Linguistics can contribute to language education by making teachers empirically aware of the complexity of language, methodologically attuned to improved teaching techniques, and theoretically informed about the general nature of language. Past education projects which have been affected by the application of linguistic principles are Breakthrough to Literacy, which involved the recognition of linguistic competence, and Literary Stylistics, which employed linguistics for understanding literary effects. The potential contribution of linguistics to language education is high. However, there are difficulties of implementation which must be overcome. The primary difficulty in the use of linguistics is the amount of formalism the subject contains, prohibiting its application to classroom teaching. Thus, what teachers need is not linguistics, but functional "language awareness" as employed in the Language in Use Project. However, "language awareness" must be based on "linguistic awareness," which involves establishing training criteria for teachers that will close the gap between formalism and functionalism. (LG)
The Educational Use of Linguistics

By David Crystal - University of Reading

Over the past 5 years, largely thanks to the interest of the DES Inspector, I have been able to give many lectures to groups of teachers, from the first-year level to the sixth-form, variously entitled 'Linguistics and the teacher', 'Language and the teacher', and the like. 'The teacher' here is usually the teacher of English, less often of modern languages, rarely of science or religious education, and never, regrettably, of PT. (The link between language development and the realization of body movement potential - what I suppose would be called 'kinepastic' - is a much neglected scientific field of study!)

The lectures 'Language and the teacher' and 'Linguistics and the teacher' are by no means the same. The second presupposes the first. A talk on the latter aims to convince the teacher of the importance of language as a means of communication and a medium of education; to demonstrate something of the range of language variation and function in a community, of the power and resources and limits of language, and of the complexity of language as an acquired structure. A talk on linguistics takes most of this for granted, and suggests how our knowledge of language 'works' can be broadened and deepened by the use of facts, techniques, and principles derived from linguistics. The aim is primarily to bring our awareness of language's structure and function out into the open: to provide a principled and explicit awareness of the phenomenon, one which is capable of formulation and definition in precise terms, so that it can be used as a means of facilitating communication between people of similar preoccupations, and also as a means of developing a consistency and coherence in our views and studies of language. A better example of these aims would be stylistics, where it is generally accepted that the provision of a linguistic basis can in principle provide an objective basis for our critical opinions, a means of improving our chances of reaching a more comprehensible and comprehensive apparatus for the analysis of texts. (Whether linguistic stylistics can be expected to produce semantic insights, as R. Steiner, EURHYTHMY AS VISIBLE SPEECH (New York & London: Anthroposophic Press, 1973), suggests, it is which particular descriptive apparatus is the most illuminating, is whether linguistic stylistics can be expected to produce semantic insights.)

Five years ago, then, most of my talks were on language; these days they are on linguistics. From the point of view of the linguist, at any rate, much has been made. Language sensitization, as a teacher-training policy, seems to have become a fact, and a fashionable one. Thanks to in-service courses, a range of introductory books on language in education, and a couple of controversial theories (first Chomsky's, and then Bernstein/Lakatos's), language sensitization has become the norm. What still remains is the larger task, 'to instil', as Baal put it, 'a sense of rational relation to language'.

The motivation which makes teachers begin looking at introductory textbooks in linguistics, sociolinguistics, etc, seems to come from 2 sources, one negative, one positive. The negative motivation is usually dissatisfaction with available techniques; a realization that traditional descriptions, theories, and methods, are inadequate as a means of coping with problems of language enrichment. The positive motivation is from the recognition of a particular linguistic insight, which prompts a query:

In this respect, the contributions of linguistics can be summarised under 3 general headings: empirical, methodological, and theoretical. The empirical contribution of linguistics is related to the analysis of linguistic patterns and relations, as reflected in manuals on pronunciation and grammar, and in dictionaries, and related to historical, social and psychological variables (the latter covering such data as information about acceptability, attitudes to usage, and so on). I find that on the whole teachers underestimate the complexity of language structure and function, and are therefore likely to be unprepared for the complexities of teaching.

In many cases, the phenomena of intonation are largely unfamiliar to most teachers, and their relevance (e.g. in the development of reading skills) is largely ignored. In syntax, there is the vast array of previously unrecognised facts that provide much of the impact of the triad of CONVERGENCE IN ENGLISH: in vocabulary, there are the structural studies of semantic relationships, which are slowly influencing current practices in education. In general, we might say that there is a multiplicity of such phenomena which are still not very well understood, and that the structure of language is to mobilise these stereotypes to demonstrate the reality of language use.

But of course, there is the old point that in a sense there are no such things as pure linguistic facts. Facts change depending on the way we observe them, and the importance of methodological self-awareness is manifest. Here too there are traditional stereotypes of analysis and description, and the contribution of linguistics has been to pay attention to the limitations of our traditional techniques and to provide alternatives. For instance, all introductory textbooks reveal the weaknesses of the parts of speech model of analysis for grammar, for instance, and indicate alternatives; and there is the traditional confusion between such concepts as those which should be kept apart (such as time and tense, gender and sex, etc - a theme well emphasised by Palmer, 1969). The issue, of course, is more fundamental than the descriptive arguments involved. The important point, in the first instance, is not, for example, whether English has a future tense or not, but that there is a question here which ought to be asked. The dangers of methodological complacency, the distortions of outdated models, the restrictiveness of rigid parsing techniques, and so on, are matters which the linguist can readily point out through examples of this kind, as he can the desiderata implicit in a linguistic approach - the need for a precise terminology, a powerful notation, a well-developed model, a systematic procedure. In particular, the linguist's concern for methodological-awareness emerges most clearly in his awareness of the possibility of alternative analyses, and the need to specify criteria in order to justify particular solutions - for instance, in developing a system of word-classification. I shall return to this point below.

By a theoretical contribution, I am referring, in the first instance, to the reasoning which has led to the establishment of general explanatory principles about the nature of language - fundamental principles which seem to underlie all linguistic theories and models. Some such principles would be: the distinction between form and meaning, description and prescription, langue and parole, and paradigmatic and syntagmatic; the notions of language system, language variety, and linguistic level; the inevitability of language change, and the ordered basis of language acquisition. Each of these principles is important, not only in itself, but also because it has direct implications for any pragmatic or pedagogical views about language, e.g. explaining attitudes to correctness, or analysing problems of comprehension. Within each of these headings, more specific principles can be


2 This notion of stereotype and reality is explored in relation to conversation in D Crystal, 'The nature of advanced conversation: stereotype and reality in linguistics and language teaching', in GAL Proceedings, 1972.

depending on our choice of linguistic model, e.g., the postulate of a particular set of levels, or the generative conception of deep vs. surface structure, or the notion of elaborated vs. restricted codes. The process could continue indefinitely. In the present paper, all I wish to point out is that the manipulation of theoretical assumptions in linguistics can make at the theoretical level for the development of a general 'state of mind' about language based upon these maximally general assumptions, the aim being to remove misconceptions about language which distort it, and which in the various applied spheres could be harmful to progress.

In all of the assertions which are purely empirically-based criticism tends to arise, or that there is no system in English spelling, or that a child brought up in a bilingual environment will be language-delayed. Once again, the linguistic contribution is not necessarily to provide an answer, but to make people aware that there is an issue. In the example just given, the discussion might take the following form. The conventional reasoning in favour of a language-delay hypothesis is common-sensical in origin: a child exposed to more than one language will be language-delayed; there will be widespread interference; and linguistically it is true; in both slower and poorer, accordingly. Against this, it is possible to add various arguments: that it is impossible to generalise without a clarification of what is meant by 'bilingualism', cases where the child is exposed to both languages in equal proportions being extremely rare; that the two languages come to be associated with distinct social roles, so that as long as the social setting remains clear, the languages remain unconfused; that we should not underestimate the child's linguistic abilities - particularly when we note the 'multilingualism' present in all of us, and the fact that the majority of the world's children are reared in a multilingual environment; and lastly the speculation that if there is any kind of innate linguistic ability, the availability of more than one language for it to 'practise on' might produce children whose language developed more rapidly than the reverse. All of this is hypothetical, in the absence of much detailed study, but the existence of an Issue is indisputable, and once it has been pointed out and discussed, a deeper understanding of the problem is generally recognised.

Examples of specific principles originating in linguistics which have influenced or directed applied projects are not hard to find. Two must suffice. First there is the basic principle seen in BREAKTHROUGH TO LITERACY that the linguistic complexity of reading materials should be firmly based upon the spoken competence of the child, at whatever level. The principle may seem self-evident, but it is well-known that it was flouted widely and seriously in the past. A syntactic analysis of the sentence patterns in the first books of, say, JANET AND JOHN or the LADYBIRD series, shows that there is little consistency, and that many of the patterns used are either very much ahead of a 5-year old, or simply not English at all. Sentence length varying from 1 to 14 words; frequency of relatively uncommon usages, such as the present tense; sentences such as 'What have you, John?' and 'One little, two little, three little kittens'; and so on. The linguistic idea behind the sentence-maker is that...

1 Of course, with appropriate intonation, this last example could be made acceptable; but it is rarely presented to the child in such a way (e.g., in a sing-song, rhythmic way), and in reading back I have never heard anything other than the usual flat, one-sound-one-tone-unit production on the part of the children. I cite this example in order to bring out the point that the whole question of the relationship between intonation and punctuation, between pauses and the layout of the material on the page, and the significance attached to prosodic features (albeit unconsciously) by teachers in evaluating success in reading (aloud) needs to be investigated. (The only attempt I have seen to introduce ideas about intonation into a primary level context appears in J. James and R. O'Grady, Language and Writing (Melbourne, 1985)).
the child's communicative experience only in terms of structures already acquired, and this allows for the installation of reading as a separate skill - separate, that is, from the development of his general linguistic abilities. And the more general point that it is not to be made - going back to the earlier point - is that the child can and should be helped to read - and this will involve some form of understanding or understanding his linguistic demands. It is of course this point which has motivated the recent emphasis on language in education by Barnes, Britton, Creber, the Rosens, and others.

A second example of a specific linguistic contribution is in literary stylistics. The aim of stylistics is providing a meta-language for discussion of a text, and for the systematic analysis of a characteristic feature. It is also believed that linguistics can provide a basis for the understanding of literary effects. The work of F. T. Leavis (espoused by R. Quirk, THE USE OF ENGLISH, 1962: 77) that 'every English poet should master the rules of grammar before he attempts to bend or break them' applies a particular critic and stylisticians, anxious to express the author's choices and our response. Much of the discussion has been of the type 'In this novel the narrator's...'. But in addition are the words 'or motif' in literature 'imolithic' or 'all aspects of human experience, this argument runs, then this must include our linguistic as well as our non-linguistic experience etc, so that the author inevitably finds himself drawing on the whole range of language's resources in his work. The perception of any effect due to the juxtaposition of stylistic features belonging to different varieties is obviously dependent upon the recognition of the features as such. There is no irony in the opening pages of Joyce's ULYSSES without an awareness of the force and function of the religiously-flavoured involved. In this sense, literary stylistics is dependent on general stylistics, and while this is not to say anything about how this dependence might be recognisable in the construction of courses, it is to say that the factor must be borne in mind throughout the process of construction.

The potential contribution of linguistics is thus extremely wide; and one would perhaps have expected to see more progress being made than in fact has emerged. But the number of major pedagogically-orientated linguistic projects is small, and relatively few materials across the field of mother-tongue teaching have appeared. Why has this been so? The reasons, one supposes, are partly practical, partly principle. For instance, it is a fact that for many years most linguists interested in applying their subject went in the direction of foreign language teaching, and until recently there was little research money available for mother-tongue teaching projects. There has also been considerable duplication of effort - projects in mother-tongue teaching, speech therapy, or speech and drama being begun without an awareness of the literature in foreign-language teaching, for instance. More important, there have been 2 kinds of misunderstanding about the contribution of linguistics. The first is from people who have read nothing about the subject, but who feel on a priori grounds that there is a method which can either be of no value whatsoever (eg 'How can you scientifically analyse literature?') or be a panacea for all traditional inadequacies (talk of 'the linguistic approach' or the 'structural approach' - again, replicating the history of Indoan in English language teaching). The second misunderstanding was on the part of people who had tried to read in the subject without guidance and who tried to apply it prematurely or without due consideration (eg getting sixth-formers to write generative grammars without asking why). There has been a widespread assumption that any subject which
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The pragmatic point about generative grammar has recently been made by C J Fillmore, 'A GRAMMARIAN LOOKS AT SOCIOLINGUISTICS', in GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY ROUND TABLE ON LINGUISTICS AND LANGUAGE TEACHING', 1972: 276 'There is no way ... of talking about grammaticality or well-formedness without getting in many ways involved in the details of social interaction by means of language', and of, further, 387, ff.
is far more complex and its formal notation indicates cannot in principle be handled as an exercise in logic or linguistics - partly because of the time it would take to master the approach. In the meantime, the question of whether the approach is or is not fruitful for the solution of pedagogical problems is largely irrelevant: The misunderstanding is obvious, and of course had already been anticipated by Chomsky for generative grammar, who denied the pedagogical relevance of his work.

For many years, these stereotypes have been slow in fostering, with only modestly reflecting their uncertainty as to whether their discipline should be primarily on theoretical lines, or whether questions of social and personal responsibility ought to dictate a more applied direction for their work (in this respect reflecting current discussion as to the purpose of university education or the changing character of students' interests, and so on). A particular point is not to be emphasised, in any discussion of the relationship between linguistics and the classroom, for instance, that the subject should not be identified with the science of one of its models, and that one has to be extremely selective in applying the subject's findings. It is still necessary to say clearly that some linguistic models are more applicable than others, that some models of linguistic behaviour are more immediately and usually applicable than others, and to avoid any application here referring to the possibility of a linguistic notion to general fruitful pedagogical hypotheses, e.g. the notion of language variety as a central issue in the LANGUAGE IN USE problem. It has also to be recognised that the subject has serious self-imposed or historically explicable limitations, and it is important for everyone to be aware of this, linguist as well as teacher.

For instance, linguistics is strongly biased towards the study of language production and not comprehension (traditionally the province of the psychologist), thus we find consider recent discussion on oracy but next to nothing on the equally active process of oracy. As long as these limitations are recognised, there is no problem. The danger comes with the familiar discrepancy between the problems of the classroom and the problems which the linguist is used to dealing with - the danger is that the linguist overreaches himself, applying techniques in places where they should never have been allowed to go, providing pseudo-solutions to pseudo-problems, and possibly using up a great deal of public money in the process. These are charges which linguists have to walk a tightrope between: 'stating the obvious' and 'being irrelevant'. It may seem trite, but the only way in which this can be done is by being scrupulously self-critical, of oneself as well as one's subject - an attitude which I personally find comes most readily by placing one's subject in the perspective of current thinking in the philosophy of science. For example, much of the bitterness which accompanied the stereotyped opposition between stylistics and literary criticism might have been avoided, one could argue, if the intuitive element which underlies all linguistic stylistic enquiry (e.g. in the initial selection of texts for study, in the assessment of stylistic significance or similarity) had been recognised - a point which can be made about scientific enquiry as a whole.

I make these points in order to give some recognition to the fact that there are considerable difficulties in implementing the claimed contribution of linguistics in educational studies - difficulties due to the differing interest of the subject, to the differing experience of the investigators, and so on. But there are all difficulties which, as our experience of the situation improves, should disappear. What I want to do now is look at a difficulty which will not disappear, unless we consciously dispense with it, because it is felt to be a question of principle.

It is made, for instance, by P B Medawar, THE ART OF THE SOLUBLE (Penguin, 1982). The stylistic issue is raised in D Crystal, 'Objective and subjective in stylistics', in B Kachru and H Stahlke (editors), CURRENT TRENDS IN STYLISTICS (Edmonton: Linguistic Research Inc).
be: a linguistics, as an academic discipline, and language teaching. This is the
view that teachers do not need linguistics, but something which is referred to as
'language awareness' (or some similar phrase). The authors of the LANGUAGE IN USE
project (1971) for example, say at one point: 'The teacher ... is unlikely to find
the usual concern of the specialist in linguistics, the explicit, formal and
analytical description of the patterns of a language, immediately relevant to his
needs' (P Doughty, J Pearce and G Thornton, LANGUAGE IN USE, 1971, p 11). Or again,
in the first instance the teacher's job is 'not to impart a body of knowledge, but
to work upon, develop, refine and clarify the knowledge and intuitions that his
pupils already possess, and to study language functionally, pragmatically, the
means by which individual human beings relate themselves to the world, to each other,
and to the community of which they are members' (p 11). In a more recent publish-
tion, the approach is developed into a philosophy of 'Language Study' (P Doughty and
the implications of these statements? On the face of it, they add up to a radical
statement of disassociation. I think it is worth our looking at this point in some
detail, as the implications go well beyond the Language in Use project as such, and
raise issues equally applicable to any educational project which desires a linguistic
orientation. I shall however restrict my illustration to Language in Use in the
first instance, as I have worked with the materials of this course at some length,
and find that a great deal of value can be learned by looking carefully (and I hope
constructively) at its limitations. It should go without saying that I would not be
doing this if I did not think this course to be an important contribution to the
field of educational linguistics.

To begin with, it is worth pointing out that the view of linguistics found in the
above quotations is very much a stereotype: it is a conception of linguistics as
a descriptive study, providing a detailed account of a language's structural proper-
ties, and so on. But this conception of linguistics is not fair to the subject AS IT
IS TAUGHT in universities in this country. The academic subject deals with both the
formal study and the social, psychological, and other implications. To treat lin-
guistics as if it were an academic subject somehow separate from language in some
social sense is to raise a straw man. Language in Use is as much an exercise in
linguistics (of one kind) as phonetics practicals are. The aims are similar, the
presuppositions are similar - even some of the techniques are the same (eg some of
the substitution exercises). Let us then be clear that we are talking about one
kind of linguistics, when we are examining the orientation of Language in Use - at
least this way we shall avoid having to talk about teachers 'languaging' pupils,
and the like. My point is more or less recognised in Doughty and Thornton, where
a distinction is drawn between a 'narrow' and a 'broad' view of Linguistics: the
former sees Linguistics 'as a discipline which is concerned exclusively with the
organization of the sound patterns of natural languages, and their relationship to
the corresponding organization of the internal pattern of those languages, phono-
logical, grammatical and lexical' (49); the broad view sees Linguistics as part of
the study of human behaviour - Firth is quoted, the aim being 'to make statements
of meaning so that we can see how we use language to live' (51). It is precisely a
broad view of Linguistics which I am insisting on. What I fail to see is the dis-
tinction between this and 'Language Study', in their sense - though perhaps this is
not surprising, as it depends upon a highly abstract and ill-defined notion of
'agency' vs. 'process' (see pp 51-2). But there are more important reasons for my
attitude than this essentially terminological point.

The distinction between linguistics and language study is a good example of a
pseudo-opposition, for the simple reason that the latter is dependent upon the
former in certain crucial respects. Even if we accept the above restricted
definition of the subject as a body of descriptive knowledge about structures -
the 'narrow' view - it is possible to argue that this CANNOT be left out of the
teacher's consideration, and that trying to do so causes more problems than it
solves. Language in Use claims that its aim is 'to provide an approach to the
study of our own language that neither demands of the teacher specialised knowledge
This is defensible, for the pupil; but some familiarity is essential for the teacher, and indeed it is unavoidable. In the interests of consistency, coherence, and comparability, one needs some specialized terminology, and it is no coincidence that a teacher of language must have a good grasp of both theoretical and descriptive terms. Language in Use itself inevitably uses large numbers of such terms - function, form, adjective, sentence, grammatical class, active voice... Many of these terms are guarantors, but of course their senses may be very different (e.g., the hallidayan concept of 'transitivity'). And unless the teacher understands the basis and limitations of this terminology, how can he carry out even the most elementary exercise, let alone do it with confidence? For instance, a number of the units tell the pupil to go and look for other examples of the same kind of linguistic phenomena as the one being discussed. But how do you decide about what is same and what is different? That is the story of the whole history of Linguistics, as Bernard Bloch said. And even within the units themselves, when the teacher is told to discuss how texts differ in syntax, or to work out some rules from a few sample sentences, what is this but explicit linguistic analysis? I frankly doubt whether many teachers could do this well without training. Either they would simply impose old-fashioned analysis on the sentences, which would run counter to the point of the exercise; or they would miss some of the differences between sentence structure; or they would set up oversimplified rules which would have to be quickly altered as new sentences were brought in by the pupils. The alternative, to print a typical set of sentences (which can be guaranteed to be analysed safely and regularly), would develop into the unthinking orthodoxy and inflexibility which is the aim of the course to avoid. The only solution, it seems to me, is to learn enough linguistics to be able to anticipate and thus control these problems - but the time and practice it takes to develop the spontaneous awareness of linguistic identity, similarity and types of divergence is considerable. Language in Use is wrong to minimise this problem. Language in Use in effect takes teachers so far and then says 'Carry on': but one cannot, without specialist training, and the amount of this must not be underestimated.

Let us look at this from a different angle. Language in Use provides many excellent ways of starting off a discussion, but it leaves the control of the ongoing discussion very much in the hands of the teacher - and this can lead to problems, without assistance. The teacher must know when to STOP the discussion, having begun it - when to let it continue would involve the pupils in too complex issues; and this means he must be able to see the possibilities in a line of argument, and so on. Three examples will illustrate this - one from phonetics, one from semantics, and one from syntax. In phonetics, if accents are being discussed, and the difference between north and south emerges over the use of /a/, as in BATH, the point will quickly be made that north uses short /a/ whereas south uses long /a/. But this is only partly true, as words like /hat/ indicate. The apparent exceptions can throw a teacher who does not expect them.

The apparent exceptions can throw a teacher who does not expect them. Here, then, we have a tendency rather than a rule: and the problem for Language in Use is to deal regularly with such rules, but not of tendencies. This is a general issue. Many of the questions Language in Use raises do not have clear-cut answers, and the
teacher will be prepared for this. This point is not sufficiently emphasized. For instance, in dealing with contrasts in intonation, voice-quality, etc., it is important to tell the teacher that the value of the exercise lies in the teacher's ability to recognize 'disinfective features', for example, so in time at one point, it is implied that the responses that will be obtained will be largely in agreement, but a teacher will be very lucky if this is so. Likewise, reactions to accent-interpretations will be extremely various and some will be bound to be wrong. But will the teacher recognize differences in accents when he hears them, without some reference to others? And to what extent should this 'invisible material' for a teacher - that, is, their own experience of variation in acceptability - be obtained in project work, or the teacher should set up from various sources of such material. Either way, the study of English inevitably involves the imparting of some body of knowledge, I call this doing linguistics.

In short, while Language in Use requires its pupils to make a largely ostensive analysis of language, accumulating inventories of features in texts they have collected for themselves, the teacher's job goes far beyond this, as he must be able to help them to generalize, to go beyond their texts, to get them thinking abstractly about what they are doing and what they can do. If the main aim of the exercise is to develop their command, or competence, then it must be made clear that this will never happen as long as the pupils are restricted to exercises of the inventory type. Pointing out causes, in particular functional effects is not developing competence; competence implies creativity, and to get this an awareness of the formal power of language is prerequisite. Instead of questions of the type 'What features were used in the text to obtain such-and-such an effect?', we need 'What OTHER features could have been used?' Getting pupils to answer this last question is far more difficult, and requires fresh assumptions and techniques, which only linguistics can provide.

I have argued that the development of mother-tongue competence, as a pedagogical strategy, can only succeed if language-awareness is underpinned on the part of the teacher by linguistics-awareness. As already mentioned, this reasoning is applicable to far more than language in use. The approach of Britton, Burn, and others also requires this underpinning. Their approach takes a general linguistic-educational-social hypothesis, and accumulates large samples of data as illustrative of the nature of the problem and of the ways available for attacking it. The authors' advice is well worth following. In a recent book (L Stratta, J Dixon and A Wilkinson, PATTERNS OF LANGUAGE, 1973, 140), the teacher is advised, rightly, not just to be aware and empirical, but to study language more systematically. But they then say, '...the relationship of language with learning should be an essential study. What this study might consist of is,
or, of course, a matter for debate, but we suggest that perhaps a desirable course is not to attempt to define educational linguistics, or even to attempt to define educational linguistics specifically, but what we shall call educational linguistics'. Their outline which follows with no help from the 'unicorn of the study', however; there is nothing specific, the teacher will surely be left wondering how the required systematicity is to be obtained from the required educational linguistics. In short, is it not systematics?

The writer refers the reader to others like - Evans et al., Britton, and Wilkins - but even the latter, who is the most explicit about techniques, is a long way away from the kind of linguistic perspective discussed above.

I am wholly in favour of a functionalist perspective for linguistic studies, and I find that quite explicit. It implies explicit in one of the early papers of a functionalist not even reference to function, the pendulum has swung to the present approach - but the danger is not to extremes, as a functionalist account of language with no formal control can be just as sterile as the reverse. This, then, is where attention needs to be focused in the near future. Without some grounding in linguistic principles and procedures, the aims of the whole educational exercise in language work are unlikely to be achieved. The gap has got to be bridged, and it can only be, in my opinion, after a whole battery of syllabus studies have taken place. But if linguistic is the criterion actually required by teachers operating at, say, 'the form 1 level',

Could one work out the specific demands first, and then, as it were, write a grammar to fit? It remains to be seen. As it stands at the moment, even if a teacher does become language aware, he is left in great doubt as to how he can assess his results, or compare them with others. Two teachers may differ radically about the norm and linguistic abilities of a child. In other words, attention now needs to be paid to evaluative procedures - to testing, criteria, etc. This cannot be avoided. To take a final example, in the project on Writing Across the Curriculum, there are many examples of children showing improvement after the recommended approach has been used. The interesting theoretical questions are why some children did not improve, or did not improve so much, or why teachers rate a particular kind of development more highly than others, or whether certain teachers get better results than others for a particular reason. Such questions cannot be answered as yet - indeed they are only beginning to be asked. Whatever the answers, it is quite clear that formal knowledge and systematic analytic techniques will play a large part in their formulation. I am not the person to make suggestions as to how further grounding in linguistic principles and procedures might be introduced into a training programme. I hope this will be something that this conference will put its mind to. All I hope to have done in the present paper is to indicate that for the mother-tongue teacher, the question that should be being asked is not 'How little linguistics can we get away with?', but 'How much linguistics do we need?'