"TESOL: The Organization and the Profession" *

Jim Alatis

Executive Secretary
TESOL, Washington, D.C.

I am pleased to have the opportunity once again to address MEXTESOL. Despite the distance from here to Washington, D.C., I feel very close to our Mexico affiliate. I have watched the growth of your organization with great interest and I have kept in touch with you via your presidents. TESOL the parent watches the development of all its affiliate offspring. My remarks are in keeping with that theme: I have entitled them "Ontogeny recapitulates phylogeny" or "The Development of the individual retraces the steps through which the whole race has passed" or "Like father, like son." That is, just as TESOL publishes a Journal, so MEXTESOL publishes a Journal. TESOL publishes a Newsletter; MEXTESOL publishes a Newsletter. TESOL organizes national conventions; MEXTESOL organizes national conventions. I understand that, in collaboration with the Jalapa chapter, MEXTESOL organized an ESP Symposium, which is also a reflection of TESOL Special Interest Group activities. Just as TESOL has its 52 affiliates, MEXTESOL, with the recent addition of La Paz, BCS, Chihuahua and Guerrero brings its chapters to a total of 18. Congratulations.

It is often the case that the child outstrips the parent and in fact, MEXTESOL has gone us one better in organizing regional conventions. This year's series in Torreón, Guadalajara, Puebla, Mérida, Morelos, Chihuahua, and Veracruz brought together a total of 1,000 members. TESOL has taken a lesson from you and is planning its first regional convention for the Midwestern Region of the U.S. So, among my other reasons for being here, I have come to pay you homage and to thank you on behalf of the entire profession. The work you do here frequently serves as a model

* (Revised edition of plenary session Speech delivered at the 1980 MEXTESOL Convention, Acapulco)

for others to emulate.

I do hasten to add, however, that in all your activities, the family ties remain. For example, I noted with interest in the Report of the Executive Committee (as printed in the April 1980 issue of the Newsletter) that the Committee recommended that, while they would like MEXTESOL to be made 'more autonomous', they would also like to establish MEXTESOL's affiliation with International TESOL "on a more formal basis." Specifically, they mentioned making TESOL publications (the Quarterly, Newsletter, convention information, etc.) available to MEXTESOL members.

There is, of course, another example of the very strong relation that has existed between TESOL and MEXTESOL. It is the sad reminder in the 1979 winter issue of the MEXTESOL Journal that Ruth Crymes, then President of TESOL, was on her way here to Mexico to deliver a speech when she died tragically in an airplane crash. The issue of the Journal was dedicated to her memory. I was deeply touched by the memorial statement by Miriam Rosas, founding member of MEXTESOL. So you see, just as with any family, there are many ties that bind TESOL and MEXTESOL.

All this is by way of preface to my remarks on the national and international dimensions of TESOL -- the organization and the profession -- and it is also by way of encouragement to you to continue to work within the parent organization as a member of a family of professionals. I would like now to present a bit of background to TESOL, to suggest some of the issues of current interest in the profession, and to remind you, as members of TESOL, of our obligation to those who need to acquire English.

Let me begin with my usual definition of TESOL. TESOL is an international professional organization designed for those who are concerned with teaching English as a second or foreign language or English as a second dialect. The length of the definition reflects the extent of the domains, i.e. the academic concerns, of TESOL. These concerns have developed as the profession and the organization of TESOL have developed in the history of the U.S.

English is the most widely taught foreign language in the

world. Teaching English is therefore a vast undertaking. Vast undertakings require organizations, and organizations, as we all know, require acronyms. Hence, TESOL, an acronym that is most widely used in the U.S.

A distinction is made from two other acronyms which also enjoy currency: TEFL, teaching English as a foreign language, and TESL, teaching English as a second language. Albert Marckwardt first called attention to the distinction the British have traditionally made between TEFL and TESL: in the case of TEFL, literary and cultural goals predominate and use of the language as an active communicative tool is minimized. In TESL, on the other hand, the primary goal of instruction is the achievement of a high level of communicative competence in English, sometimes developed to a point of balanced bilingualism or, not infrequently, English dominance over the native language.

American usage has moved historically from TEFL to TESL to TESOL. TESOL has the advantage of encompassing both terms. At the same time, its choice reflects the development of the profession from one whose major concern was foreign students to one whose focus is turning to domestic learners of English in the U.S. who cannot accurately be described as "foreigners."

TESOL is also the acronym for Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, an independent professional organization established in 1966. TESOL the organization was created out of professional concern over the lack of single, all-inclusive professional organization that might bring together ESOL teachers and administrators at all educational levels. The formation of the organization was a sign of TESOL's maturity as a profession. It is worth looking back to where TESOL has been in order to understand where TESOL, both the field and the organization, is today and where it is likely to go in the future.

Any attempts to trace the development of English as a second language in the United States must begin with the relationship between linguistics and language teaching. Teach-

ing English as a second language has been an educational activity in the United States for over 300 years. Its first 'students' were the North American Indians, and one may note the ironic coincidence that one of the profession's most important concerns remains the teaching of English to native American Indians. The coincidence is made more remarkable when one realizes that the early anthropological linguists such as Boas, Sapir and Bloomfield, based their linguistic theories on studies of the American Indian languages. These linguists collected and analyzed samples of speech and formulated hypotheses on language from the analyses. The methods and findings they derived were eventually extended to the study of the more commonly known languages, including English. Thus, English-teaching methodology profited greatly from linguistic science, a twentieth-century outgrowth of the study of American Indian languages. The wheel has come full circle.

A major contribution of modern linguistic science to English teaching was the application of scientific analysis to the language, including an analysis of the system of mutually contrasting basic sounds (phonemes) and an analysis of the grammar.

Another major contribution was the emphasis on the study of the contrasts between the learner's mother tongue and the language being learned. This notion of contrastive analysis is the most important distinguishing feature of the approach advocated by Charles Fries. Prof. Fries and those who followed him insisted as well on the importance of contrastive analysis of the target and source cultures.

Further on I would like to discuss some of the current issues in language research and methodology which are of great interest to TESOL professionals; here, however, I intend to trace in some detail the history of the TESOL profession in the U.S. since its inception in the 1940's. The phrase "in the U.S." is a key one; it is important to note that Great Britain, by this time, already had a century and a half of experience in teaching English abroad. However, late entry of the U.S. into the field was in one sense its greatest asset, since it meant that U.S. TESOL efforts were, from the very outset, under the direction of people with training in linguistics. Such was not the case with the Western European nations who already enjoyed a history of language teaching ex-

perience, and who considered the new linguistic concepts as Albert Marckwardt has said "as objectionably American as the variety of English spoken in the United States."

The United States in the 1940's initiated wide-scale participation in English language teaching abroad as well as the establishment of the first intensive TESOL programs at home. TESOL abroad received its impetus from the establishment of adult education projects in Latin America under our Good Neighbor Policy. TESOL efforts at home were concentrated on the development of intensive courses for the foreign students who were attending U.S. colleges and universities. The establishment of the English Language Institute at the University of Michigan in 1941 marked the first intensive, linguistically-oriented TESOL program in the United States.

As a result of the expansion of national interests, by the end of World War II American TESOL activities had spread to the Near East, the Far East, and parts of Europe. The 1940's provided the groundwork for what was to become a major educational concern.

The 1950's marked a decided increase in TESOL activities. The State Department exchange program had expanded to include over twenty countries, more English institutes had been established within the universities, and instruction had been extended to the non-English speaking elementary and secondary school children in the American educational system.

By the 1960's, TESOL had become a worldwide endeavor. The USIA (now ICA) conducted adult English classes in over fifty countries and held short-term seminars and workshops for local teachers in countries throughout the world. By the mid 1960's over 2,000 Peace Corps volunteers were teaching English in over forty countries. The Fulbright program assinged 115 professors and teachers to English programs in the educational institutions of 22 foreign countries. The Ford Foundation and Rockefeller Foundation also assisted in the development of training facilities overseas.

On the domestic scene, American colleges and universities were serving a greatly increased number of students

from abroad. By the end of the decade, there were over 90,000 foreign students served by programs in some 150 colleges and universities. However, the development of greatest significance in this decade was the profession's change of focus from the adult, university-level foreign student to the American school-aged child.

In 1964 the U.S. Federal Government officially recognized the thousands of children, either immigrant or native born, whose mother tongue was not English and who, therefore, needed specialized instruction in English if they were fully to understand and participate in U.S. cultural, social and economic life. Testimony before the House General Sub-committee on Education in 1967 revealed that, of the 3 million non-English speaking students in U.S. schools, only about 1 million were receiving English language instruction. The melting pot myth was being dispelled by a truer version of the facts; the existence of a multi-lingual society. Attitudes towards the role of non-English languages in U.S. society began to be re-examined. As Fishman suggested, bilingualism in the language of one's immigrant parents began to enjoy the acceptance, even status, that formerly had been restricted to bilingualism acquired in more elite social settings, e.g. from a Harvard education or from study abroad.

Continued arguments for the recognition and acceptance of a multi-cultural and multi-lingual society, and concern that all children be provided equal educational opportunity, culminated in the Bilingual Education Act of 1968, designed to meet the special needs of large numbers of children of limited English-speaking ability in the United States. Subsequently, the Bilingual Education Act of 1974 was to provide the first definition of a bilingual education program: 'instruction given in, and study of, English and to the extent necessary to allow a child to progress effectively through the educational system, the native language of the children of limited English-speaking ability.' The most recent development on this scene was the issuance by the Dept. of Ed. of the Federal guidelines for bilingual education programs, an effort to clarify the government position on bilingual education since the Lau Guidelines took effect. TESOL professionals were conspicuous by their presence at the government hearings on the proposed rules. I would like to share the testimony with you now as illustrative of TESOL's position on bilingual education: TESOL has

historically supported bilingual education both as a means of preserving the cultural and linguistic identify of non-English speaking peoples and as a means of enriching English-speaking peoples. Our organization endorses and applauds the issuance by the Department of Education of the revised regulations.

The two principles emphasized by the regulations, namely, (1) that students must be taught English as quickly as possible, and (2) that students should not be permitted to fall behind their English-speaking classmates while they are learning English, are completely consonant with principles and practices that TESOL has officially espoused since its inception as a professional organization in 1966 and which were reiterated in its testimony at hearings on bilingual education programs in 1967.

TESOL endorses the Department of Education position on English as an essential component of bilingual education programs. However, the proposed rules fail to stress that teaching English to native speakers of the language is <u>different</u> from teaching English to non-native speakers of the language.

It cannot be stressed too strongly that learning English as a second language is different from learning English as a mother tongue. Features of the language which are not taught in school to native speakers of English <u>must be taught</u> to students of English as a second language.

Further, this kind of language teaching requires specialized education on the part of the teacher; the mere fact of being a native or fluent speaker of the language (whether English or the second language) is not enough to qualify a person to teach in an ESOL or bilingual program. TESOL insists that the <u>teacher</u> of English as a second or other language must be <u>taught to teach English as a second language.</u>

TESOL insists that the teacher receive <u>professional</u> education in teaching ESOL, including <u>courses in linguistics</u>, anthropology, sociology and psychology. Failure to require that teachers of English as a second or other language hold the appropriate credentials results in the glaring inequities in the school system that Title VI was designed to address.

At present, it is generally the case that teachers of English to native speakers of English are required to hold a certificate in the teaching of English. At present, it is generally the case that teachers of French (where French represents all foreign language instruction) to non-native speakers of French are required to hold a certificate in the teaching of foreign languages. However, as yet, it is not generally the case -- in fact, it is rarely the case -- that teachers of ESOL to non-native speakers of English are required to hold a certificate in ESOL. TESOL strongly urges the Department of Education to include in its regulations a carefully defined statement of the need for truly qualified teachers of ESOL (and of bilingual education) as well as total support for the adoption, nationwide, of teacher certification programs both in ESOL and in bilingual education.

There are two options for teaching language and other content subjects to non-native speakers of English: (1) intensive English-as-a-second language programs and (2) bilingual education programs, of which intensive ESOL is a component.

The conviction of the profession that teacher education is the decisive factor in ESOL and bilingual education programs led to the development of a major document outlining the requirements which should form the basis of any bilingual education or ESOL teacher preparation program. Reference to the TESOL Guidelines for the Certification and Preparation of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages in the United States will clarify the distinctions between the education each type of teacher should receive. Implicit in the Guidelines is the assumption that bilingual education programs are intended to be transitional to monolingual instruction. We in TESOL strongly support the idea that a primary goal of our educational system must be to teach English to non-native speakers. However, we do not feel that English language instruction must necessarily be at the expense of the students' primary language. We truly believe in the value of knowing a language other than one's mother tongue. We agree with the report of the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies* that the presence of bilingual minority groups in the

---

*Strength Through Wisdom. A Critique of U.S. Capability. A Report to the President from the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies. November 1979.

U.S. constitutes an as yet untapped reservoir of linguistic and cultural expertise which our nation so desperately lacks. Failure to encourage the development of non-English language skills wastes the precious resources of bilingualism.

We would hope that the proposed rules would encourage the continued development of languages other than English, both in native speakers of other languages and in native speakers of English. That bilingual education is considered only a compensatory program for non-native speakers of English, a kind of intellectual overreaction for past sins, rather than an enrichment program for both native and non-native speakers of English is, we feel, most unfortunate. Our profession has been concerned with non-native speakers of English of all ages for decades. It is without exaggeration that we can say that our work in the field predates the passage of the Bilingual Education Act. We have always supported the idea that all people have the right to learn and maintain their own language and culture. We have labored on behalf of non-native speakers of English to see to it that they have opportunities to learn English and to preserve their own identity.

We would insist that ESOL and bilingual education are not mutually exclusive nor competing educational approaches. As we have stated previously, ESOL is a component of any bilingual education program. The two programs do not exist as an either/or proposition. Rather, they are thoroughly compatible and mutually supportive.

Finally, as an organization dedicated to the teaching of English as a second or other language, we deplore instances in which non-native speakers of English have been denied their rights to learn English and other content subjects. We would like to restate and reaffirm our belief that, if the Department of Education would formulate its regulations to insist that students be taught by certified specialists in ESOL and certified specialists in bilingual education -- and only by certified specialists -- a greater number of non-native speakers of English would truly have access to equal educational opportunity.

You will have noticed that our testimony referred often to instruction in language and culture. We firmly believe that

any program of bilingual education or ESOL instruction must address the cultural as well as the linguistic differences of the student population. American linguistic theory is based on the principle that language cannot be divorced from culture. In this regard, I was delighted to see, in a recent issue of the Journal of the National Education Association (Today's Education), a review of a book recently published by the National Foundation for the Improvement of Education (a foundation created by the National Institute of Education). The book it refers to is called Mexico visto por sus niños, a collection of pictures and writings of Mexican schoolchildren. The reviewer wrote of the book: "The collection that resulted...has a richness and a variety that provides insight into the beauty and cultural diversity of Mexico. The children gave refreshing perspectives on Mexican history (as well as) the children's view of themselves and their hopes for their country." The Foundation, with the strong support of the Director of OBEMLA, Dr Josué González, received permission to publish the book in the United States. They were also awarded a contract to develop, pilot test and publish a comprehensive instructional kit to accompany the book. (The kit is available from the NFIE, Room 804E, 1201 16th St., N.W. 20036 in Spanish and English editions). I would like now to describe the kit in more detail in order to illustrate a point about teaching a second language and culture, a point which TESOL professionals have long insisted upon. The review describes the kit as having one section which is directed to the teacher as learner, that is, as an introduction to the child's world of perception and expression, a cultural history of Mexico and a discussion of the values expressed by Mexican children. A second section addresses the teacher as teacher, that is, contains a glossary, bibliography and sections on teaching strategies. The section on teaching Mexican culture (the article goes on to say) "explains the necessity, when teaching any other culture, of upholding the integrity of that culture. This involves the principles of fairness and honesty in discussing customs that, in many cases, will be different from one's own cultural norms. In other words, the teacher's role is to promote intercultural understanding in students."

Now, these remarks are so in harmony with TESOL principles, that I had to re-read the article to see if I hadn't

written it myself. Quite seriously, what the article described is at the heart of TESOL teaching and preaching on the necessity of teacher education.

It is the central point of the TESOL testimony at the bilingual education hearings, as I hope was obvious from the selections from that testimony which I have presented you. If nothing else comes of that testimony than to have impressed the Department of Education with the necessity of their insistence upon teacher qualifications, I will feel that we have done our job.

As you well know, bilingual education is the major item on the U.S. educational scene, and it is a topic to which TESOL professionals have devoted much time, thought and energy. But it is not our only concern, and I would now like to review, very briefly, some of the major research interests which occupy the profession these days. We might call this a 'state of the art' address, for I am referring now to a paper prepared by Ruth Crymes which she was to present at the 1979 MEXTESOL Convention. I find it appropriate, therefore, to quote from the article which has been printed in the TESOL Newsletter.

Ruth Crymes referred to the chief current trend in ESL instruction, namely, attention to three processes of language learning: (1) the natural process of second language acquisition, (2) the process of intervention, whereby a second language learner consciously promotes language acquisition by employing learning strategies, and (3) the process of interpretation, which we apply to communication. The first has been the area of most concentrated research in recent years. Language acquisition proceeds by approximative stages, called interlanguage. Research into the interlanguages of ESL learners is very active. Krashen has investigated the order of acquisition of certain morphemes, d'Anglejan and Tucker have investigated the order of acquisition of more complex structures and argue, along with other researchers, for a natural order of acquisition. If nothing else, it is clear that we have a great deal to learn about the natural processes of second language acquisition. However, researchers are beginning to suggest that we can help learners learn how to

intervene consciously in the natural process. Rubin has begun to identify and investigate learner strategies such as guessing, drive to communicate, lack of inhibition and attending both to meaning and form. We need to learn the constraints on these strategies -- constraints of personality, attitudes and individual learning styles. Sociolinguists and linguists are identifying the elements that contribute to meaning in communication. Discourse analysis investigates ways that elements interact to provide clues to meaning. Haliday and Hasan have explored in great detail the system of cohesion in English. Hymes discusses at length setting, relationships between participants, knowledge and experience and other factors in communication.

As a consequence of these new lines of research, ESL teachers have come to approach their curriculum in a different fashion: from the point of view of the communication needs of the learners. Linguistic competency, once the sole focus, is now viewed as only one of the interrelated elements supporting the learner's communication needs. The implication of this approach is that each syllabus must be developed for its target learners and their particular needs. The existence of a natural process of second language acquisition implies a new emphasis on the learner and hence the syllabus must allow the learners to work at their individual rates. Thus, we need to learn more about learning strategies in order to help learners help themselves.

If, then, we were asked to predict the language learning scene in the 1980's, we might say as V. F. Allen does, that we are likely to see 7 distinctive features: peer-medisted instruction, hypothesis testing, notional-functional exercises within a structural framework, greater tie-in with content matter from other subject areas, increased emphasis on vocabulary learning, efforts to improve listening skills, and systematic transitions to <u>natural texts</u> as the bases for L2 materials.

I would like to conclude my remarks with a final plea to you as fellow professionals with an obligation to the vast and varied population which requires English instruction. In doing so I will quote from a paper by Shirley Brice Heath and Charles Ferguson*.

---

* Plenary address given at the TESOL Convention, San Francisco, March 1980: "TESOL and Language in American Life" in <u>On TESOL '80</u>. Ed. J. Fisher. TESOL. 1980, pp. 14

"Two hundred years ago, in 1780, John Adams, writing a letter to a friend, prophesied that 'English will be the most respectable language in the world and the most universally read and spoken ... /it/ is destined to be ... more generally the language of the world than Latin was in the last or French in the present age.' He was a little off in the timing of his prediction since he thought English would reach its position of eminence in the 19th or even the 18th century. He perhaps gave too great a significance to America's role in the process, since the sole reason he gave was the 'increasing population in American, and their universal connection and correspondence with all nations.' But basically, his prediction was right; he read the evidence correctly at a time when the evidence was slight and few others agreed with him.

Now, in 1980, English is clearly the principal language of the USA and is very close to being the principal language of the world. The USA is fortunate in that it does not have to struggle to establish a principal language for national communication and its own principal language allows it to communicate widely throughout the world and to have ample access to modern scientific, technical and humanistic knowledge. Correspondingly, the people of the USA have two sets of language responsibilities:

First, toward other languages:

(1) The people of the USA have an obligation to encourage the use of languages other than English on the part of communities in the country who have or have had these languages in their repertoire.

(2) The people of the USA have an obligation to acquire languages other than English to an extent that is adequate for present and foreseeable communication needs between the USA and other parts of the world.

Second, toward English:

(3) The people of the USA have an obligation to cherish the English language in all its diversity in this country and throughout the world, so that every well-educated American may have basic knowledge of the structure and use of English, the regional, social

and register variation in American English and the place of American English among the Englishes of the world.

(4) The people of the USA have an obligation to provide full opportunity for the acquisition of English by speakers of other languages within the country. This implies research and teaching in the processes of second language acquisition and in the methods of teaching English to speakers of other languages under differing conditions.

(5) The people of the USA have an obligation to see that their country plays a major role in meeting the expressed needs of other parts of the world to acquire English.

In these obligations, instruction in English for native speakers of English as well as mother-tongue instruction for languages other than English, and the teaching of English speakers of other languages as well as the teaching of other language to speakers of English all complementary components in the American language scene. They all draw upon the same sources of research findings in the language sciences, the social sciences, and education. In the letter of John Adams, he was advocating the founding of a Language Academy in the USA. Most of us would not agree with that recommendation, but he was surely right in recognizing the need for scholarly and scientific attention to the problem of the spread of English. No doubt, he would be pleased to see the scope and intensity of the operations of TESOL, and he would applaud renewed American attempts to meet the obligations which flow from the language situation in the nation."

Conclusion

I would now like to end where I began: on the relationship between TESOL and its affiliates. I should like to emphasize that the abiding relationship between us and you is one of mutual service and joint need. Through its affiliates, TESOL reaches not only a wide audience, but an organized one. In an age of new challenges and new opportunities for ESOL teachers, the possibility of united action at local, state, national and international levels is most important, as I believe I have illustrated with the

bilingual education testimony. At the same time, the affiliates find in TESOL an international forum for the exchange of ideas, for exploring professional issues, for reaching agreement and for expressing this agreement with one voice which, at present count, speaks for approximately 9000 members.

At the same time, TESOL hopes that affiliates will see that part of their strength derives from keeping TESOL informed of their activities and questions, and from calling to the attention of their membership the privileges and advantages that accrue to the individual who joins TESOL and takes an active part in its programs. Membership in TESOL and in a TESOL affiliate permits and facilitates professional growth.

TESOL has great vitality and a sense of youthful idealism and social mission. On the national side, it is our abiding belief in cultural and linguistic pluralism and in equality of educational opportunity that gives us a special excitement and relevance. On the international front, this relief has its history and roots in the notion of mutual educational exchange and improved cross-cultural communication.

In this connection, I would like to end with a quote from México visto por sus niños, for I believe that it states better than I can the ideology that unifies and strengthens us:

> "I ask everybody in the world and especially the Mexican people to treat one another as true brothers and I wish that discrimination between people would not exist and that there would not be any more wars between the great nations of the world because it would be a real tomb and the end of the planet Earth."