relation between linguistic items, such as words or phrases; whereas reference is a relation between meanings. In terms of the linguistic system, reference is a relation on the semantic level, whereas substitution is a relation on the lexicogrammatical level, the level of grammar and vocabulary, or linguistic form.

Reference items such as he or she can be identified exophorically in reference to the physical environment. The cohesive tie results from the semantic identity. Substitution, on the other hand, occurs only endophorically, or within the text. There are three types of substitution, all of which act as marker or filler items: nominal,
verbal, and clausal, as shown below:

a. Hiro had several tours to choose from. He finally chose that one. (nominal)

b. Who has the auditron? Sun does. (verbal)

c. It's likely that the conference will be held in Los Angeles. If so, we can easily drive there. (clausal)

3. Cohesion through ellipsis. Ellipsis may be seen as simply another kind of substitution, i.e. a 'zero substitution'. But Halliday and Hasan (1976:142) treat it as a separate category because although substitution and ellipsis embody the same fundamental relation between parts of a text (a relation between words or groups or clauses—as distinct from reference, which is a relation between meanings), they are two different kinds of structural mechanism, and hence show rather different patterns.

Ellipsis occurs when something is already understood. There are two ways to retrieve this presupposed or unstated information, only one of which is associated with ellipsis. Ellipsis as a cohesive device occurs only when there is something in the structure of the sentence to suggest that some relevant information has been omitted. If not, then we must depend on our presuppositional knowledge of the context in which the sentence was used in order to identify the missing referents, and the cohesive tie would result only exophorically.

There are two major types of ellipsis: nominal and verbal, as illustrated in the sentences below.

a. Which of the three movies did you prefer?
   Gandhi was the best. (nominal)

b. What's Karol doing? Cooking dinner. (verbal)
In the second sentence of example 'a' above, the word movie has been deleted. In example 'b', She is has been left out of the second sentence. In both cases, the elliptical items may be retrieved endophorically from their preceding sentences.

4. Cohesion through conjunction. Reference items, it will be recalled, require retrieval of specific semantic information from elsewhere in the text, or, in the case of reference alone, in the physical environment. The referents of conjunctive items, on the other hand, cannot be identified so easily. Halliday and Hasan (1976:226) state:

Conjunctive elements are cohesive not in themselves but indirectly, by virtue of their specific meanings; they are not primarily devices for reaching out into the preceding (or following) text, but they express certain meanings which presuppose the presence of other components in the discourse.

There are four main subcategories of conjunctive items: additive, adversative, causal, and temporal. Halliday and Hasan (1976:238) give these examples of each:

For the whole day he climbed up the steep mountainside, almost without stopping.

a. And in all this time he met no one. (additive)

b. Yet he was hardly aware of being tired. (adversative)

c. So by night time the valley was far below him. (causal)

d. Then, as dusk fell, he sat down to rest. (temporal)

5. Cohesion through lexical reiteration. The fifth and final category of cohesive elements is lexical cohesion. Simply put, it
occurs when 'one lexical item refers back to another, to which it is related by having a common referent' (Halliday and Hasan 1976:278).

There are five kinds of lexical cohesion: the same item repeated, a synonym, a superordinate, a general noun (which often indicates the speaker's attitude), and collocation. Examples given by Halliday and Hasan (1976:279-80) for the first four of these subcategories are:

- There's a boy climbing that tree.
  - a. The boy's going to fall if he doesn't take care. (same item)
  - b. The lad's going to fall if he doesn't take care. (synonym)
  - c. The child's going to fall if he doesn't take care. (super-ordinate)
  - d. The idiot's going to fall if he doesn't take care. (general noun)

Halliday and Hasan (1976:284) consider collocation to be more problematic than the other four types of lexical cohesion.

Collocation is basically 'cohesion that is achieved through the association of lexical items that regularly co-occur.' Some lexical items co-occur systematically, such as opposites (e.g. boy ... girl), ordered series (e.g. north ... south), and unordered lexical sets (e.g. red ... green). Other pairs of words cannot be as easily classified in systematic semantic terms (e.g. try ... succeed).

Halliday and Hasan (1976:286) state:

The cohesive effect of such pairs depends not so much on any systematic relationship as on their tendency to share the same lexical environment, to occur in COLLOCATION with one another. In general, any two lexical items having similar patterns of collocation—that is, tending to appear in similar contexts—will generate a cohesive force if they occur in adjacent sentences.
They assert that collocation is not limited to pairs of words but may occur as entire chains of lexical relations, most often independently of grammatical structure.

In her study, Johns coded the data using all five of the categories of textual cohesion described above. However, only three of these categories—reference, conjunction, and lexical cohesion—predominate in her analysis and show significant results. The discussion which follows outlines the procedures Johns used to discover these patterns of cohesive elements in the EBE register, in ESL students' expository prose, and in determining the kinds of cohesive errors that ESL students tend to make.

**Procedures.** The EBE corpus to which Johns applied the Halliday and Hasan cohesion coding scheme consisted of actual business letters and annual reports from American companies. She purposefully left out business communication textbooks, internal reports, memorandums, and other types of in-house business writing, delimiting the study to only those genres of the EBE register that communicate with the public.

For the business letter corpus, Johns chose 20 letters in three categories, the first two of which are treated most frequently in business writing textbooks: sales letters (10), adjustment letters (5), and a group of miscellaneous letters (i.e., one each of thanks and information; information only; thanks only; information, invitation, and sales; and rejection). Ten of these letters were in the sales category; the remaining ten formed a mixture of the other types. These letters were obtained from the letter file used to
teach a business administration course at San Diego State University; each one had actually been written and mailed. They originated in companies or institutions and each had a different author so that no one idiosyncratic style could predominate. Most of the business letters discussed one or a limited number of topics and therefore contained one or a limited number of conceptual paragraphs. The entire text of each of the 20 letters was coded using the Halliday and Hasan scheme.

The annual reports were selected from companies whose names appeared in the Wall Street Journal publication of the 65 stocks included in the Dow Jones Industrial average, e.g. AT & T, Texaco, TWA, etc. Johns assumed that the study of an annual report is formal and that information is carefully presented to impress the reader with the company's success. The length of annual reports prohibited analyzing them in their entirety. Instead, pages were chosen at random from 20 different annual reports (also randomly selected). Then, one conceptual paragraph was chosen from each of the 20 samples and coded.

The non-native speaker corpus was not limited to the EBE register. It included business letters but also essays and narrative passages from ESL students in expository writing classes at San Diego State University. It was assumed that having a wide variety of topics in this corpus would permit a large variety of cohesive elements to be elicited. All of the students had been in the United States for two years or less and had had a minimum of formal instruction in American English. All of these students, however, had TOEFL scores of 450 or higher. They can therefore be described as
high Intermediate or advanced level students. Furthermore, they had studied the formal written rhetoric of their native languages, presumably enabling them to transfer writing skills more easily to a new language. This data, although representative of college ESL students, is nevertheless relevant to professional immigrants in the United States, who, for the most part, share the same academic background as their younger counterparts and have similar needs in learning English for business communication.

The 214 samples of ESL student's expository prose were taken from five language groups: Japanese, other Oriental languages (i.e. Vietnamese, Chinese--Mandarin and Cantonese, and Korean), Romance languages (i.e. Spanish, French, and Portuguese), Farsi, and Arabic. In turn, five conceptual paragraphs were randomly taken from each language group, forming a corpus of 25 samples for analysis. Johns did, however, analyze all the cohesive errors in the 214 samples. It should be noted that there was not equal representation in each language group since it was necessary to obtain samples from only those students who had been only minimally exposed to American English written rhetoric. Most of the Mexican-American students at San Diego State University did not qualify since they had been in the U.S. for more than two years.

Cohesive elements in the EBE corpus. In all EBE corpuses, i.e. the three groups of letters and annual reports, the most commonly used cohesive device of all five categories was lexical cohesion. Table 9 (page 106), using the figures available in Johns' study, shows that lexical cohesion represents nearly 50% of all the cohesive
Items used in the entire letter corpus. There was a significant difference for reports, however, which used lexical cohesion at least 31% more often than any of the letter corpuses. This may be due to the fact that reports have longer and more developed paragraphs than letters. Any given conceptual paragraph in a report might repeat and develop the same three or four notions within a topic, causing a higher incidence of lexical cohesion.

When the subcategories of lexical cohesion were compared, some interesting differences surfaced in the distribution of items in relation to the EBE genres. The figures in Table 9 show that considerable diversity exists among the corpuses. The subcategory 'same item' was used extensively in reports because of the repetition of the company's name. The high incidence of 'same item' in sales letters may be the result of the writer's belief that the repetition of the product name or its synonym will guarantee the reader's remembering it.

One reason for the large amount of collocation in any EBE genre is that Johns used this subcategory as a 'catch-all' for items which are cohesive and lexical but could not be coded into any of the other lexical categories in the Halliday and Hasan scheme. In one report, however, the function of collocation seems clear. It is predominantly used in a paragraph to tie in with two items in the title 'Employment and Opportunities'. A preponderance of synonyms might be expected in this case, but the paragraph uses collocation in connection with the rhetorical functions of detail and example to discuss the various steps the company is taking to assure personal and professional growth. Thus, topic, purpose, rhetorical mode,
subcategory of grammatical cohesion are interwoven in the texture of this report.

The miscellaneous letters were also marked by a higher incidence of collocation and superordination than the other corpuses. Even when considering the speech acts performed in the miscellaneous letters, i.e. giving information, thanking, inviting, and rejecting, it is hard to speculate why these types of lexical cohesion should be prevalent. It is nonetheless a phenomenon worth exploring further.

Reference was the second most common cohesive device used in all the EBE corpuses. The frequency of reference in reports, however, was strikingly lower than in the three letter genres, as shown in Table 9. The absence of personal pronouns in reports indicates that their writers prefer an impersonal style, except to refer occasionally to the company with a collective we/us.

Again, there was a variety within the subcategories of reference in relation to EBE genre. Some of these differences can be explained by considering the purposes and rhetorical acts commonly performed in each genre. The greatest use of reference items was made in sales letters. By far the most common subcategory was the second person pronoun you/your. The next largest subcategories for reference in sales letters are the first person pronouns we/us and I/me. The prevalence of these particular cohesive items is easily explained by sociolinguistic factors. Successful letters of persuasion (e.g. sales) should, according to business communication experts, establish a rapport with the reader and create a sense of mutual purpose. These letters should also appeal to the reader by catching his or her interest, showing reader benefits, and describing the specific action
which the reader should take. Wanting to create the proper
perlocutionary effect with a prospective customer, writers therefore
use an abundance of you/your.

Adjustment letters similarly had a high incidence of we/us and
you/your. However, the distribution of first and second person
pronouns is the converse of what it was in sales letters. While the
latter stressed the second person, the former emphasized the first
person. This can be explained by considering the purpose of
adjustment letters, which differ in tone from sales letters because
they intend not to persuade but to answer customer complaints.
Writers of adjustment letters perform a predictable set of speech
acts. They grant or deny the adjustment, propose a solution to the
customer's claim, emphasize the action they will take, and reaffirm
the company's good intentions and the value of its products. In all
of these acts, the agent is the company, or we/us.

The final observation to make about diversity among the
reference subcategories is that the demonstrative pronoun this was
prevalent in both reports and adjustment letters. The following
example from a report (Johns 1979:208) illustrates its function of
referring back to an earlier idea in the same conceptual paragraph:

The Company's unusual non-operating charges and
credits resulted largely from its program of
divesting operations which do not conform to the
Company's future plans for growth. As part of this
program, ...

Its use indicates that some information is being presupposed but that
its referent is retrievable in the close proximity of an earlier
sentence. Semantically, this means 'nearness' and 'specificity'. It
is thus equivalent to the 'second mention' function of the definite
The third largest category of cohesive devices found in all the EBE corpuses was the conjunctives. Although the percentage of total occurrence shown in Table 9 is low for all genres, some significant differences again surfaced when comparing the subcategories of conjunctives. In sales letters, the simple additives and and also were the most predominant. Far fewer adversatives appeared, but when they did, these were limited to the simple but. Therefore was common in adjustment and miscellaneous letters, and suggests the presence of the rhetorical mode cause and effect. In the act of answering a complaint, as adjustment letters do, reasons are necessary to explain a denial or to justify the company's actions.

Finally, it is important to note that although reports ranked second in their use of conjunctives, they employed the greatest variety of its subcategories. For example, they used the complex additive in addition; the simple adversatives yet and while; the emphatic contrastive however; correctives such as instead and on the contrary; and the casuals therefore, consequently, and as a result. Diversity in the use of conjunctives is evidently a benchmark of the formal style conventionally associated with reports. The most extensive use of any conjunctive category made in reports, however, was of the temporals then/next. This is probably due to fact that writers of annual reports deal with events of the past year in chronological order, as well as explain the effects of these events on the company's prosperity.

The cohesive categories of ellipsis and substitution represented very few items in any of the EBE corpuses. A notable exception was
the variety of ellipsis in sales letters. Ellipsis formed only 7% of all cohesive items found in this EBE genre, but these items fell into 7 different subcategories. Furthermore, ellipsis occurred in 9 of the 10 sales letters analyzed. This implies that sales-letter writers expect readers to make their own presuppositional links between propositions since they are apparently less explicitly stated than in other EBE genres. The use of ellipsis, then, may be another way to create the informal, conversational tone that business communication experts recommend for sales letters.

Cohesive elements in the writing of non-native speakers. Although the corpus of non-native speakers' expository writing contained only a few samples of business letters, it is worth considering here for two reasons. First, Johns' application of the Halliday and Hasan cohesive-element coding scheme to the writing of ESL students is the only attempt to do so, to the knowledge of this researcher. Secondly, the frequency of occurrence of cohesive elements in both the native speaker and the non-native speaker corpuses can be compared and the differences and similarities noted. Such data can inform the ESL curriculum designer as to the most difficult aspects of intersentential cohesion for ESL students, thus indicating which devices should be given priority in the syllabus.

As in the EBE corpuses, lexical cohesion was the most frequent cohesive class employed in all five language groups, and again there were notable differences in the subcategories of items among the five groups. Interestingly, speakers of 'other Oriental languages' relied on lexical cohesion at a rate of 71% of all items used, and Japanese
speakers at the rate of 65%, whereas it comprised less than 50% each for both Farsi and Arabic speakers. Johns gave a more detailed breakdown of the predominant subcategories of lexical cohesion for each language group, which has important implications for studies in contrastive rhetoric. Some of these figures are shown in Table 9.

Reference was the second largest class of cohesive items used, with the exception of Romance language speakers (only 9% compared to the highest, 30% for Farsi speakers). Of the reference subcategories, he was the most frequent item for Arabic speakers, the and they/their for Farsi and Japanese, and they alone for other Oriental languages.

The third most frequently used class of cohesive devices was conjunctives, as it was in the EBE corpuses. The Romance language group employed this device at a rate of 19% of the total devices used and also with the greatest variety of any language group. The conjunctives used in the writing of Farsi and Arabic speakers, on the other hand, were mostly limited to and but although all language groups used and with high frequency, as shown in Table 9. The implications of these figures are discussed below.

Johns did not discuss ellipsis and substitution since they occurred so rarely in the data.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Sales</th>
<th>Adjust.</th>
<th>Misc.</th>
<th>Reports</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lexical cohesion: subcategories</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same item</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>synonym</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>superordinate</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collocative</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lexical cohesion: Percent of totals</strong></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reference: subcategories</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they/them</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you/your</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I/we</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we/us</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>this</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reference: Percent of totals</strong></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conjunctives: subcategories</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for example</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>but</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>however</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on the other hand</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>therefore</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>then/next</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conjunctives: Percent of totals</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9

Comparison of the Cohesive Elements in the Written Discourse of Non-Native Speakers and Native-Speaking Business Writers (based on Johns 1979)

**Key**

J Japanese  
O Other Oriental Languages  
R Romance Languages  
F Farsi  
A Arabic
Non-native speaker errors in the use of cohesive elements. By explaining the kinds of errors non-native speakers of English make in terms of Halliday and Hasan's cohesion coding scheme, Johns has provided valuable guidance for teaching advanced writing skills in general and for EBE in particular.

Of the five categories of cohesive elements, conjunctives and reference caused the greatest number of problems for non-native speakers of English. Surprisingly, relatively few errors were made in lexical cohesion, even though it represented the largest percentage of all cohesive items used. Ellipsis and substitution caused few problems, but then the ESL students in Johns' sample rarely used these two categories of cohesion. Thus the low incidence of error may be explained by avoidance strategies on the part of all the language groups, with the exception of Romance speakers, who used both categories successfully and more frequently than the other four groups. It should also be noted that the EBE corpus contained low proportions of ellipsis and substitution, as well, indicating the rareness with which these categories are used even in native speakers writing.

Certain contrasts emerged from the types of errors made in each of the five language groups. These findings have implications for rhetorical contrastive analysis since the differences may be the result of native language interference on the discourse level. Some of the variation, however, may be due to the influence of the theme or mode of the writing assignments, which covered a wide range within expository prose.
The few errors that occurred in lexical cohesion were made by speakers of Japanese and 'other Oriental languages'. One common problem was the redundant use of the same item where a synonym or reference item would have been more appropriate, as shown in the following example:

_Sunglasses_ are no longer a seasonal item. _Sunglasses_ may be worn for a decorative or protective purpose. (Johns 1979:463)

Another lexical difficulty arose when the student selected an erroneous synonym:

_You will also receive our sales manual_ for use of the dealer's salespeople. _In this catalog_ you will find our various ... (Johns 1979:463)

The other language groups, i.e. Romance, Farsi, and Arabic, made use of lexical cohesion successfully.

In the reference category, there were numerous errors, especially for speakers of Japanese, other Oriental languages, and Romance languages. The vague and redundant use of _it_ and _they_ was prevalent in the writing of Japanese and other Oriental language speakers, as illustrated below:

_Statistically, the Japanese working hours for a week are more than forty hours. And also they are working on Saturday except for a few companies._ (Johns 1979:303)

There is no antecedent to retrieve the referent for _they_ in the second sentence; this error occurred consistently in the Japanese corpus. Romance speakers similarly confused _they_ and _you_, perhaps being unaware of formal and informal registers in English. One Romance speaker wrote:

_More people are attending college now than ever before. Without a college degree, your chance of finding a job are slim._ (Johns 1979:470)
Yet another problem in the reference category for these three groups was that the students were unsure when to use definite (i.e., the) or proximate (e.g., this) premodifiers, as in this example:

During the past 30 years, many ships and airplanes have disappeared in this area. They vanish without any reason. Investigators couldn't find anything out about these strange disappearing ships and airplanes. The phenomenon which couldn't be explained exists in the modern world. (Johns 1979:425)

The student justified her use of the by pointing out the post-modifying relative clause which couldn't be explained, which is a cataphoric use of the on the intrasentential level. That is, the specificity of the is retrievable in the same sentence. In her paragraph, however, the should be used anaphorically since certain phenomena have already been discussed in the first two sentences. The necessary cohesive tie with the preceding text is more accurately realized with this since it provides proximity, time (present), definiteness, and number (the passage should read 'these phenomena').

A Romance speaker similarly substituted it for this in the following example:

Oxygen (O₂) is a chemical element which is part of the air. At least 20% of the air is oxygen. It means that ... (Johns 1979:465)

Once again, this would have been better since it relates anaphorically across a sentence boundary to provide proximity. In addition, this can refer to one or both of the previous sentences, while it has only a singular interpretation.

A unique problem of reference occurring in the Romance speakers corpus was the frequently deleted intrasentential it, as in this student's example:
Deletion of it may have been caused by native language interference, although Johns did not discuss it. Her purpose was only to describe errors in the non-native speaker corpus, not explain their causes. She noted, however, that there was relatively less reference used in the Romance speakers' corpus, which may have implications for contrastive rhetoric studies.

Problems with the use of the entangled the writing of Japanese, other Oriental language, and Romance speakers. The first two groups inserted the or deleted it in the wrong places, while the latter group tended to overuse it.

Non-native speaker errors in the conjunctive category were prevalent throughout the entire corpus. The main problems were overuse, inadequate repertoire, and failure to create the appropriate context for their use.

Compared to the native-speakers' EBE corpus, the non-native speakers tended to use conjunctives too often. In the EBE data, conjunctives represented only a small proportion of the total cohesive elements used. In contrast, the non-native speaker data showed much higher conjunct rates, the highest being 19% for Romance speakers. Of course, the EBE register may not be comparable to expository prose since both are different modes of writing, but even EBE college textbooks, which are representative of academic prose, employed conjunctives at the low rate of 9% (Johns 1980:40).4

Another difficulty with conjunctives for non-native speakers was
that they did not have an adequate repertoire of them. And and but were substituted profusely for more complex and precise conjuncts. This Romance speaker, for example, confused the reader with an over-generalized use of and:

The steel industry has always been a cyclical one, growing and shrinking following the trends of the economy. And the steel industry is suffering from the impact of the last recession and fluctuations of the market. (Johns 1979:471)

The more specific conjunct for example is called for here. Furthermore, the position of and at the beginning of the sentence was typical of all five language groups. ESL students apparently are not aware that Initial and marks an informal register in English.

Several other kinds of errors indicate that ESL students need a clearer grasp of conjunctives and more versatility with them. There was semantic confusion between the adversatives but and however among the Japanese speakers. The writers in the other Oriental language group evidenced too narrow a range, their favorites being however and nevertheless for adversatives and thus and therefore for causals. Romance speakers sometimes used internal temporals redundantly, as did this writer:

Secondly, health is another social fact. (Johns 1979:478)

They also failed to use the conventional fixed-phrase form of a conjunct, as the following example illustrates:

In a few more time, you will have a colored garden. (Johns 1979:478)

Even when a complex conjunct was used, it often did not have the appropriate surrounding text. In the example below, the text is
insufficient to support the for example because too many 'presuppositional leaps' are necessary for its interpretation:

Discrimination appears in many forms through stereotypes that were conceived by society since a long time ago and naturally not by nature. For instance, women have been considered the weakest sex and that falls on the division of jobs: for example, the weight and that they have children. (Johns 1979:473)

The same problem occurred with the adversative conjuncts, e.g. however, on the other hand, rather, nevertheless, despite this, etc., when the surrounding text failed to establish enough 'dissonance' for their use.

The Farsi and Arabic corpuses displayed unique patterns in the use of conjunctives, as shown in Table 9. These patterns are conducive to contrastive studies of rhetoric. While these two languages often use parallel structures as a means of paragraph development, English relies on the subordination of some elements to the topic (Kaplan 1972). This sort of 'rhetorical interference' may account for the overuse of and in sentence-initial position in the writing of the Farsi and Arabic speakers in Johns' study. Parallel structures do occur in English expository writing but are usually restricted to the sentence level between similar parts of speech. Subordination is preferred in English paragraphs since it accommodates a straight line of development from a central idea. Embedded structures allow for the precise and efficient delineation of subtopics. In contrast, paragraphs in Semitic languages tend to be developed with parallel structures, and consequently coordinate conjunctives are frequently employed. Although Farsi is not a Semitic language, it may be grouped with Arabic since both share a
common rhetorical background through the influence of Islamic writing (Johns 1979:480). The following example, written by a Farsi speaker, illustrates the preference for coordinate rather than subordinate structures:

As you know, Iran has a great civilization which goes back to thousands of years into man's history. And for this good reason you can visit the great Koorosh's palace which is called Takhteh Jamshid. And it was first built by the Koorosh's command, the first kind of Persian empire. (Johns 1979:482)

The first and in the passage above could be substituted by a causal conjunct, such as therefore, consequently, or because of this. The sentence beginning with the second and could have been embedded as an adjective clause since its information is subordinate to the focal point of the paragraph, Takhteh Jamshid.

In addition to errors made in the cohesive categories of Halliday and Hasan's scheme, Johns found other problems which nevertheless caused breaks in textual cohesion. These were errors in verb tense and tense shifting, the lack of embedded (subordinated) clauses resulting in too many simple sentences, and faulty paragraph development. Cultural conventions also played a role in confusing students as to what kind of rhetoric was appropriate. Johns noted that it is difficult for non-native speakers to achieve the balance between casualness and respect that typifies American business writing. This has been especially obvious when her Japanese business students tackle American business letters. Johns (1979:317) states:

Several Japanese business students have mentioned ... that they cannot tolerate what appears to them as the rude and informal manner by which business is conducted by letter in this country. One student who had worked for IBM Japan for several years dropped
his business writing class because he was repulsed by the approach he was required to take. What often happens when Japanese attempt American style is that they become too direct.

To support this statement about directness, Johns (1979:317) cites the following business letter written by a Japanese student:

Dear Mr. Anthony:

I'm shipbuilding industry's import sales manager. I looked for your corporation's good quality steel. Would you mind sending steel price list?

Then, we'll hold a meeting about to import steel from your company. Probably our company will contract with your company for three years.

The second paragraph is too direct since it uses will instead of the conditional would to soften the request for a meeting (here a meeting seems to be demanded). Such a sure promise of a contract is also inappropriate.

Despite certain tendencies for cohesive error within each language group, it is still possible to generalize about the collective errors of non-native speakers as a whole. The results of Johns' error analysis show that students may have difficulty with lexical cohesion by repeating the same word too often and by choosing an erroneous synonym. Ellipsis and substitution tend to be avoided, as they are in the EBE corpus. The cohesive items found to be most challenging to non-native speakers are reference and conjunctives. The predominant errors in reference are vague and repetitive use of personal pronouns, confusion between the, it, and this, and misuse of the. The major difficulties with conjunctives are the students' limited repertoires, the overuse of only a few conjunctives, the mistaken use of conventional fixed forms, and the failure to
establish the appropriate context for the use of a conjunctive, e.g. creating the necessary 'dissonance' for an adversative. Furthermore, rhetorical interference is revealed in students' use of conjunctives, as when Arabic and Farsi speakers transfer the coordinate structures, accompanied by and, from their native languages to their English expository prose.

In summary, the formal linguistic description of the EBE register in terms of its lexicon, syntax, and discoursal features is an indispensable source of information for ESL curriculum designers. From the data obtained through the register analysis of EBE, a representative list of linguistic features can be selected from which to set instructional objectives. In this chapter, data have been presented which support the hypothesis that EBE is a distinct register of English. Chiu's studies in particular show that even within the EBE register, lexical and syntactic differences distinguish spoken from written EBE. The differences between these two channels of communication also reflect more general differences between formal and informal uses of English. Similarly, Johns' analysis of the cohesive devices used in business letters and reports has identified several items which differentiate, for example, the conversational tone of sales letters from the more formal annual reports. With a knowledge of the distributional patterns of these register features of EBE, foreign-born professionals will be able to master several formal linguistic conventions of the American business speech community.

Register analysis, then, is a viable means for determining ESL course content. Like the other fields from which this study draws,
register analysis is an attempt to describe language in context. In this case, the context is business communication for professionals. However, as was pointed out in Chapter IV, register analysis deals only with the formal features of linguistic code and fails to account for the communicative acts these features perform in actual situations. Register analysts are restricted by their method of quantitative analysis to the mere listing and ranking of discrete items of lexicon and syntax. Even Johns' study, which takes the macrolinguistic perspective of analyzing the cohesive elements that create unity between sentences, is still limited to the formal linguistic description of overt grammatical items. Johns has not accounted for the rhetorical acts which her data were performing at the time they were extracted from context. Furthermore, as Johns' study demonstrates, the frequency of occurrence of a linguistic item alone cannot predict the degree of difficulty that ESL students will have with mastering it. Lexical cohesion is a case in point; this category predominated the data, yet the ESL students in her study generally had little trouble with it. Thus, the necessity of conducting error analyses as Johns has done becomes obvious. Such studies are equally valuable to the ESL curriculum designer since they allow for the more accurate appraisal of the students' linguistic needs.

Despite the fact that the register analyses of Chiu and Johns raise many questions about the relationship between the frequency of linguistic items in the EBE register and the rhetorical acts their presence may indicate, their findings form an integral part of a description of English used for interpreting specific texts and for
performing specialized tasks for limited purposes. If foreign-born professionals are to perform their job-related tasks successfully in English, they must be familiar with the way that the language operates in the process of accomplishing them. A solid description of the EBE register would therefore be one of the most fundamental resources available to the ESL curriculum designer. Such a description, however, rests solely on empirical observation and quantitative analysis. Curriculum designers need also to balance their knowledge of the EBE register with a consideration of the prescriptive advice which applied linguists in the field of ESL give about syllabus design. Their expert viewpoints, although at times in direct opposition, are discussed in the next chapter.
NOTES TO CHAPTER V

1Hicks (1952) has developed a master list of essential business terms for American high school students by conducting frequency counts.

2Dowling and McDougal (1982) present vocabulary exercises which include subtechnical terms in the EBE register.

3Pytelka (1972) has summarized some of their work in English.

4Singh (1977) provides additional evidence that non-native speakers overuse conjunctive elements in English because their native language may use discourse connectors more overtly.
CHAPTER VI

Issues in Curriculum Design

In order to establish reliable guidelines for an ESL curriculum for foreign-born professionals, curriculum designers must consider the issues which have been raised in the field of curriculum design itself. A lively debate is currently being waged over the nature and purpose of a second or foreign language syllabus, primarily among British or applied linguists. The viewpoints of David A. Wilkins, Christopher N. Candlin, and Michael P. Breen represent the more progressive camp, while Henry G. Widdowson and Christopher J. Brumfit are more traditional in their orientation. Both the theoretical and practical issues which this controversy unearths are vitally important to ESL teachers and curriculum designers alike. An awareness of these arguments will inform their decisions for selecting and organizing course content, with the ultimate goal of helping students to achieve communicative competence in English.

In the following discussion, the grammatical syllabus (GS) and the notional syllabus (NS) are described, compared, and criticized. Then the most recent alternative, the process syllabus (PS), is explained. Finally, the researcher will make a general recommendation for an ESL curriculum for foreign-born professionals.

The source of any syllabus content is largely the answer to a weighty question: What is the nature of language? Linguists have answered this question in a variety of ways, and syllabus designers
have, in turn, relied on linguists’ formal descriptions in selecting course content. The basis of the GS (grammatical syllabus) is the school of post-Bloomfieldian structural linguists who perceive languages as an independent system of phonology, grammar, and vocabulary in its own right. In pedagogical application, grammatical units are taken as the basic means of syllabus organization and rarely go beyond the sentence level. The typical GS contains the present perfect tense, the definite article, the noun clause, and so on. In order to select the structures to present in the course, however, the syllabus designer must determine the criteria for making the selection.

In the GS, curriculum items are selected on the basis of the syntactic system because it offers the most economical means of organizing and sequencing the material. Brumfit (1981:90) states:

> Intrinsic cohesion will be dependent on the extent to which items in the syllabus are elements in a system. If they are, then it will be possible to present the system in a structured way, so that the overall system is reflected in the organization and sequencing of the elements.

Thus, the grammatical system of a language provides a convenient framework for ordering the items in a syllabus.

The intrinsic criteria traditionally used for selecting and ordering GS content which are inherent in the grammatical system of a language are simplicity, regularity, frequency, and contrastive difficulty. It is generally agreed, however, that what constitutes a simple or complex structure is difficult to define. The judgement is often made intuitively since the psychological validity of measures of complexity has not yet been proven. Neither does transformational
generative grammar offer a solution, although embedded sentences are
more complex since they depend on a prior main clause. Not all
syntactic structures, however, have such dependencies. Kernel
sentences have no intrinsic order, and the order of transformations
would require learning relative clauses before attributive adjectives
(Widdowson and Brumfit 1981:203).

Because the GS is based on the perception and description of
language as an independent system of structures, its critics say that
it has neglected the use of language in communicative settings.
Keith Johnson (1982) observes that the GS develops 'systemic
competence' in learners; that is, they gain control of only the
structural mechanisms of an abstract system. When students find
themselves in actual situations of language use, they may be unable
to participate effectively. This is partly because of the limited
nature of the activities in the GS-based classroom, where teachers,
in aiming to develop systemic competence in their students, may
sacrifice preparing students for communicative performance in real
situations of discourse.

Another disadvantage of the GS, according to its critics, is its
foundation on a 'synthetic' approach to language learning and
teaching. The GS is viewed as being synthetic because learners must
synthesize the structural elements which are presented to them step-
by-step in isolated parts, each item depending on the prior learning
of another. Students cannot use the language effectively until they
have accumulated enough of its parts later in the course. The
linguistic environment is tightly controlled and attempts are made to
prevent their exposure to certain unfamiliar forms. As a result,
students are not exposed to authentic language materials. Instead, the items they must synthesize are artificially derived from the course-textbook writer's idealized analysis of the structures of the language. Consequently, students end up where they could have started: with real communicative uses of the language. Their motivation suffers moreover from not being able to apply what they learn in class more immediately.

Thus the chief flaw of the GS is that it presents the language to be learned as a decontextualized system of linguistic form. This exposes one of the knottiest and most intriguing problems in the study of language: defining the relationship between form (structure) and meaning (semantics, function). Wilkins (1976:9) states:

The assumption seems to be that form and meaning are in a one-to-one relation, so that the meaning to be learned in association with a particular grammatical form would be self-evident. In practice, language is not like that. A single grammatical form may be semantically quite complex. The learning of grammatical meaning needs to be planned no less than the learning of grammatical forms.

The lack of congruence between form and meaning is illustrated by Widdowson (1971:38-9) in the following utterances: 'Bake the pie in a slow oven', 'Come for dinner tomorrow', 'Take up his offer', 'Forgive us our trespasses.' All of these sentences are imperatives, but each one has a different illocutionary force, i.e. respectively: instructions, an invitation, a suggestion, and a prayer. The GS has not accounted for such variations of language use in the past and for a good reason: there has been no formal linguistic description of the theoretical relationship between form
and function. Wilkins had a challenging task before him when he set out to bridge the gap by building a semantic and notional framework with which to produce a notional syllabus.

Wilkins' intent in *Notional Syllabuses* (1976:11) is to find a better way of taking account of the communicative aspects of language than is possible within the framework of a grammatical syllabus. Wilkins attempts to do for language pedagogy what Hymes (1972a) does for the description of language: to unite form and content in a single focus of study in order to understand the human ability to speak.

Equating communicative competence with the ability to express and interpret meaning in language, Wilkins (1976:18) proposes that we 'organize language teaching in terms of the [semantic] content rather than the form of language'. It should be noted that Wilkins by no means denies the importance of grammatical form nor questions the need for it in a syllabus. The organizational principles of the NS, however, are not derived from grammatical forms but from notions of meaning.

Wilkins has arranged the notional content of the NS into three classes of meaning: semantico-grammatical, modality, and communicative function. The semantico-grammatical category expresses our perceptions and concepts about the nature of the universe, i.e. time, space, sequence, quantity, and grammatical case relations. This category is within the realm of traditional semantics and refers to the meaning carried by the grammatical system of a language. Wilkins does not imply a separation of content from form but makes meaning the governing factor in our choice of the form of our
expression. Other terms for this category are ideational, cognitive, or propositional meaning.

The second category, modality, expresses the attitude the speaker takes towards his or her own utterance, whether spoken or written, in terms of its truth value. Different degrees of certainty or commitment are expressed through various linguistic devices: phonological, lexical, and grammatical. Wilkins (1976:22) notes that certain grammatical devices are commonly used to express modality: 'modal particles, different moods of the verb (subjunctive, optative, jussive, for example), a class of modal verbs (as in English) or modal uses of some of the tenses in the basic verb paradigm (conditional, past).'

Finally, the categories of communicative function are perhaps the most important since they have had the greatest impact on materials and syllabus design in recent years (e.g. McKay and Rosenthal 1980; McKay 1982). They account for language use in context and the illocutionary forces of utterances in interaction. Wilkins acknowledges the lack of theoretical tradition backing this category but includes it as an essential component of communication. He reasons that the lack of a one-to-one correspondence between form and meaning necessitates basing the syllabus on the more vital partner, notional content. His classification of communicative functions consists of six categories under which more specific functions are subsumed. They are: judgement and evaluation, suasion, argument, rational inquiry and exposition, personal emotions, and emotional relations. Wilkins carefully emphasizes that his inventory of notions is only a tool and does not constitute an NS
itself. The syllabus designer is free to do as he or she wishes with the categories since their ordering in relation to one another and the ordering of subcategories to larger categories has no pedagogical significance.

Wilkins conceives of an actual NS as employing an 'analytic' approach to language learning. While the synthetic approach of the GS presents isolated items from the formal system of language step by step, the analytic approach is 'organized in terms of the purposes for which people are learning language and the kinds of language performance that are necessary to meet these purposes' (Wilkins 1976:13). Consequently, students are presented with a particular behavior, such as 'seeking permission', which will contain diverse linguistic structures from which they will generalize, or analyze, how these meanings are realized structurally (hence the term 'analytic').

How, then, does the syllabus designer select and sequence the notional content of the NS? First, he or she chooses the types of meaning that the students will find most useful to their communicative purposes, and then identifies the forms which realize these functions. Predicting students' purposes is the most important criterion.

Another criterion for the selection process is that syllabus content should reflect the most obvious conventions of language use. These conventions help us to interpret an utterance provided that there is no contextual evidence to contradict our interpretation. A growing body of research in the description of norms of interpretation in the area of conversational routines (as presented in
Chapter III) justifies and provides such content for the NS. At the time of Wilkins' writing, however, it did not exist. Consequently, the examples he proffers for the communicative function category of 'seeking permission' were arrived at through introspection. Nevertheless, they serve the practical purpose of illustrating the recurrent, conventional associations between a function and the variety of forms which realize it. These realizations range from simpler forms, i.e. *May I use your telephone. (please)*? to those of greater complexity, subtlety and nuance, i.e. *I don't suppose you'd be prepared to let me use your telephone. (would you)*? (Wilkins 1976:60-1). The simpler forms could be assigned to the earlier stages of language learning. Then, in the later stages, students would 'recycle' through this semantic unit and expand their rhetorical repertoires. Any criteria, however, based purely on conventions of language use (rather than form) require that the students know which realizations are appropriate in particular situations.

Wilkins' concept of the cyclic ordering of semantic units is an answer to the type of vertical construction an NS might have as students progress from simple to complex realizations of the same function. He also considers the linear axis of sequencing, i.e. the consecutive ordering of the syllabus units. Here a problem lies in the fact that Wilkins has found no intrinsic ordering to the categories he has introduced. How, then, can continuity be achieved between the units? Wilkins' suggestion in 1976 was to link consecutive units thematically (by topic) or to introduce an extrinsic cohesive device such as a storyline.
Even though in his NS Wilkins attempts to compensate for the deficiencies of the GS by incorporating both form and function, it has several limitations. Christina Bratt Paulston criticizes Wilkins' NS for focusing solely on the target language to the neglect of cross-cultural concerns. If Wilkins' categories of communicative function are universal, then they should not cause as great an obstacle to second language learning as linguistic form does. Paulston (1981:94) states that

there are universals for the social use of speech acts, and in this case what the student needs are linguistic forms he himself can generate to clothe his communicative intent. Intent of speech acts transfers from one language to another without difficulty for the student, and it is only when the intent is inappropriate in the target culture that the student gets into trouble.

Wilkins intended his taxonomy to be universal for Indo-European languages and cultures, that only the forms for the realization of the functions would vary. If, on the other hand, these functions are not universal (in the case of complaints being inappropriate for Japanese to perform, according to Paulston), then teachers would be asking their students to learn and apply new norms of behavior. Learning another language fluently definitely involves a socialization process; however, suggesting a change in someone's discourse patterns may be tantamount to suggesting a change in his or her identity.¹

One of the most serious limitations of the NS is its shaky theoretical foundation on the as yet unchartered relationship between grammatical form and communicative function. Wilkins acknowledges that any function may take a variety of forms, making it impossible
to generalize about the forms of sentences and their functional uses. If we assume that syllabus content should be organizable on the basis of its own internal cohesion, we must reject the NS. Widdowson and Brumfit (1981:205) state:

However appropriate notional or functional categories may appear to be, they will need to demonstrate that they do not have to be learnt one by one as separate and unsystematizable items before they can compete with the rules of generative grammar in economy, and therefore possible ease of learning. This is not to say necessarily that economy outweighs relevance as a criterion ...

The assumption underlying this statement is that the more systematizable the content, the easier it is to learn. If the relation of form to function is not systematizable, Wilkins is confronted with the dilemma of having no intrinsic sequencing strategy by which to order the NS content. He admits that if students receive no ordered exposure to the grammatical system, their creative ability to generalize about form would be endangered, and their acquisition of grammar would be unnecessarily retarded. The solution Wilkins posited in 1976 was to graft the well-established criteria used for the GS (i.e. simplicity, regularity, frequency, and contrastive difficulty) into the notional units of the NS. The grammatical criteria, however, would play a secondary role. The problem of how much weight to give grammatical criteria still remained unsolved; Wilkins found no justification for any single solution.

By 1981, however, Wilkins had resolved these organizational problems. No longer is the content of the NS based on notional categories, but rather on language events. Language events are
selected by identifying those in which students will eventually participate. Each event is then analyzed for its socio-semantic, structural, and lexical content. The syllabus units are made up of the language activities which are typically related to the events, such as reading texts, writing reports, interpreting statistics and summarizing. This integrated approach makes new demands on the syllabus designer. Wilkins (1981:88) states:

The task of the notional-oriented (or perhaps one should now say 'socio-semantically oriented') syllabus designer is therefore to approach his task flexibly, not seeking to designate the units exclusively in notional terms, but on occasions taking important interactions as the starting-point and on others conceptual categories, specific activities, topic areas or perhaps physical situations (settings). Whatever the starting-point other parameters will be entailed. A unit on making arrangements will deal with certain functions (suggesting, agreeing, disagreeing, confirming ...), with modal notions (possibility, certainty, doubt), with conceptual categories (future time, points of time, place ...), with topics (travel, entertainment ...), with different channels (face-to-face, telephone ... ) and so on. These in turn will define the grammatical and lexical content and will provide experience of the different language skills (reading, writing, etc.) needed.

The final criticism of Wilkins' NS concerns the notion of needs assessment. Both his 1976 and 1981 versions are based on the premise that syllabus content can be determined by predicting the meanings, functions, and notions that students will find most relevant to their communicative purposes. Widdowson and Brumfit (1981:206), however, doubt that students' needs can be predicted accurately, except when the language is used in extremely restricted situations, e.g. foreign-born doctors in emergency rooms or air traffic controllers. Even then, this approach falsely simplifies the nature of the
learning task, 'as if the learner has to be filled up with items like marbles in a tin'. Furthermore, they hold that much of the spontaneity and creativity of learning a language is missing when needs are so highly predictable. There is always an element of unpredictability in natural language use; therefore, learners' needs can best be met by studying an economical linguistic system, i.e. the grammar, which will allow them to meet a much wider range of needs.

There is a more profound kind of student need than merely predicting their likely uses of the target language: the need to 'learn how to learn'. Despite the disparity between the GS and the NS on what the focus of syllabus content should be, both are based on a product-oriented design. That is, each type of syllabus specifies its content as terminal objectives, or what the students will be able to do at the end of the course. Neither the GS nor the NS attempts to explain the means, or the transitional behavior, by which students will master this content.

The question is now raised as to what extent a language syllabus should account for the learning-teaching process. There are a variety of standpoints in answer to this question, although many applied linguists agree that the syllabus must have some specifiable relationship to teaching methodology and students' cognitive styles. The most progressive solution to this question is advocated by Breen and Candlin (1980): the 'communicative curriculum', or the 'process syllabus'.

The PS (process syllabus) departs from the conventional content syllabus in that it takes a much broader perspective on syllabus design. In narrower terms, the content syllabus is a collection of
Items (whether structures, functions, situations, topics, etc.) pre-selected and sequenced to facilitate learning in the classroom. The PS, on the other hand, accounts for a wider variety of components, such as the nature of communication, the capacities and contributions of the students, the teaching-learning process, and the role of content within this process.

The PS is designed to reflect the actual process of communication, a process that is not clearly systematizable. Nonetheless, learning to communicate can be characterized as learning to participate as a member of a given speech community. This entails a knowledge of the social conventions and rules of speaking within the group. Breen and Candlin (1980:90) stress that these rules are not static but dynamic:

Since communication is primarily interpersonal, these conventions are subject to variation while they are being used ... Communicating is not merely a matter of following conventions but also of negotiating through and about the conventions themselves. It is a convention-creating as well as a convention-following activity. So, in learning how to communicate the learner is confronted by a variable process.

To participate in this dynamic process, communicators must master three systems of knowledge, all of which are unified: ideational (conceptual), interpersonal, and textual (formal). Having a command of these macro-functions of language allows us to share meanings with others. Furthermore, sharing meaning involves the communicative abilities of interpreting, expressing and negotiating. These abilities, in turn, underlie the four conventional language skills (speaking, listening, reading, and writing) and enable us to perform them. Therefore, in selecting PS content, or target
repertoire, the curriculum designer necessarily defines the level of communicative abilities, or target competence, on which the successful performance of the repertoire depends.

In contrast to the product-oriented syllabus, the PS has the underlying assumption that the students can learn the target repertoire by applying the capacity to communicate in their native languages. While the content-based syllabus objectifies the target language as something unknown and separate from the student, the PS makes use of what the students already have to offer and widens the definition of what the object of learning actually is. The purpose of the PS is to activate and refine 'process competence', which is 'the learner's changing and developing communicative knowledge and abilities as the learner moves from initial competence towards the target competence' (Breen and Candlin 1980:109). Not only does process competence vary with time within an individual, it also changes from student to student. Thus the PS accommodates individual learning styles and the different routes that students take to reach their learning objectives.

The role of content in the PS is also innovative. The content for a particular course is selected 'from a pool of communicative performance on the basis of a sociolinguistic analysis of the target situation' (Breen and Candlin 1980:91). At first glance, the PS approach to content selection resembles that of the NS, where content is selected on the basis of predicting students' communicative purposes. In the PS, however, content is seen as a servant of the
learning-teaching process. Breen and Candlin (1980:102) state:

Content would not necessarily be prescribed by purposes but selected and organized within the communicative and differentiated [i.e. differing process competences] process by learners and teachers as participants in that process. Therefore, the learner would use the content of the curriculum as the 'carrier' of his process competence and as the provider of opportunities for communicative experiences through which personal routes may be selected and explored as a means to the ultimate target competence.

This viewpoint has important consequences for sequencing, subdividing, and creating continuity in the syllabus content. Unlike the GS, where the intrinsic order of the syntactic system itself determines sequencing and subdivision into units, the PS has no preplanned, step-by-step sequencing. This is because the dynamic and variable nature of communication and the changing process competences of the students preclude any such linear and cumulative ordering. Sequencing is instead seen as a cyclic process by which students constantly build up their knowledge and exercise their abilities according to their own personal routes and varying process competences at a given point in time. In this way, the PS responds to individual differences among students rather than assuming that language learning can occur by only one step-by-step accumulation of 'static' blocks of knowledge or series of ordered skills. The PS reflects the dynamic process of communication by sequencing content on the basis of the state of the learners themselves. The syllabus designer can only choose a variety of content which will activate and refine students' process competences and thus enable them to master the target repertoire.

Instead of subdividing content into units of structures or
functions, the PS organizes content around activities and tasks which generate communication. On this point, it is similar to Wilkins' 1981 revision of the NS, where units are based on language events and the activities they involve.

Continuity in the PS is the natural result of students refining their process competences and pursuing their different routes to the target competence. Continuity emerges from students meeting the requirements set up for the accomplishment of each activity. The communicative acts which occur during the teaching-learning process have their own coherent sequence, as well. In addition, there is continuity between ideational and textual knowledge; concepts are realized through form. Since these two types of knowledge are interrelated, each aids the comprehension of the other as students develop their process competences. Finally, continuity results from a 'cycle of skill-use' set up in a given activity as students move from reading, to writing, to speaking, for example.

In sum, its advocates say that the PS is superior to any content syllabus because it is based on the ever-changing processes of communication on the one hand and of learning and teaching on the other. Rather than impose a prescriptive route on teachers and students, in which students receive knowledge of a static target repertoire, the PS allows them to explore and discover ways of knowing and to jointly construct their own syllabus (Candlin 1983). In this sense the syllabus is only a guide to the real syllabus, i.e. the one negotiated between teacher and students in class.

While the concept of the PS is promising, it has several limitations which prevent this writer from embracing it for the EBE course.
discussed in this study. Much more research is needed in the
cognitive and affective factors of the learning process before they
can be raised to the status proposed in the PS. There is not enough
justification for deemphasizing the systematizable aspects of
content. Ironically, in doing so, the PS ignores the role of
generalization in the learning process. The advice of Breen and
Candlin (1980:102) that sequencing should derive not from the
implicit logic of the content but from the 'states of the learners',
poses the problem of how these states are to be evaluated. How can
students' process competences be assessed if not by their abilities
to perform the target repertoire? And if process competence varies
from student to student, how can priorities in content be determined
for the entire group, unless recourse is made to individualized
instruction? Breen and Candlin never mention individualized
instruction; they only speculate in the abstract without providing
concrete examples. To this researcher's knowledge, the PS has not
actually been implemented and therefore rests on a priori claims.

The concept of negotiation between teacher and students jointly
to construct the syllabus in class brings to mind a troubling
scenario in which only the strongest and most initiating students
would express themselves. A predesigned content syllabus may be an
imposition on some students, but as Widdowson (1983) observes, 'for
some learners, initiative is an imposition.' These students may need
the security which the control of a predesigned syllabus affords.
Moreover, what is to guard against students mistaking their
preferences for an actual awareness of their own learning strategies?
Negotiation implies an agreement between equals; however, the teacher
has some degree of expertise, not as an authoritarian dictator, but as an experienced and knowledgeable guide. Of course, teacher and students negotiate their way towards the target competence; nevertheless, the PS assumes that students know themselves and their learning styles very well. Experience suggests that they may not.

The PS attempts to integrate syllabus content within a communicative language teaching methodology. In doing so, the PS makes a theoretical statement about the nature of communication, language teaching, and learning. Yet, as a practical pedagogical tool, the syllabus should play a much less ambitious role. Brumfit (1983) states that a syllabus 'only assists learning; it cannot define it.' The predesigned content syllabus is therefore not as inflexible, authoritarian, and constraining as Candlin imagines. It only becomes so when it is insensitive to the processes which have been discussed. In subordinating content to process, the PS paradoxically imposes innovation on teacher and students, while the content syllabus, which simply identifies the target repertoire, allows teacher and students the freedom to explore possible routes to its successful performance. In other words, processes are more naturally handled and negotiated between the teacher and students, by trial and error, and through innovative teaching methodology rather than comprising the syllabus itself. The role of content as the servant of the teaching-learning process does not necessarily imply that the best syllabus is one constructed by the teacher and students in retrospect, as Candlin proposes. On the contrary, if syllabus content is articulated in advance, it fulfills one of its prime functions: 'to reduce the "hidden curriculum" as far as possible by
establishing an organization which is made explicit for debate and consequent improvement' (Brumfit 1983). Predesigning the curriculum clearly defines the starting point from which the teacher and students still have the freedom to negotiate and innovate. Stepping from theory to application during the actual implementation of a pre-designed syllabus always requires adjustments. Breen (1983) states:

Although the teacher may 'follow' a predesigned syllabus, every teacher inevitably interprets and reconstructs that syllabus in a creative way so that it becomes possible to implement in his or her classroom. Similarly learners create individual syllabuses from their own particular starting points ... The classroom, therefore, is the point of interaction between the predesigned syllabus and individual learner syllabuses ... We may therefore deduce that a 'good' predesigned syllabus is one which is sensitive to this creative interaction.

Having reviewed the benefits and limitations of three types of language syllabuses, i.e. the GS, NS, and PS, the investigator recommends an approach to ESL syllabus design for foreign-born professionals which is essentially flexible and eclectic, taking the best which each syllabus has to offer. The GS affords the most economic presentation of structure, whether on the level of sentence or discourse, because form is systematizable. All forms, however, should be presented in context so that their communicative functions are apparent. The strength of the NS lies in its attempt to integrate communicative functions with linguistic form. The NS presents students with contextualized language items; thus, an organizing principle of the NS is language events. As also recommended in the NS, the curriculum designer can shuffle various starting points as needed. One unit may be based on interactions, another may begin with conceptual categories, and still another may
start with a specific activity. Wilkins' concept of recycling syllabus content is also a fertile one since the teacher and students can recall whatever aspects of form or function are required by the language event at hand. The PS offers curriculum designers descriptions of the processes of communication and teaching-learning, as well as a guide to the interrelationships of all the curriculum components. The PS also outlines the concepts which underlie the development of a communicative language teaching methodology. It draws attention to the creative role that students play and the interaction between the teacher and students in reconstructing (not constructing for the first time) the syllabus as it is implemented in class. The notion of a cycle of skill-use is especially useful for mapping out the relationships between consecutive activities to create continuity and engage the differentiated routes to learning unique to each student. These methodological concerns are vital because no matter how fine a description of the target repertoire the curriculum designer has, it is still only a 'generalized and idealized description when set against any instance of actual use. Description of use is not the same as use' (Widdowson and Brumfit 1981:204-5).

An eclectic approach allows the strengths of each syllabus type to check and balance against any deficiencies. The curriculum designer can incorporate systematizability, communicative functions, and innovative methods which account for the learning process into a preplanned syllabus, yet allow the focal point to change to meet the needs of each learning situation. The flexible syllabus can focus on
structures or functions as needed and ultimately on their inter-
relationships.

Undoubtedly, such a demanding challenge will tax the ability of
any curriculum designer to synthesize and organize the many variables
involved. The resulting freedom of choice which confronts the
curriculum designer requires increased expertise and responsibility
to make informed decisions. The preceding chapters of this thesis
have reviewed literature in three areas— the ethnography of
communication, discourse analysis, and ESP—in order to inform the
curriculum designer's decisions. In the final chapter which follows,
specific suggestions for an ESL curriculum which can develop the
communicative competence of foreign-born professionals will be
offered.
NOTES TO CHAPTER VI

1Ron and Suzanne Scollon (1981:37) believe that changing one's discourse patterns entails changing one's identity. They recommend that anyone involved in language teaching or research should 'fully understand what it means to propose changes in people's use of language.'
CHAPTER VII

Conclusion

This thesis has suggested that curriculum content for foreign-born professionals be drawn from descriptions of contextualized language. To achieve this objective, selected literature was reviewed in three areas: the ethnography of communication, discourse analysis, and English for Specific Purposes (ESP). It was felt that these three areas would provide the curriculum designer with an accurate and detailed description of the contextual features of the American-business speech community, of the relationship of sentences to larger units of discourse, and of the specialized linguistic features of the English for Business and Economics (EBE) register. These descriptions would then form a resource for course content designed for foreign-born professionals.

The rationale for this approach is that the three areas provide study of the socio-cultural and linguistic contexts of the English language, thus providing the curriculum designer with information to which foreign-born professionals have not had access. Even though high-intermediate and advanced students have mastered the basics of English grammar, they often report dissatisfaction with their proficiency in the language. Not having learned the socio-cultural conventions of the American-English speech community from childhood as a native speaker of English has, foreign-born professionals need to be provided with an explicit framework for acquiring these
conventions quickly and consciously. This framework should allow them to make generalizations about the relationships of form to function and to develop strategies for coping and interacting with others in the speech community to their full potential. In addition to the socio-cultural context of language, it is important that foreign-born professionals extend their knowledge of sentence-level structures to learning how sentences are fashioned to create a connected text and what kind of discourse constraints operate on words, sentences, and paragraphs. Thus, students need to be sensitive to linguistic context as well as to the socio-cultural context.

The question posed at the beginning of this study—'What do foreign-born professionals need to know and do in order to communicate effectively in the American-business speech community?'—will now be answered by suggesting curriculum content for the productive skills of speaking and writing. These recommendations are presented in outline form and are introduced with suggestions for integrating the items, designating a possible starting point, and sequencing the content. Next, the limitations of basing a curriculum on contextualized descriptions of language are discussed. Finally, areas for further research are suggested which would strengthen such a curriculum for actual implementation.

A problem inherent in a linear presentation is that the items sometimes appear unnecessarily one-dimensional. The outline presented here is actually meant to be multi-dimensional and represents several simultaneous strata of form, function, context, and content. The most obvious stratum is the division between
speaking and writing which forms the two halves of the outline. This dichotomy is not always distinct since some of the curriculum items may apply to either skill. For example, knowing the rhetorical patterns of argumentation and the differences between formal and informal registers are equally important in speaking and writing.

The second stratum incorporates the elements of communicative competence that have been identified. This stratum emphasizes the indistinct nature of the boundaries between the three fields examined (i.e. the ethnography of communication, discourse analysis, and ESP) from which items relevant to curriculum development have been extracted. The concept of communicative competence, which originated with Hymes in the ethnography of communication, has subtypes of competence that can be traced throughout the curriculum outline. For example, linguistic competence, one of the subtypes, is implied wherever grammatical items are listed, including not only syntactic structures but cohesive devices as well. Linguistic competence transcends sentence-level grammar because students need to shape the literal, propositional content of sentences so that they are syntactically appropriate to their surrounding text.

Two more subtypes of communicative competence, identified by Hymes in his SPEAKING model, are incorporated in the outline: interactional competence and interpretive competence. Specific examples of these competences in spoken English are the turn-taking system and the use of contextualization cues. In both speaking and writing, ESL students need to develop global interpretive competence, thus enabling them to infer and imply; to do so, they must first realize that literal, propositional meaning is not always equivalent
to intended meaning. Hence some curriculum items raise students' awareness of illocutionary force and perlocutionary effect to help them interpret and perform speech acts. These parts of the curriculum are especially important for evoking the desired reaction to business letters. Moreover, understanding illocutionary acts, or the meaning underlying a text, and translating this into syntax and rhetorical modes is essential for creating coherence in any kind of expository writing.

Finally, the three fields overlap in their emphasis on differential competence, an essential subtype of communicative competence which should be included in an advanced ESL curriculum. Foreign-born professionals must be taught to differentiate among varieties and registers of language. To do this, they must be made aware of parameters such as audience, task, and purpose (components of Hymes' SPEAKING model). They must be taught to recognize the specialized forms and uses of English in their jobs, fields, and disciplines. For example, they need to learn which verbs and verb phrases appear most frequently in administrative correspondence in EBE.

The curriculum guidelines should be viewed as multi-dimensional with several intersecting strata of language and communicative skills. The individual curriculum items, although stated in isolation, can and should be integrated in practice through the common axis of a single lesson plan. Like baroque counterpoint, in which independent melodic lines are unified on the vertical axis as members of the same triadic chord, the language curriculum has separate but simultaneous threads of form, function, context, and
content, which should be integrated into a unified lesson plan.

One factor distinguishing the curriculum outline presented here from an actual curriculum is that no specific starting point is identified. As was suggested in Chapter VI, the curriculum designer may vary the starting point flexibly. In addition, there is no reason why the ESL teacher, by diagnosing the students' needs from what they are able to do, cannot provide individualized instruction as one component of the course, starting at a different place for each student.

Another factor which distinguishes the curriculum guidelines presented here from an actual curriculum is that the items are not sequenced in any particular order. More information in socio-cultural, linguistic, and pedagogical areas (see the recommendations below) is needed before an appropriate sequence can be determined.

In summary, there are two essential criteria for including specific items in the curriculum guidelines. These criteria should be applied to any expansion of this curriculum. First, each suggested item on the curriculum has the potential of joining with others to achieve a communicative purpose in a meaningful situation where interaction with participants occurs in both spoken and written language. Second, the items should provide students with a generative basis for developing communicative competence. Regardless of the particularities of each student's situation or the unique purposes each has for using English, certain fundamental principles of contextualized language are universally needed by high-intermediate and advanced students. Mastering inferential skills and recognizing the contextual appropriacy of various syntactic
structures rather than memorizing local skills may be a more productive basis for language study for foreign-born professionals. Thus, students will have a vehicle for acquiring unlimited new information.

The following outline is therefore presented as an attempt to construct a springboard on which the future development of a complete curriculum for foreign-born professionals can be based.

Suggested Guidelines for an ESL Curriculum for Foreign-Born Professionals

1. Speaking Skills

The students should be able to:

A. Choose the language and speech act variety appropriate to settings in the American-business speech community, e.g. conference room, coffee break, company office, job interview

B. Adjust the language and speech act variety appropriately for the participants and their role relationships, e.g. colleagues, co-workers, supervisors, subordinates, clients

C. Choose the language and speech act variety that is conventionally recognized and expected in the American-business speech community for the successful completion of tasks and activities at work

1. Use the appropriate linguistic markers of casual speech
   a. Contractions
   b. Two-word verbs
   c. Slang and idioms
   d. Phonological assimilations and elisions

2. Use the appropriate linguistic markers of politeness
   a. Past tense of modal verbs, e.g. Would you mind calling back in an hour?
   b. Past forms for expressing opinions, e.g. I thought ..., it seemed to me ..., I figured ...
3. Use the appropriate language variety for various genres of spoken EBE
   a. Lexical and syntactic features of verbs in boardroom discussions (see p. 80)
   b. Casual speech at coffee breaks
   c. Formal oral presentations
   d. Lectures

D. Know how the turn-taking system operates in English, i.e. be able to predict, follow, and make conversational moves (see p. 45)

1. Know when to speak in an exchange
   a. Signals that predict the possible completion point of another's turn
      1) Length of pause between turns
      2) Speed of speech
      3) Loudness
      4) Final intonation contours
   b. Routine expressions that signal allocation of turns to
      1) Nominate self, e.g. May I say something?
      2) Nominate another, e.g. What do you think, John?
   c. Routine expressions to manage interruptions for
      1) Interrupting, e.g. Pardon me for interrupting, but ... ...
      2) Reclaiming one's turn after being interrupted, e.g. As I was saying ...
      3) Telling others explicitly and directly that the speaker is not finished, e.g. I haven't finished

2. Expand their repertoire of adjacency pairs
   a. Standard pairs
      1) Greeting--greeting
      2) Question--answer
      3) Complaint--apology/denial
      4) Offer--accept/reject
      5) Request--grant/reject
      6) Opinionate--agree/disagree
      7) Compliment--accept/reject (see p. 46)
   b. Creative responses to given first-pair parts to achieve flexibility and novelty in rejoinders (see p. 46)
   c. Answers for commonly asked questions at job interviews
      1) Strategies to show strengths and to compensate for weaknesses, such as problems with English
      2) Grice's maxims for appropriate responses (see p. 38)
      3) How to volunteer information about oneself assertively
   d. Questions to ask prospective employers
3. Make repairs (see p. 47)
   a. Routine expressions for self-repair, e.g. *Uh, I mean* ...
   b. Appropriate time and place to repair another's speech
   c. Making self-repairs and checking for understanding comfortably since native speakers often do

E. Be aware of rhetorical patterns for argumentation and structuring information in English speech (see p. 24)

1. Be aware that rhetorical organization may not be universal in all languages

2. Employ English methods of maintaining immediate relevance between turns, e.g. repeating a key word or phrase from the previous speaker's utterance

3. Use a linear style of argumentation in general conversation and in parliamentary procedure at meetings (i.e. get to the point directly)

F. Develop skills in the three parts of conversation: openings, topic talk, and closings (see p. 48)

1. Manage openings
   a. Contextually appropriate greetings
   b. Initiation of the first topic by engaging in small talk
   c. Openings which are appropriate to the channel of communication, e.g. self-identification on the telephone (*This is John*), and in all types of business calls

2. Manage topic talk
   a. Taboo topics in certain contexts
   b. Fluent and creative topic talk
   c. Placement (upgrading and downgrading) of anchor point (see p. 49)
   d. Logical connectors to explicitly signal discourse coherence to listeners, e.g. to show the direction of argumentation, chronological sequencing, process sequencing, cause and effect, etc.
   e. Routine expressions for
      1) Focusing on one aspect of a topic, e.g. the main aspect, an unpleasant aspect, or a surprising aspect, e.g. *Believe it or not* ...
      2) Signaling change of topic or digression, e.g. *Speaking of X* ...
      3) Leading group discussions toward the group's objectives for
         a) Allocating turns
         b) Keeping the discussion on the topic
         c) Clarifying others' statements (see p. 58)
3. Manage closings
   a. Routine expressions for
      1) Closing and leave-taking
      2) Pre-closing techniques, including pre-first-topic closing offerings, e.g. Am I taking you away from a client? on the telephone
   b. Placement (initiating or postponing) of closings

G. Develop inferential strategies to enable students to interpret and perform speech acts in English (see p. 31)

1. Distinguish between literal, propositional meaning and intended, implied meaning (illocutionary force) by exercising
   a. Word denotation and connotation
   b. Figurative language
   c. Idiomatic expressions, especially those conventionally associated with certain speech acts

2. Have access to the tacit, presuppositional knowledge shared by members of the American-business speech community

3. Recognize and produce English contextualization cues (see p. 21)
   a. Prosodic features for
      1) Expressing and interpreting speaker attitudes
      2) Indicating the semantic features of an utterance, e.g. for emphasizing and contrasting
   b. Interjections and grammatical devices, e.g. delictic pronouns, to create coherence in spoken discourse

II. Writing Skills

The student should be able to:

A. Recognize and use the specialized lexical features of the written EBE register

1. Use subtechnical terms in EBE in a variety of contexts (see p. 78)

2. Employ the characteristics of lexical verbs in administrative correspondence as opposed to those of boardroom discussions
   a. A richer variety of lexical verbs
   b. More precise and specialized definitions of verbs
   c. Greater formality of verb choice (see p. 79)
B. Recognize and use the specialized syntactic features of the written EBE register

1. Employ the characteristics of lexical verbs in administrative correspondence as opposed to those of boardroom discussions
   a. Greater variety and complexity of verb phase types
   b. More passive voice
   c. Greater use of modal verbs
   d. Absence of negation (see p. 84)

2. Realize that verb tenses are not evenly distributed in discourse but that tense choice correlates with certain verb phrase types in administrative correspondence in relation to their contexts and the speech acts they perform

3. Shift tenses correctly within sentences and across sentence boundaries

C. Recognize and use the grammatical devices which create textual cohesion between sentences in written discourse (see p. 99)

1. Know the distributions of these devices among the EBE genres, e.g. business letters and reports and their subtypes
   a. In sales letters
      1) Personal pronouns, e.g. you/your, we/us, I/me
      2) More ellipses than other genres
      3) Simple conjunctions, e.g. and, also, but
      4) Repetition of the product's name or its synonym
   b. In adjustment letters
      1) We/us more than other personal pronouns
      2) The referent item this
      3) The simple conjunction and
      4) The conjunction therefore to show cause and effect
   c. In annual reports
      1) More lexical repetition of the company's name
      2) No personal pronouns except we rarely to refer to the company
      3) The referent item this
      4) A greater variety and complexity of conjunctions than other genres
      5) Several temporal conjunctions, e.g. then/next, to report the company's progress during the year chronologically

2. Overcome problems with devices of grammatical cohesion which are known to be difficult for non-native speakers writing general expository prose in English (see p. 107)
a. In the category of lexical cohesion
   1) Redundant use of "same item"
   2) Failure to use synonyms
   3) Failure to choose an appropriate synonym
b. In the category of reference
   1) Vague and redundant use of pronouns
   2) Failure to recognize antecedents
   3) Errors in gender and number agreement
   4) Inappropriate contexts for the functor words the and this
      a) Overuse, omission, and wrong context for the
      b) Inability to determine from where the specificity of a noun or noun clause is derived in order to select the or this
         (see p. 109)

c. In the category of conjunctions
   1) Imprecise, simplistic, and repetitious use of conjunctions
   2) Unawareness of frequency and degree of explicitness that is conventional in English
   3) Inappropriate semantic, syntactic, and rhetorical contexts for their use
   4) Heavy reliance on coordinate conjunctions, e.g. and, but
   5) Avoidance of subordinate conjunctions, e.g. although, while, resulting in immature sentences without subordinate clauses and no improvement of linear paragraph style

D. Know how the devices of grammatical cohesion which are appropriate for each EBE genre relate to the speech acts typically performed in each and the desired perlocutionary effect on the reader (see p. 99)

1. Use markers of informality, conversational tone, and a direct appeal to the reader in sales letters

2. Use tact, finesse, and Grice's cooperative principles to avoid arousing the reader's suspicions in persuasive letters (see p. 38)

3. Use agentive we to perform these speech acts: grant/deny an adjustment, emphasize an action to be taken, and reaffirm the company's good intentions and the value of its products in adjustment letters
4. Create the desired perlocutionary effect by developing the linguistic features of these 'C' qualities in all business letters (see p. 39)
   a. Courtesy—politeness markers
   b. Consideration—the 'you' perspective
   c. Creativity—originality and avoidance of clichés
   d. Conversational tone—key and markers of informality

5. Develop a sharp sense of appropriateness to achieve an ideal balance between naturalness, originality, and correctness in letters

6. Use linguistic markers of formality and focus on illocutionary force in extended paragraphs in reports

E. Know which letter formats are conventionally employed to create the desired perlocutionary effect on the reader in good news letters, bad news letters, and persuasive letters

F. Develop illocutionary value across sentence boundaries and between propositions in extended discourse, i.e. create rhetorical coherence, especially in business reports

1. Understand how presuppositional information is expressed implicitly in a text through surface syntax and article and verb tense choice; convey such presuppositional information grammatically (see p. 34)

2. Detect and produce both deductive (conclusion presented first) and inductive structures and know which is appropriate for various types of reports

3. Perceive the sequential and hierarchical patterning of written discourse, e.g.:
   a. Conceptual paragraphs (see p. 34)
   b. Interrelationships between rhetorical objectives, functions, and techniques (see p. 36)
   c. The constraining of certain features of sentence-level grammar by the higher elements in a rhetorical hierarchy (see p. 35)

G. Use rhetorical modes as the identifiable, logical forms in all expository writing

1. Select the appropriate modes according to the writer's purpose and the nature of the topic being discussed

2. Arrange material in each of these modes, especially the ones most relevant to each student's tasks, activities, and purposes at work (see p. 41)
a. Modes of reduction
   1) Definition
   2) Generalization and examples
   3) Summary/paraphrase
b. Modes of completion
   1) Modes of division
      a) Comparison and contrast
      b) Pro and con
   2) Modes of integration
      a) Sequence
         i) Chronology
         ii) Process
         iii) Spatial description
      b) Classification
         i) Classificatory description
         ii) Causes/effects
         iii) Persuasion

3. Explicitly understand those aspects of rhetorical organization that may be language-specific by making use of studies in contrastive rhetoric to compare the features of English rhetoric (e.g. linearity) with those of the students' native languages (a few examples in any language may suffice to intrigue students about rhetorical differences) (see p. 112)

4. Use rhetorical modes as manifestations of universal processes of logical reasoning in order to facilitate the transfer of what students already know of these processes in their native languages to writing tasks in English

Limitations

There are two major limitations to this curriculum design which would be true of any curriculum based on contextualized language. First, there remain some inadequacies in the ESP register analysis research completed thus far. Second, Halliday and Hasan's cohesion theory may not be easily adapted to teaching ESL students to read and write coherently. Although there are other minor limitations, these two assume a major role in circumscribing the effectiveness of this curriculum.

Although the ESP register analyses identify certain linguistic
features of lexicon, syntax, and textual cohesion of EBE, they often do not describe the communicative acts which these features perform. For example, while Chiu identifies four semantic categories for the lexical verbs used in administrative correspondence (i.e. authorizing, informing, requesting, and sending), she neglects to do so for the boardroom discussion corpus. Nor does she attempt to correlate the administrative correspondence data with categories of speech acts. Furthermore, without considering the communicative functions of verb phrase types, it is impossible to know why boardroom discussions should exhibit more modals, past tense, and complex verb phrases for the verb feel than does administrative correspondence, especially when the latter generally has a higher incidence of these same verb phrase types. The question of how the semantic value of the verb predisposes it to the performance of certain speech acts and therefore certain linguistic structures is left unanswered. Even Johns, who takes a discourse perspective, analyzing the cohesive elements that create unity between sentences, does not account for the rhetorical acts which the data were performing at the time they were extracted from context.

Another problem with ESP register analyses is that frequency of occurrence is often the only criterion for selecting curriculum content. A distinction must be made between description and prescription, i.e. between what is done and what should be done. For example, Chiu's frequency study reveals that the passive voice is common in administrative correspondence, yet every business communication expert this researcher has read generally advises that the passive voice be avoided in favor of a more vivid and active
style. In fact, the proponents of the 'readability' movement encourage a more communicative writing style in government publications and corporate writing. Students will not be able to attain communicative competence unless they understand the reasons for using various linguistic forms in given contexts. Knowing only how to form the passive voice and that it is often used in administrative correspondence, for example, is inadequate. It is far more important for students to know what rhetorical and pragmatic functions the passive voice performs in relationship to the social uses of language and to its surrounding linguistic text. It is better, therefore, to teach syntactic structures in terms of their contextual appropriacy rather than to condemn or recommend them because of their frequency.

Despite these criticisms, frequency of usage studies such as those conducted by Chiu or Johns are invaluable because they reveal which linguistic forms native speakers prefer in given contexts. Much more must be known about the influence of extralinguistic factors on the selection of one linguistic form over another if teachers are to design effective curriculums.

The second major limitation deals with Halliday and Hasan's cohesion theory. It is doubtful that teaching students to correctly produce devices of grammatical cohesion in isolation will result in the improvement of their ability to write coherently at the discourse level. In other words, the correct use of cohesive devices is the result of coherence, not the cause. Coherence in turn is derived from content; the language user creates coherence by applying to a text his or her knowledge of the world, of the topic, and of the
discourse. Although ESL students should learn to use cohesive ties, they are not the ultimate solution to students' writing problems. Instead, the teaching of cohesive devices should be supplemented with material from broader psycholinguistic theories which account for the interactive processes occurring between reader, writer, and text. Patricia L. Carrell (1982:485) states that 'textual cohesion represents only a potential which can be fully realized only when a reader identifies the scheme underlying a text.' Therefore, rather than teach cohesive ties superficially at the surface level of a text alone, the underlying formal rhetorical structures and cultural presuppositions should be presented explicitly.

Suggestions for Further Research

In spite of their limitations, descriptions of contextualized language from the ethnography of communication, discourse analysis, and ESP register analyses are essential for sound ESL curriculum design for foreign-born professionals. More empirical studies are urgently needed to deepen the pool of resources available to curriculum designers. Further investigation should be undertaken in the ethnography of communication, in discourse analysis, and in ESL pedagogy.

Within the field of the ethnography of communication, a complete study of the American-business speech community should be conducted to identify and describe its rules of speaking according to the parameters of Hymes' SPEAKING model. Additional fieldwork should be conducted which tapes, transcribes, and analyzes various gatekeeping and other business situations as Gumperz has done.
In order to make an ESL curriculum as effective as possible, the curriculum designer must also know how the American-business speech community differs from other business speech communities. Contrastive analyses of the rules of speaking from a cross-cultural perspective is therefore recommended. Hymes' SPEAKING model, intended for this purpose, can be applied to discover which rules are universal and which are culture-specific. This information would enable curriculum designers to identify the rules that are likely to cause interference as well as the rules that should be easily acquired. It would also help teachers to diagnose the problems of individual students.

For the channel of writing, the hierarchical structures common in expository prose above the sentence level should be described in more detail. More study is required to explain how rhetorical coherence and grammatical cohesion are developed across sentence boundaries in written discourse. Other pressing questions are: What are the hierarchical features of discourse that constrain syntax at the sentence level? How is presuppositional information signaled grammatically in a text? Can verb tense continuity, which also builds up textual cohesion, be studied and described from a discourse perspective? What errors do non-native speakers of English make at the discourse level that are not identified by Johns? Finally, narrower contrastive studies of business letters in various languages should be conducted to identify the degree of formality and directness considered appropriate in relation to the purposes and context of each letter genre.

The final group of recommendations for further research are the
most practical because they are pedagogical. How effective is an integrated curriculum with a constantly changing starting point for each unit? Is it better to have a content-based curriculum in which the organizing principle is the topics of selected reading passages, thus incorporating a reading-skills component? Is it feasible to include as subject matter for discussion actual descriptions of contextualized language? Should Hymes' SPEAKING model be presented to students, and should they be encouraged to become amateur ethnographers of communication themselves? These questions can be answered by studies that document the success or failure of students in courses based on these various kinds of curriculums.

Curriculum designers and teachers must also assess students' needs and evaluate their progress in acquiring communicative competence. Once these needs have been identified, teachers can implement an individualized instruction component into the curriculum. This would also allow the teacher to accommodate differences in cognitive styles as well as the varying interests and needs among a heterogeneous group of foreign-born professionals. These individualized activities would complement a core of curriculum items which are universally important to all students in the course. Tests of communicative competence should also be devised to measure the success of the teacher, curriculum, and students.

Lastly, more studies are required to understand the language learning process. No matter how accurate the description of the target repertoire, even if it integrates form, function, context, and content, it remains only an idealized description. Defining the elements of communicative competence thoroughly will not guarantee
the students' acquisition of them. Studies in second language acquisition are therefore needed to identify the processes by which communicative competence is acquired. These should be conducted in global terms to trace the acquisition of functions, discourse structures, and extralinguistic features of context. Such studies will give ESL teachers insights into the creative role that students play in the language learning process, and into the type of interaction between students and teachers that best stimulates both affective and cognitive faculties. In addition, teaching activities and materials, whether authentic or adapted, are urgently needed which appeal to students, activate these learning processes, and integrate form, function, context, and content.

Although empirical studies of contextualized language have not yet yielded a firm description of the interrelationships between linguistic form and communicative function, it is not necessary to wait until linguists have definitively accounted for all of the communicative properties of language. On this point the researcher would like to close by sharing with the reader Widdowson's (1979:59-60) encouraging remarks:

We can set about devising exercises to develop a knowledge of grammatical cohesion. We can consider how far we can select and grade teaching material in terms of communicative acts rather than simply in terms of linguistic structures. We can, in short, be working out ways in which we can teach our students to use the foreign language to define, classify, generalize, promise, predict, describe, report, and so on; to make them aware of how the language is used for the particular kind of communication they are concerned with ... [The applied linguist] may follow his own path towards pedagogic application once the theorist has given a hint of the general direction. He may even, on the way, discover a direction or two which the theoretical linguist might himself explore with profit.
Although this study has posed many unanswered questions, it has given the investigator more than 'a hint of the general direction' which she intends to explore further. This review of literature and the resulting curriculum guidelines have confirmed the usefulness of applying descriptions of contextualized language to ESL curriculum design, not only for foreign-born professionals but for any high intermediate or advanced students of ESL. These students have reached the point in their acquisition of English at which they need to integrate and consolidate the discrete items they have mastered into a complete, holistic grasp of language in context.
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GLOSSARY OF TERMS

anaphoric reference: the interpretation of a presupposed element in a discourse by referring back in the text to an earlier element which can decode its meaning.

appropriate: the quality of a sentence or utterance which is adequate, happy, and successful in relation to a context in which it is used and evaluated.

coherence (rhetorical coherence): the relationship, not always overt, between the illocutionary, or communicative, acts which the propositions of a text perform.

cohesion (grammatical cohesion): the overt grammatical relationship between the propositions in a discourse, expressed by the formal syntactic and semantic features of sentences.

collocation: cohesion that is achieved through the association of lexical items that regularly co-occur. These may be opposites, ordered series, or unordered lexical sets.

communicative competence: the knowledge which speakers have about the rules of speaking in the speech communities of which they are members, incorporating several other kinds of competence, e.g. linguistic, interactional, interpretive, and differential competence. Also, the ability to interpret discourse, both receptively and productively.

conceptual paragraph: a group of organizationally related concepts which develop a given generalization in such a way as to form a coherent and complete unit of discourse. Several physical paragraphs may be contained in one conceptual paragraph.

contextualization cues: the discourse features that signal a speaker's meaning and attitude in conversation.

contrastive rhetoric: the comparative study of the differences in rhetorical patterns for structuring information and arguments in discourse in various languages.

conversational moves: in conversational analysis, the regularly occurring, identifiable structures of conversation, especially of the turn-taking system, e.g. adjacency pairs, repairs, openings, topic talk, and closings.
delictic words: a word, which functions to point out an individual person, thing, or idea. 'Deixis', the act of pointing out or indicating, is a feature of such words as personal pronouns, e.g. I, he, you, etc., demonstrative pronouns, e.g. this, that, and relatives such as who, which, etc., and particularly the definite article the.

differential competence: the knowledge required to be able to recognize and select the specialized varieties, or registers, of a language which are preferred or obligatory in certain situations.

discourse: a text, either spoken or written, which forms a fairly complete unit and which displays linguistic features of grammatical cohesion and rhetorical coherence.

discourse analysis: the linguistic analysis of consecutive units of spoken or written language longer than a sentence for the purpose of identifying regularities in the distribution of its linguistic features, hierarchical relationships, and any other features of sentences in meaningful combination with other sentences or utterances. May incorporate the formal linguistic analysis of texts and/or the sociolinguistic analysis of the communicative acts which texts perform.

EBE (English for Business and Economics): a variety, or register, of English used especially for the communicative purposes characteristic of the field of business and economics, including business communications. See ESP.

ESP (English for Specific Purposes): a utilitarian approach to ESL teaching and learning based on a rigorous assessment of students' needs and on the linguistic (i.e. lexical, syntactic, and discoursal) analysis of specialized varieties, or registers, of English.

EST (English for Science and Technology): a variety, or register, of English used especially for the communicative purposes characteristic of scientific and technological fields. See ESP.

ethnography of communication: a sociolinguistic field which investigates the relationship between language and social life by employing the fieldwork techniques of anthropology to describe the rules of speaking for any given speech community.

gambit: literally a starting manoeuvre, whether in chess or in conversation, giving its user an advantage in the game. It applies to all types and functions of conversational routines.

illocutionary force: the intended or implied meaning of an utterance, or sentence, as opposed to its literal meaning. See speech act.
interactional competence: the knowledge of the specific behaviors and properties that attach to speaking, e.g. the turn-taking system, how long pauses should be, which speech act can or should follow another, etc.

interpretive competence: the knowledge of the belief system of a speech community and the underlying conventions and logical processes which allow the participant to imply and infer meaning in the language.

perlocutionary effect: the effect which an utterance or sentence has on its recipient, i.e. the listener or reader.

propositional content: the literal meaning, or referential content, of an utterance or sentence, i.e. what is predicated about what or whom.

register: a term referring to the specialized use of a language in a given job, field, or discipline which therefore displays a unique set of stable, linguistically identifiable features.

register analysis: the quantitative linguistic analysis of the lexical, syntactic, and overt cohesive features of texts in a specialized variety or register of a language to determine the frequency and distribution of these features. It traditionally excludes the analysis of rhetorical features such as illocutionary force.

rhetorical modes: basic patterns of discourse organization, such as definition, exemplification, description, comparison and contrast, chronology, classification, persuasion, cause and effect, etc.

rules of speaking: the rules which describe the orderly relationship between language and social life. Also, the ways in which speakers associate particular modes of speaking, topics, and messages form with particular settings and activities in various speech communities.

SPEAKING: a mnemonic device referring to the components of speech in Hymes' descriptive model for the comparative study of the rules of speaking in various speech communities.

speech act: a unit of direct or indirect meaning in language which is on a level distinct from the sentence, and which mediates between the usual levels of grammar and the context in which it occurs. Every speech act implicates both linguistic form and social norms, and bears three kinds of meaning: propositional content, illocutionary force, and perlocutionary effect.

speech community: a community sharing rules for the conduct and interpretation of speech.
systemic competence: a knowledge of language that is limited to its linguistic code, or system, to the neglect of the communicative functions which the linguistic features of the system perform in the process of communication.

text analysis: the analysis of the formal, explicit cohesive ties which create grammatical cohesion between the sentences of a discourse, exclusive of rhetorical coherence. See discourse analysis.

utterance: may be synonymous with the written sentence; more narrowly, it may refer to the stretch of speech between two periods of silence or potential silence, usually marked at the end of a rising or falling terminal juncture.

variety: see register.