

wanted besides!)

: manipulation + , on the right of the boundary there is no segment, then α is $_$ and we have the context [+ seg]_[-seg], which is correct for the deletion of final boundary.

R_2 : General convention⁽⁹⁾: the boundary # inserted at the beginning and the end of every string belonging to a lexical category: insertion of the # boundary.

R_3 : + $\rightarrow \phi$ / # _: deletion of + on the right of # :
irritation: irrit + at # + ion \rightarrow irrit + at # ion.

R_4 : # \rightarrow + before certain affixes.

The statement of these rules is rather a hypothesis on the process of boundary assignment, which is not fairly clear in the way it is exposed by chomsky and Halle than an attempt to describe the real process.

FUNCTIONS OF BOUNDARIES

We can now turn to the role of these boundaries through the restrictions which are associated with them.

For the prefix boundary, which is not our main concern we can say that it is inserted between a prefix and a stem, forming a string belonging to a lexical category, by a readjustment rule, and since these two elements (prefix and stem) are not independent words or lexical items, they cannot be separated by a # boundary (recall the convention about the # boundary) > As, to account for the stress pattern of some words, we need to make clear that in these words stress rules are blocked by the presence of a boundary, we postulate this = boundary.

This boundary will not allow a rule to apply to a string where it is not mentioned in the proper place. In the case of the assignment of primary stress by the Main Stress Rule, the primary stress, for example, will be assigned on the remaining part of the string on the right hand of that boundary since the Main Stress Rule applies from the end of the string,⁽¹⁰⁾ the context being in this case: /X_C.]

For the formative boundary⁽¹¹⁾ we can say that its presence can be marked in a rule and consequently this rule applies only to a string containing + at the proper place.

But the absence of + cannot be marked in a rule.

This means that if we have a rule such as:

$$X \rightarrow Y / A B _ C,$$

The same rule applies in the following contexts in this given ordering:⁽¹²⁾

$$A + B + _ + C$$

$$A B + _ + C$$

A+B _____ + C
 A+B+_____ C
 AB _____ + C
 AB+ _____ C
 A+B _____ C
 A B _____ C

For the word boundary #⁽¹³⁾ we can say that a string containing this # boundary is not subject to a rule unless the rule explicitly mentions # in the proper position.

To sum up the restrictions associated with the different boundaries, let's say that:

- If a boundary is mentioned in a rule, this rule applies only to a string containing that boundary in the proper position.
- If no boundary is mentioned in a rule, this rule applies only to a string without a boundary or containing a + boundary, or to the remaining part on the right hand of a = boundary, when the context allows it.

This rule will never apply to a string containing a # boundary.

Concerning the rules of stress assignment, it appears that the choice of the boundary will be crucial to account for the place of the main stress in a word, or rather that the presence of a given boundary will condition the place of the main stress.⁽¹⁴⁾

We know that the absence of + cannot be marked in a rule and that a string containing # is not subject to a rule unless this rule explicitly mentions # in the proper place.

Now we can see that a string containing a + boundary will be subject to the M.S.R. while # being not mentioned in that rule, a string containing the latter boundary will never be stressed by that rule. In a similar way the vowel and consonant pattern of a string containing a # boundary will remain unchanged since a rule of word-level phonology or concerning the vowel and consonant system, will never apply to it (unless the boundary is mentioned in the rule at the proper place).

We have seen that, in the process of derivation by adding suffixed, the stress and vowel-consonant patterns may be affected or remain unchanged according to the boundary separating the "stem" and the suffix. When the stem does not belong to a lexical category, the boundary will be the formative boundary + but when the stem belongs to a lexical category, the boundary will be a # boundary but may be replaced, by a language specific rule, by a + boundary according to the suffix. To simplify this statement let's say that some suffixes are preceded by a + boundary and some others by a # boundary.

Obviously, with suffixes preceded by a + boundary, changes in stress and vowel-consonant patterns may occur while with suffixes preceded by a # boundary, the stress and vowel-consonant patterns will remain unchanged. We can now try to divide the class of suffixes into two categories: the category of the strong suffixes and the category of the neutral suffixes. Let's tentatively define the neutrality of a suffix as the propriety of a suffix to leave the stress and vowel-consonant patterns of strings unchanged. When a suffix is said to be neutral, it is associated with a # boundary. On the contrary if a suffix affects the stress and vowel-consonant patterns of a string, it is said to be strong and associated with a + boundary. The ultimate aim would precisely be to divide the class of suffixes into two categories: one associated with a + boundary: the strong suffix category; the other associated with # boundary: the neutral suffix category.

NOTES

¹ Boundaries/baundariz/:

divisions between linguistic units. There are different types of boundaries. For example, boundaries may be:

- a. between words e.g. the # # child
- b. between the parts of a word such as stem and affix, e.g. hind#ness
- c. between syllables,

² See Chomsky and Halle, S.P.E., pages 66, 67.

³ It is easy to fall into the error of assuming that our mark "+" is just like space between words that we use in English traditional orthography. The situation is more complicated. The factors which control where we leave spaces in writing are manifold: pronunciation is one, but grammatical and semantic considerations play a part, as does arbitrary tradition. Our phoneme /+/, on the other hand, is defined purely in terms of pronunciation. If it turns out that many occurrences of /+/ fall where in writing we would leave a space, and that relatively few fall where traditional orthography does not prescribe, then this is a matter of interest—mainly in the light it sheds on our orthographic habits, since it tells us nothing new about /+/. e.g. If one word ends with an unstressed syllable and the next word begins with one, there is no /+/ unless the first word ends with a vowel and the second begins with one. Orthographically, of course, one always leaves a space:

- a) Junean Alaska |júnowaLæska|
- b) pirate savannah |pájratsavæna|
- c) pirates of Anna |pájratsav + æna|

In contraction with is or has, such as John's and he's, no space is left in orthography. The form he's is usually spoken with no /+/, but John's often has one:

- a) John's going / Jan + z + going/

The / + / in John's sometimes drops; in the possessive form John's (as John's hat) muddy transition is customary.

⁴ Chomsky and Halle say: "alternatively, we could dispense with this element and permit reference in rules to formative-initial and formative-final position... In our formulation, formative boundary never is preceded or followed by a boundary but must be bounded on both sides by segments.

⁵ See Chmsky and Halle S.P.E., Pages 364, 365.

⁶ See note 2 page 1.

⁷ See Chomsky and Halle, S.P.E. convention 115 page 366.

⁸ For more information see Chomsky and Halle, S.P.E. pages 366, 370.

⁹ See note 7 page 2.

¹⁰ Se chomsky and Hall, S.P.E., page 94 & 10.

¹¹ See Chomsky and Hall, S.P.E., Page 66-67.

¹² See Chomsky and Halle, S.P.E., page 67 and 364, 365.

¹³ See Chomsky and Halle, pages 66, 67, S.P.E.

¹⁴ See Chomsky and Halle, S.P.E., pages 68-69, 84, 85.

¹⁵ See Charles F. Hockett, a course in modern linguistics pages 58.59.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Chomsky, Noam and M. Halle. *The Sound Pattern of English*. New York: Harper and Row, 1968.

Halle, M. and S. J. Keyser. *English Stress Its Form, Its Growth And Its Role In Verse*, New York, Harper and Row, 1971.

Jones, D. *English Pronouncing Dictionary*. London: J.M. Dent and Sons 1969.

Marchand, H. *The Categories And Types Of Present Day English Word-Formation*, London: CH. Beck, Munchen, 1969.

Hocket, Charles F. *A Course In Modern Linguistics*. London: Macmillan, 1958.

ARE WE HELPING OUR STUDENTS?

Aghdas Dastghalb

اهداف آموزش زبان خارجی همواره از مشاغل مورد بحث اساتید و محققین این رشته می‌باشد. سؤالاتی که مطرح است اینست که آیا نیاز زبان‌آموزان و یا تصمیمات مسئولین آموزشی در این خصوص اعمال می‌گردد؟ و آیا اهداف، مشخص و دائمی یا برحسب اوضاع و احوال متغیرند؟ و در چه جنبه‌ها و مهارتهایی از زبان‌بایستی آموزش داده شود؟ بعقیده صاحب‌نظران چون آموختن کلیه جوانب یک زبان مقدور نیست تدریس زبان تخصصی جوابگوی مناسبی جهت رفع نیازهای علمی و حرفه‌ای زبان‌آموزان تلقی می‌گردد. نظریات متخصصان در این موارد تا حدودی در این مقاله منعکس گردیده است. ضمناً نیاز به مطالعه کتب و نشریات خارجی در رشته‌های مختلف علمی مسئولین آموزشی را بر آن داشته که مهارت خواندن را بیشتر از سایر مهارتها مورد توجه قرار دهند. اما این انتخاب که بجا نیز می‌باشد نبایستی باعث عدم توجه به سایر مهارتها گردد زیرا محققین، کلیه مهارتها را ضروری و مکمل یکدیگر می‌دانند. در پایان توصیه‌های صاحب‌نظران به مدرسین و معلمین جهت تحقق اهداف آموزش زبان و برآوردن نیازهای زبان‌آموزان ارائه شده است.

The aim of second or foreign language acquisition has often been a point of argument among language teachers and researchers. Should language teaching be geared to individual learner's needs or should it be determined by educational authorities or other sources of decision? Another question which can be raised in this regard is: are language aims fixed or do they undergo changes and modifications as a result of changing conditions or attitudes? If we take up the first question and try to look at the language

learners' needs we might as well ask another question: what aspects of the language does some particular group of learners need to know? We have to answer the first two questions at least tentatively and the last one definitely since it is practically impossible to teach *all* of any language. (Tarone and Yule 1989) Selection has to be made at some point during the language learning course. What a learner needs in order to pursue a literary career is apparently not the same as the person who wants to work in business or engineering. The example often cited regarding aspects of the language is that of Andre Gide, the well-known French writer with a wide knowledge of the English literary vocabulary, who was unable to ask a London bus driver where to get off. (Mackey 1965)

Within the language teaching profession the problem of what is to be taught still remains unresolved although there is a definite shift in emphasis from purely *formal* to a more *functional* type of instruction. As Finnochiaro points out, "The focus of language and language learning today centers primarily on what human beings do with language and how they use it in their lives." (Finnochiaro 1989, p.1). Whether a person wishes to communicate a message or express his own emotions, needs or even clarify ideas in his own mind, it is the function of language to convey the message or express meaning. The function of language is not only to convey a message or express meaning but also do it appropriately in a clear and coherent manner.

Whatever categorization and classification we adhere to as to the function of language, the question for any limited language teaching program is: should students be trained to communicate in a foreign language or are they supposed to learn the rudiments of grammar and special vocabulary in order to read and comprehend materials related to their own field of study? The concept of *languages for special purposes* was increasingly recognized in research and practice by the end of the seventies, as a response to the pressing needs of professionals and university students (Stern 1987).

Research on language for special purposes shows that, language varieties which are conditioned by social context, commonly referred to as 'registers' have characteristics beyond special vocabulary or expressions related to the subject. Registers, as LSP researchers claim, differ not only in terms of vocabulary but also in terms of grammar and frequency and the function of certain grammatical structures. For example, the frequent use of passive construction in scientific writing as well as the use of complex noun phrases, nominalizations, etc. is among the special features of this kind of writing. "If it is true that the specific items of vocabulary and grammar which must be mastered by a language learner are *register-specific* - that is, that

such items vary in frequency when language is used in different contexts - there are definite implications for syllabus construction for the language classroom." (Tarone & Yule 1989). In other words, since there are important differences between, say, the English of commerce and that of engineering, it should be possible to determine the features of specific situation and then make these features the basis of the learners' course.

In the case of learners such as Gide, who is learning the language for a very specific purpose, it is possible to focus only upon the learning of a single register, which is usually in the written mode. Although the learners may encounter unforeseen needs for the effective use of language, as it happened in the case of Andre Gide, such cases are not frequent and can be overlooked. "However, it is often possible, to differing degrees, to limit the registers of the language which are taught, based upon an investigation of the identifiable aims of any group of learners." (Tarone & Yule 1989)

Such an investigation is certainly influenced by one's view of language in general; whether we look upon language as something neutral, or we look upon it as a part of experience. Notions of this kind will certainly influence and even determine language teaching syllabuses in any educational setting. There were times when language was only viewed as a set of formal features and the main concern of teachers was to give formal grammatical instruction as the only way to promote second language acquisition. Since then, other theories of language have brought on from similar to very different theoretical explanation.

The shift of emphasis from purely formal aspects of language to a functional and communicative function has put language in a different perspective. Now, the ability to use language as a means of communication and developing communicative competence in learners receives a great deal of attention in almost every language teaching program. The key components of 'communicative competence' which was first coined by Hymes (1972) in contrast to Chomsky's 'linguistic competence', includes 1) grammatical competence, 2) sociolinguistic competence and 3) strategic competence (i.e., the second language learner's ability to compensate for problems in communication). (Stern 1987) The result of this shift of emphasis is that the aims of language instruction are not just the teaching of the language skills, i.e., understanding speech, speaking, reading and writing and the fact that someone understands and produces language correctly is no guarantee that s/he can also use it appropriately and to communicative effect.

Another shift of emphasis which took place around 1970's was the distinction between teaching and learning. The emphasis that was traditionally put on methods, techniques and materials is an indication that

learning was regarded as the inevitable outcome of teaching. Many factors contributed to this shift of interest from teaching to learning. One of these factors is the fact that the methods and techniques have not always produced the expected outcome and therefore, the role of the learner could no longer be overlooked (Littlewood 1991). This discovery is not new and it is just as true now as it was before the seventies.

Mackey's remarks in his introduction to *Language Teaching Analysis* reveal the writer's dissatisfaction with the method concept and the emphasis unduly placed on teaching methods at the expense of disregarding the learning process and other related factors. According to Mackey, "Good teaching is no guarantee of good learning; for it is what the learner does that makes him learn. Poor learning can nullify the best teaching, just as poor teaching can devalue the best method. (Mackey 1965 P.X).

Learner factors are now among the most important variables in language pedagogy. According to Stern (1991) the language learner "is and should be the central figure in any language teaching theory" (p. 360). In both theory and practice the role of the learner is firmly established and factors such as age, language learning aptitude, cognitive style, attitude, motivation and personality are among the variables which are currently discussed and investigated by practitioners and researchers.

As to the nature of the four skills, the definition commonly used to characterize these skills is no longer satisfactory to some researchers and teachers (Widdowson 1985).

The distinction between listening and reading as receptive skills and speaking and writing as productive skills has raised some arguments. According to these researchers, language learning should be directed at the development of the ability to use language communicatively; the kind of communicative competence that enables the learner to interpret discourse whether the emphasis is on productive or receptive behavior. If this is the accepted aim, "... it would follow that any approach directed at achieving it should avoid treating the different skills and abilities that constitute competence in isolation from each other..." (Widdowson 1985, p. 144) Therefore, it is recommended that the underlying interpreting ability be developed and the way to achieve it is to adopt an integrated approach towards it.

Conventional pedagogic approach, however, tends to move in the opposite direction. That is, language teaching courses are based on the practice of separating the different skills and since the course books have been written on the basis of the same principles of separation of skills, one often finds a great deal of disparity between the different sections. "Thus, it is