

OCCASIONAL PAPER #6  
1985

A SYLLABUS FOR AN ADVANCED ESL  
LECTURE COMPREHENSION AND  
NOTE-TAKING COURSE

Roni Lebauer

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many people played important roles in bringing this project to its final form. I am grateful to each one of them.

I would especially like to thank David Rickard for providing the initial impetus to get something done, for raising the right questions, for demanding better answers, and for providing constant encouragement.

I would like to thank Miho Steinberg and Richard Day for their faith in my work and for giving me the opportunity to devote time to syllabus and materials development as part of my graduate assistantship duties. Specifically, I would like to thank Miho Steinberg for her 'beyond the call of duty' work in distributing the needs analysis questionnaires and contacting the various departments.

My thanks also go to Michael **Grossman** who, in the course of many conversations, contributed to the underlying ideas in this thesis, and who played an important role in testing materials in the classroom and suggesting revisions. Most important, I want to thank him for his emotional support.

Lastly, I wish to thank the members of my committee-- Ted Plaister, Jack Richards, Richard Day--for their time, comments, and encouragement.

## ABSTRACT

This thesis presents a semester-long syllabus with sample materials for a lecture comprehension and note-taking class for advanced ESL students in a university setting. The syllabus presupposes a high level of grammatical competence on the part of the students, taking for granted that it is not on the level of lexical or sentential comprehension that the student has difficulty. Rather, problems are assumed to stem from insufficient **time** of processing due to lack of familiarity with the language and the assumptions concerning lecture discourse in that language. Background information is cited regarding research in connected discourse processing, the effect of culture on that processing, lecture discourse analyses, and lecture comprehension and note-taking pedagogy and skill needs. A needs analysis concerning the listening comprehension, note-taking, and production requirements of university students is presented and discussed.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS . . . . .	iii
ABSTRACT . . . . .	iv
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	vii
CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	-
CHAPTER II. RESEARCH IN THE AREA OF LECTURE COMPREHENSION AND NOTE-TAKING . . . . .	9
Skills Involved in Lecture Comprehension and Note-taking by Native and Nonnative Speakers . . . . .	9
Cognitive Factors Involved in Lectures Comprehension and Note-taking and the Influence of Culture on These Cognitive Factors . . . . .	17
Discourse Analyses of Lectures and Notes . . . . .	26
Lecture Comprehension and Note-taking Pedagogy . . . . .	35
CHAPTER III. LISTENING COMPREHENSION, PRODUCTION, AND NOTE-TAKING NEEDS OF UNIVERSITY ESL STUDENTS WITH IMPLICATIONS FOR SYLLABUS DESIGN . . . . .	52
Needs Analysis Procedure . . . . .	54
Analysis of Faculty and Chairman Responses With Syllabus Design Implications . . . . .	56
Analysis of Student Responses With Syllabus Design Implications . . . . .	65
CHAPTER IV. A SYLLABUS WITH MATERIALS AND METHODOLOGICAL SUGGESTIONS FOR TEACHING LECTURE COMPRE- HENSION AND NOTE-TAKING TO ADVANCED ESL STUDENTS . . . . .	77
A Listening Comprehension, Note-taking, and Production Syllabus for Advanced ESL Students . . . . .	77
Materials and Methodological Suggestions For Teaching Lecture Comprehension and Note- taking to Advanced ESL Students . . . . .	84
CHAPTER V. CONCLUSION . . . . .	115

APPENDIX . . . . . 123  
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . . 134

## LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1	Sequencing For Listening Practice . . . .	45
2	Johns and Johns' Note-taking Syllabus . .	50
3	Breakdown of Faculty and Chairman Questionnaire Responses . . . . .	57
4	Percentage of Time Devoted to Lectures, Student Presentations, and Discussions .	58
5	Breakdown of Department Course Offerings in Terms of Lecture and Discussion Style.	60
6	Is it Necessary to Take Detailed Notes? .	60

CHAPTER I  
INTRODUCTION

Nonnative speakers of English coming to English speaking countries for university study are often unprepared for the different levels of aural skill demanded of them. Most probably, they have not been exposed to large amounts of English native speaker speech spoken at different speeds, in different registers, in different dialects, in different contexts. One of these varieties of native speaker speech that is especially essential to these students is lecture discourse. Not only does the vocabulary and syntax of academic discourse differ from conversational discourse, but in addition, the language is presented in a context allowing little room for listener input (e.g. directing the topic, requesting clarification). The addressee in a lecture discourse situation cannot always be satisfied with getting the 'gist' of the talk; rather, s/he will often be held responsible for specific details or ideas. At the same time that the addressee in a lecture discourse situation is listening and processing the content, s/he is often required or feels required to take notes, thereby dividing attention and processing time even further. In order to address these needs, many pre-university ESL programs have instituted courses in advanced listening comprehension with a focus on lecture comprehension and note-taking.

The curriculum, sequencing, and materials of these advanced listening comprehension courses, however, are often vague and haphazard. Rather than teach listening, teachers often end up testing their students and giving them practice in listening. Part of the problem stems from a lack of knowledge of what the listening skill entails.

'What is learned when we learn a foreign language?' This is a crucial question for until we know what we are teaching we will not really know how best to teach it. In some sense, the answer is obvious; we learn reading, writing, speaking, morphology. But we want a different kind of answer, not a taxonomy of language; instead, we seek an identification of the skills, capabilities, and behaviors a learner comes to have. (Melvin and Rivers 1976:73)

In order to know how to teach lecture comprehension and note-taking to **ESL** students, we must first be clear on what we are teaching.

In the field of **ESL**, focus is moving from the development of linguistic competence towards the development of communicative competence. Hymes (1966) claims that language, in addition to consisting of rules relating referential meaning to sound, also includes extralinguistic assumptions about roles, situations, cultural norms and values, lexical connotations and associations, etc. if linguistic competence (in the Chomskyan sense of being a tacit knowledge of language structure) were the only criterion for effective comprehension, there would be no reason to specify varying demands in different situations. Yet, it can be demonstrated that the interpretive value of the same utterance varies according to



the situation. Interpreting language in a face-to-face encounter with a close friend, in a face-to-face business encounter, or in a viewer-television announcer situation requires the same degree of grammatical competence. The interpreter must be able to transform the string of sounds into meaningful words. However, the same question, "How are you?" spoken in each of these situations will be interpreted and reacted to differently. A close friend asking the question might sincerely want to know how his/her friend feels; a business acquaintance asking the question certainly expects a mediocre to positive reply and is only asking the question to fulfill the role of polite partner in an interpersonal exchange; the television announcer asking the question to the audience certainly expects no answer at all.

Another factor demonstrating the insufficiency of solely linguistic training is given by Rivers (1966:198) when she talks about a level in the listening comprehension skill in which the learner "may recognize the essentials of the message, but not be able to remember what he has recognized." The grammatical competence is there, but some element--time of processing? memory? different non-auditory background information?--is interfering with lasting or functional comprehension.

What sets the lecture comprehension and note-taking skill apart from listening comprehension of a more general nature? Candlin (1978:1) claims that "access to understanding

varies across discourse types." In all listening situations, the listener must make judgments about the speaker's emphasis, eliminating utterances of a tangential nature. In many general listening situations, however, the listener has the option of asking for clarification. The speaker has the option of asking or testing whether s/he is being understood. In a lecture situation, this two way clarification process is not available to the same degree. The lecturer must, through lexical, syntactic, and paralinguistic means, make clear to the listener what s/he is trying to emphasize. The listener must 'read' these signals correctly and attend to those emphasized items and ideas. The student who treats each linguistic item equally may not, upon leaving the lecture hall, be able to answer the question "what was the lecturer trying to say?". Moreover, the same student treating each linguistic item equally would not be able to take useful notes, lacking the ability to decide immediately what to write down and how to organize it.

Noise (language uncleaness, mechanical failures, outside noise, listener inattention, etc.), in all listening situations, masks some portion of the incoming language. Yet, efficient listeners still interpret the message correctly. Prediction occurs on the lexical as well as the discourse level. The listener hearing ~~the~~ can reasonably predict that a noun phrase will follow. A listener hearing a narrative can reasonably predict that the speaker will describe a

seating near the beginning of his/her talk (Van Dijk 1977b: 153-4). On the lexical level, predictive ability can be assumed to be equal across discourse types. On the discourse level, however, each discourse type has its own expected organization, an organization which might very well vary across cultural boundaries (Candlin 1978). Therefore, another aspect of achieving interpretive competence (the listening segment of **communicative competence**) in an academic lecture situation would be achieving an ability to predict the speaker's train of thoughts and organizational plan.

In any listening situation, the listener is expected to play an active role, making appropriate inductions and deductions. Here, again, the student needs to be aware of the specific organization of lecture discourse. The lecturer expects the listener to follow his/her train of thought and to follow the same rules of interpreting as s/he would. If a lecturer began by giving examples of problems without solutions, the listener can be assumed to know that the lecturer will at some point tie together the seemingly unrelated examples into one conclusion. The lecturer is assuming that the listener is making inductions as s/he listens. Not only, then, does the listener have to predict future organizational patterns but the listener also has to interpret previous discourse in a way appropriate to the seeing. A major question of direct relevance to the ESL student listening to a lecture is asked by Gumperz (1977),

"How can we be certain that our interpretation of what activity is being signalled is the same as the activity that the interlocutor has in mind, if our communicative **backgrounds** are not identical?"

Most often, listening in an academic lecture environment goes hand in hand with another skill, that of note-taking. Note-taking presupposes interpretive competence on the part of the listener. Note-taking takes up even more of the time ordinarily used for processing and so further stresses the need for predicting, synthesizing, eliminating, and utilizing cues of emphasis. In addition, the process of note-taking requires that the note-taker make immediate judgments as to the relative value of an utterance within the lecture. Part of interpretive competence in an academic lecture environment is the ability to evaluate the importance of an utterance for subsequent retention or noting. A syllabus for a lecture comprehension and note-taking course, therefore, needs to focus on **note-taking** as a by-product of achieving interpretive competence and also as a manifestation of interpretive competence.

**This** thesis, then, is an attempt at providing a **semester-long** syllabus and materials for a lecture comprehension and note-taking class for advanced ESL students in a university setting. The syllabus presupposes a high level of **grammatical** competence on the part of the students, taking for granted that it is not on the level of lexical or sentential

comprehension that the student has difficulty. Rather, problems are assumed to stem from insufficient time of processing due to lack of familiarity with the language and the assumptions concerning discourse in that language. A course which focusses on the specific skills required in an academic lecture environment would not necessarily be directly transferrable to a general listening situation. The skills and strategies may be the same but the realizations in terms of language may be different. The proposed syllabus and materials will focus in particular on the skills of (1) predicting speaker train of thought and organizational patterns, (2) synthesizing previous information and fulfilling the speaker's expectations of the listener's competence in terms of making appropriate deductions and inductions, (3) eliminating words and phrases that are redundant or tangential to the speaker's essential message, (4) utilizing lexical, syntactic, and paralinguistic cues given by the speaker to highlight important information, and (5) evaluating the relative importance of utterances for retention or note-taking. All of these skills may be based on patterns different from the listener's native language expectations.

Chapter two of the thesis will describe research related to the area of lecture comprehension and note-taking from four different perspectives: (1) from a skill-based perspective for the native speaker (NS) and nonnative speaker (NNS)--what skills are involved in lecture comprehension and note-taking?;

(2) from a psycholinguistic perspective--how does research in connected discourse processing relate to lecture comprehension? what effect does culture have on this processing? what role does short-term memory play in NNS lecture comprehension and note-taking?; (3) from a discourse analysis perspective--what takes place during lecture discourse in terms of cues and organizational patterns? do NNSs have different expectations?; (4) from a pedagogical perspective--how can advanced lecture comprehension and note-taking be taught?

Chapter three of the thesis will describe a needs analysis concerned with the listening and note-taking needs of undergraduate and graduate students. Analysis is based on the students' perceptions, faculty perceptions, course requirements, and department statistics. In addition, the pedagogical implications of these analyses will be discussed. Lastly, chapter four will focus on individual aspects of the proposed syllabus and present materials and methodological suggestions.

--

## CHAPTER 11

RESEARCH IN THE AREA OF LECTURE  
COMPREHENSION AND NOTE-TAKING

## A. Skills Involved in Lecture Comprehension and Note-taking by Native and Nonnative Speakers

All attempts at trying to enumerate the skills involved in NS listening comprehension have dealt with at least two skills called by Brown and Carlson (1953) "receptive listening" and "reflective listening." Receptive listening focusses on the information content of the message such as the ability to keep related details in mind; reflective listening focusses on the inferential and thought processes involved in interpreting a message such as the ability to recognize relationships between main ideas and subordinate ideas, and the ability to recognize organizational elements.

The generality of such a distinction becomes clear when we look at a list composed by Rankin (in Duker 1966: 25-6) on the abilities possessed by a good listener:

- I. Ability to hear
- II. Strong purpose to listen in a wide variety of listening situations
- III. Important abilities common to most listening situations
  - A. Ability to recognize many words the moment they are heard
  - B. Ability to acquire new words
  - C. Ability to understand readily the meaning of sentences even though they are more or less complex and involved
  - D. Ability to understand and appreciate the thoughts, sentiments, and ideals presented

in relatively long units of oral expression.  
It will include the ability:

- 1) to concentrate attention on the material being presented
  - 2) to anticipate the sequence of ideas
  - 3) to associate ideas accurately
  - 4) to recall related experience
  - 5) to recognize the important elements
  - 6) to derive meaning from the context
- E. Ability to recognize and interpret what may be called oral punctuation--the system of voice inflections and pauses which are so useful in facilitating the conveyance of meaning by word **of** mouth
- F. Ability to utilize in the process of building up meaning, the vocal adjustments and facial and bodily expressions of the speaker
- IV. Specific abilities appropriate to specific listening situations
- A. Ability to analyze or select meanings
    - 1) to select important points
    - 2) to get the facts accurately
    - 3) to secure answers to questions
    - 4) to obtain materials on a given problem
    - 5) to determine the essential conditions of a problem
    - 6) to follow directions
  - B. Ability to associate and organize meanings
    - 1) to grasp the speaker's organization
    - 2) to associate what is heard with previous experience
    - 3) to prepare an outline or **summary**
  - C. Ability to evaluate meanings
    - 1) to appraise the value **or** significance of statements
    - 2) to compare statements heard with items from other sources
    - 3) to weigh evidence critically
    - 4) to interpret critically
  - D. Ability to retain meaning
    - 1) to reproduce to others
- V. Ability to select, in a given **listening** situation, the specific listening mode which is **appropriate** to the situation

Herschenhorn (1979:67-8) goes into more detail than Rankin concerning what the listener has to listen for in the phonological, syntactic, and semantic code:



- I. The phonological code
  - A. phonemes
  - B. rhythm
  - C. stress
  - D. intonation patterns and emotional overtones
  - E. sandhi-variation (including reflections of regional, social, and dialectical variations)
- 11. The syntactic code
  - A. word classes (including affixes and exceptions)
  - B. word order (including stylistic variations)
  - C. interrelationship of words (including stylistic variations)
- 111. The semantic code
  - A. word meaning (including variations within the context)
  - B. connotation (culture-tied and often dependent on region as well as individual speaker)
  - C. culture (national, regional, ethnic)
  - D. idioms, expletives, cliches, colloquialisms
  - E. false starts, pauses, fillers (redundancies)

Herschenhom, however, seems to omit the paralinguistic aspect of listening which Rankin does focus on in III E and III F of his list.

Although Rankin goes into detail about the receptive aspect of listening, he seems to glance over the reflective aspect. He does include an ability to evaluate meanings and an ability to associate and organize meanings (IV B and IV C) and the ability to anticipate sequences of ideas (III D 2) and the ability to recall related experiences (III D 4). However, he seems to overlook much of the active listening role of inferencing and interpreting.

Fessenden (in Duker 1966:30-3) talks about levels of listening and seems to focus more clearly on the interpretive role of the listener. He makes it clear that even in a single minute, one might run through all seven of the levels he

suggests. The teaching of listening, to Fessenden, should encourage variation in level, flexibility in shifting levels, and the choice of the most appropriate level for the specific occasion. Fessenden's levels are as follows:

- Level 1: isolate sounds, ideas, arguments, facts, organization, and the like--no evaluation or analysis--implies recognition of the presence of specific independent ideas
- Level 2: identify or give meaning to those aspects which we have isolated
- Level 3: integrate what we hear with past experience
- Level 4: inspect the new, and the general configuration of the new and old data (begin to evaluate)
- Level 5: interpret what we hear--we become not only concerned with the idea and its relation to other ideas we already possess but also with the possible subtle implications of the idea. Appraise both process and content.
- Level 6: interpolate comments and statements that we hear (supply in part that which lecturer doesn't provide--add, insert, guess at meaning behind and between the sound waves, predict the speaker's path)
- Level 7: introspect as well as listen. Note effect of words on listener (feeling of being pressured, entertained, etc.)

From levels five to seven, the listener is faced with the task of detecting implications and making inferences.

Inferencing is the process by which we take what is explicitly stated in the text, apply our world knowledge to it, and finally, come up with meaning. Warren, Nicholas, and Trabasso (1979:27) attempt to break down the inferencing skill into

three main inference types:

- A. Logical inference
  - 1. motivation
  - 2. psychological causative
  - 3. physical causative
  - 4. enablement
- B. informational inferences
  - 1. pronominal
  - 2. referential
  - 3. spatiotemporal
  - 4. world frame
  - 5. elaborative
- C. Value inferences
  - 1. evaluative

Logical inferences deal with the questions "why" or "how" and involve the causes, motivations, and conditions which allow events to occur. **Informational** inferences deal with the questions "who", "what", "when", and "where" and involve the people, instruments, time, place, objects, and contexts of events. Value inferences involve the listener's world knowledge about the objects, actions, and events in the text.

Listening, then, involves the following:

- (1) facility with the phonemic, syntactic, **semantic**, and paralinguistic coding of the language involved.
- (2) motivation and the interest of the listener in attending to what is being presented.
- (3) logic on the part of the listener in associating ideas to one another and grasping the speaker's **organization**.
- (4) evaluation and judgment on the listener's **part** in deciding what the speaker is emphasizing and what is **worthy**.
- (5) a **memory component**, taking for granted that the

listener can retain, either in memory or through notes, what has been presented.

(6) an active inferential **component** where the listener is listening beyond the words being spoken.

For the NNS, there are obvious things to be learned. Rivers (1962) discusses three overall stages in NNS listening comprehension. At first, the foreign language **strikes** the NNS's ears as a stream of undifferentiated noise. Gradually, the NNS notices some order and begins to perceive patterns. Later, the NNS recognizes familiar elements in the mass of speech but is unable to recognize the interrelationships within the whole **stream** of sound. Gradually, the NNS begins to recognize the **crucial** elements which **determine** the message. At a later stage, the NNS may recognize the message but still not be able to remember what s/he has **recognized**.

Rivers' analysis, however, is not complete in that it does not take us from the third stage to **complete interpretive** competence. As she does point out, the NNS must learn a new set of phonemic, syntactic, and paralinguistic codes for the foreign language. Because the cues of emphasis and de-emphasis may **differ** from cues **familiar** in the NNS's native tongue, the NNS may have difficulty judging the relative **importance** of information. Rivers also points out that memory plays a role in NNS difficulty in **listening** comprehension. Lado (1965), too, has shown **that** short-term memory in a foreign language has a **much** smaller capacity than memory in the native language.

This is a problem because the NNS may not be able to keep an item in memory storage long enough to make the appropriate associations and retroactive inferences. Rivers, however, does not consider the stage in which the discourse style of the foreign language and the background expectations of the foreign language inhibit the NNS from full interpretive competence. Because the discourse style and organization principles may differ from the NNS's native language expectations, s/he may have difficulty in grasping the speaker's organization and plan of presentation. Because the ability to make inferences may require cultural background knowledge that the NNS may not have experienced along with expectations of discourse patterns, the NNS is again at a disadvantage.

Rankin (in Duker 1966:26), in his list, includes in the abilities possessed by a good listener "the ability to prepare an outline or summary" and "the ability to reproduce meaning to others." As mentioned before, this note-taking or reproducing ability presupposes a high level of interpretive-competence. Hartley and Davies (1978:219) describe three steps involved in note-taking:

- (1) identifying and discriminating between elements
- (2) identifying and discriminating between relationships between the elements
- (3) identifying the organizing principles

It becomes obvious, however, that "identifying" and "discriminating" are ~~not~~ the only factors involved in note-taking when Hartley and Davies describe in more detail the

process by which successful notes are taken:

- (1) the note-taker organizes note-taking in such a way as to ensure that the notes reflect **either** the **framework** employed by the teacher or a framework meaningful to the learner.
- (2) the note-taker adds any necessary details **as** examples to the framework rather than records **them** as isolated elements in the notes.
- (3) the note-taker adds to the teacher's details and examples any additional ideas which give personal meaning and insight to the material.

The note-taker's job, then, is not only to receive the input from the speaker's side, but also to add **his/her** background knowledge and interpretation to that input.

As with the skills of listening, the **NNS** is **clearly** at a disadvantage. While the **NS** is allowed the freedom to organize notes reflecting either the teacher's framework or a framework that is meaningful to the learner, the **NNS** may misinterpret the teacher's framework by imposing a foreign language and foreign background interpretation. The **NNS** may interpret emphasis where no such emphasis was intended, relationships where no such relationship was intended. There can be no doubt that notes written in a "framework meaningful to the learner" are essential, but with the **NNS**, care must be taken to ensure that this framework **still reflects the** speaker's intention. **Hartley and Davies'** next two aspects of the process of note-taking are as **applicable** to the **NNS** as to **the NS**. The **NNS**, too, must add **necessary** details as **examples** to the framework and not as **isolated** elements. The **NNS**, too, must add to the speaker's ideas **that which adds personal**

meaning and insight to the material. Again, however, the NNS must be aware that cultural background and associations may not be relevant in a foreign language situation, and that in fact, these associations may be misleading.

#### B. Cognitive Factors Involved in Lecture Comprehension and Note-taking and the Influence of Culture on **These** Cognitive Factors

Much research has been done to answer the question, "What goes on in the listener's mind as s/he processes connected discourse for retention?" **One** of the first researchers to deal with this question was Bartlett (1932). He felt that researchers had to account for the fact that when a passage was **recalled**, it was not reproduced exactly but was rather reconstructed in the **light** of a person's "schema" at the time of recall. This concept of listening as being a process of **reconstruction based** on the listener's own expectations and analysis and requiring the listener's own inferences has resulted in what **may** most generally be called "schema theory." Adams and Collins (1979:3) describe **schema** theory:

A fundamental assumption of schema-theoretic approaches to language comprehension is that spoken or **written** text does not in itself **carry** meaning. **Rather**, a text only provides **directions** for listeners or readers as to how they should retrieve or construct the intended meaning **from** their own, previously acquired knowledge. The words of a text evoke in the reader associated concepts,

their past interrelationships and their potential **interrelationships**. The organization of the text helps the reader to select among these conceptual complexes. The goal of **schema** theory is to specify the interface **between** the reader and the text-- to specify how the reader's knowledge interacts with **and** shapes the information on the page and to specify how that knowledge must be organized to support the interaction.

One type of schema research in Van Dijk's (1977a, 1977b) theory of macro-structures. Van Dijk suggests that information processing involves the retrieval of the macro-structures of the discourse. (These **macro-structures** may be more commonly regarded as "topic" or "theme".) According to Van Dijk, a complete discourse comprehension model would activate knowledge of frames (units or concepts that are typically related), knowledge of super-structures (the **functive** use of the discourse e.g. **narrative, argument, advertisement**), inferences based on frames and **super-structures**, application of macro-rules (of generalization of information, deletion of information, integration of information, and construction of information) to **deduce** the **macro-structure** of the discourse.

As Tannen (1979:138) says, "terms such as 'frames', 'schema!', 'scripts' ...all amount to structures of **expectations**...based on one's experience of the world in a given culture, one organizes knowledge about the world and uses this knowledge to predict **interpretations** and relationships regarding new information, **events**, and experiences." Examples of frames are "how people look and behave" or "what the



geography of the world is." In an "eating in a restaurant" frame in American culture, there would be subsets including "eating in an expensive restaurant" and "eating in a diner." Further along in the hierarchy of information of the frame "eating in a diner" would be the concept of "eating at a counter", "tipping the waitress", "reading the newspaper over coffee." Van Dijk (1977b) treats these frames as being a hierarchy of facts, assumptions, propositions, expectations of actions and objects, all of which are stored in semantic memory.

Winograd (1977:81) defines three types of discourse schema:

- (1) interpersonal schema - conventions for interactions between the participants in a communication.
- (2) rhetorical schema - conventions for laying out a reasoning sequence which the speaker wants the hearer to follow.
- (3) narrative schema - conventions for connecting a sequence of utterances into a coherent text.

In most discourse, all three of these schemas are working at the same time. During a lecture, for example, not only are there conventions for laying out a reasoning sequence, but there are also rules of lecturer-student interaction and rules for connecting the logical sequence of utterances within the larger lecture discourse organization.

What then does the listener do as s/he processes connected discourse according to schema theory?

A receiver strategically attempts to develop a message theme as soon as possible. The developed message theme serves as an organizational criterion for relating propositions to one another. It also

serves as a retrieval cue to assess prior semantic memory schema and to decide if a message is complete and ready for **long-term** semantic memory storage. (Housel and Acker 1979:28)

Adams and Collins (1979:5) say that "every input event must be mapped against some schema and all aspects of that schema must be compatible with the input information." Connected discourse processing, then, is very much a matter of hypothesizing and assessing these hypotheses against the incoming information. Two processes in particular take place. One process is "bottom-up processing" which is evoked by the incoming data and tries to find more general schemas that encompass the incoming information. The second processing strategy is "top-down processing" which tries to find lower-level **schemas** that confirm hypotheses already made

This concept of the listener first hypothesizing a message and then later assessing the hypothesis is the basis of Halle and Steven's (1967) analysis by synthesis model of connected discourse processing. This model proposes that the listener generates internally a match for the speech s/he hears, a match that is constantly refined by testing it against incoming information. There are two stages in their model: stage one being a period of preliminary analysis and hypothesis finding; stage two being a period of synthesis and hypothesis testing. Oakeshott-Taylor (1979) posits a third stage of storage of semantic content of passage

and integration with the content of previously heard ideas.

Freedle (1972:183) expands on this notion of hypothesis formation and testing when he states that "the relative difficulty we have in isolating the relevant topic of **conversation** is related to the size of the set of possible alternatives that we believe might be discussed under a given set of circumstances." If the set of possible alternatives is too wide, possibly due to cultural differences and different expectations, the receiver will have **more** difficulty with hypothesis formation and testing because his/her chances of forming incorrect hypotheses are greater and his/her chances of **not** finding that the incoming information is fitting into the hypothesized structure is greater. Freedle later says that those with too narrow a set of alternatives have great problems because they may feel that it is the lecturer who is making an error in topic or who is wandering off the topic,

Rivers (1972) attempts to deal with the **problem** of the **ESL** student's having too great a set of alternatives on the lexical and **syntactic** level. She suggests that those **factors** which reduce the possibility of occurrence of any **particular** word or idea should be pointed out and **practiced**. (These factors could be syntactic **relationships**, e.g. the necessity for a noun phrase to follow a **determiner**, combinations of **words** of high frequency, e.g. **as a matter \_\_\_\_\_** where **of fact** or **of course** are the only reasonable alternatives, or cliches, e.g. where there's a will, \_\_\_\_\_ where **there's a way** is the only reasonable alternative.)

Rivers (1972) suggests that there is a stage in the ESL students' listening comprehension competence when this information overload can prevent the student from retaining the message s/he has heard even though s/he has understood it. In Spearitt's (1962) factor analysis of the listening comprehension skill, he found that memory span was positively correlated to the skill. Yet, Lado (1965) found that memory span is shorter in a foreign language than in the native language and also that memory span increases with mastery of the foreign language. Craik and Lockhart (1972:675-6) attempt to explain this relation of time of processing to retention in their "depth of processing" model. "Retention," they say, "is a function of depth and various factors such as the amount of attention devoted to a stimulus, its compatibility with the analyzing structures, and the processing time available." The preliminary stages in their depth of processing model are concerned with the analysis of physical or sensory features (lines, angles, brightness, etc.). Later stages are more concerned with matching the input against stored abstractions of past learning. Here, the extraction of meaning takes place. The result of this deeper and deeper analysis is a memory trace "with deeper levels of analysis associated with more elaborate, longer lasting, and stronger traces."

All of these analyses of how connected discourse is processed lead to questions of whether or how culture can

affect this processing. Johnson (in Duker 1966:39) states that "we take for granted that what the speaker means by what he is saying is precisely what we would mean if we were to say the same thing. We forget that the meaning of a word is not in the word; it is in the person who uses it or responds to it, and people differ." This hypothesis was supported in Kintsch's (1976) work when he found that American Indian stories having a narrative structure that is different from conventional Western stories were harder for non-Indian subjects to recall as compared to recalling traditional Boccaccio stories.

Scribner (1979:241) found, however, when comparing the ability to deal with syllogistic logic schema, that "the overwhelming bulk of respondents in all cultural groups showed some grasp of the genre" and that the main differences occurred across literate versus non-literate boundaries. Those from literate societies gave predominantly "theoretical explanations" concerning their answers (i.e. the statements explicitly related the conclusion to the problem's premises). Those from non-literate societies tended to give "empiric explanations" (i.e. the statements justify the conclusion on the basis of what the subject knew or believed to be true). The input is the same but the inferences on the part of the listener and the listener's assumptions in processing the discourse are different.

Scribner then raises the question of "What are the

preexisting schema~into which verbal logic problems can be assimilated?" and in answering this question, deals with the problem of what happens when the preexisting schemas differ from accumulated knowledge.

If the relations the problems express are arbitrary, though, not consonant with, or in opposition to accumulated knowledge, their assimilation into pre-existing knowledge schemas may militate against, rather than facilitate comprehension, recall, and problem solving. Such assimilation would manifest itself in 'empiric bias' as preexisting schemas become the field of operation for remembering and reasoning activities (Scribner 1979:239-40).

What unifies all of these branches of research is the idea that people do not receive information into an empty receptacle. Rather, the receiver imposes organization and unspoken ideas onto the input. This imposition arises from the receiver's accumulated 'knowledge of how the world works and how speech is used to express how the world works. Tannen (1979:144) notes how this imposition not only aids interpretation but also may shape different interpretations:

This prior experience or organized knowledge takes the form of expectations about the world, and in the vast majority of cases, the world, being a systematic place, confirms these expectations, saving the individual the trouble of figuring things out anew all the time...At the same time that expectations make it possible to perceive and interpret objects and events in the world, they shape those perceptions to the model of the world provided by them...Thus, structures of expectation make interpretation possible, but in the process they also reflect back on perception of the world to justify that interpretation.

Our assumptions about the world are so deeply ingrained as undeniable facts about the world that it may be virtually

impossible to take the jump to see the world and its organization in a different way.

For the ESL student who is called upon to interpret connected discourse in a foreign language, this research may have relevance. The student may need to recognize and make appropriate assumptions about super-structures in the foreign language. Kaplan (1966) discusses the idea of "contrastive rhetoric", the assumption that different cultures expect and call for a different system of presentation to get ideas across. According to Van Dijk (1977: 154), macro-categories (e.g. setting, resolution, episode in the super-structure of a narrative) "dominate sequences of propositions of the narrative discourse" and so, are the building blocks of interpreting a narrative. Listeners from cultures in which the macro-categories are different or very differently expressed may impose the wrong interpretation on the narrative or might end up totally confused at the seeming illogicality of the input.

On a lower level of interpretation, the ESL student must develop a source of frames similar to those assimilated by the native English speaker. Awareness of the pictures that come to mind when a certain topic is raised will lead to greater equivalence in background knowledge among NS and NNS. Rather than taking for granted that the NNS knows the implications of a topic, more attention needs to be placed on the cultural presuppositions about that topic. In terms

of vocabulary, too, implications need to be discussed. Discussion of the word begging needs to include the **presupposition** that in American culture, begging denotes need or **cunning**, that it is a degrading practice, and that it is looked upon as a nuisance.

Attention also needs to be focussed on predictive assumptions at the word and syntactic level. Predictions of what **grammatical** form can fit into a certain slot need to be practiced. Awareness of lexical collocations, words that always come together, need to be introduced. Awareness of cliches and cultural proverbs need to be dealt with.

The strategy that most needs to be worked on in the ESL classroom, then, is the making of correct hypotheses or at least, the making of incorrect hypotheses that can be refined by incorporation of preceding or incoming data leading to correct hypotheses. This hypothesis-making can be **practiced** on all levels of discourse: on the lexical level, on the **syntactic** level, and **most** importantly for lecture discourse, on the discourse level of overall organizational patterns.

### C. Discourse Analyses of Lectures and Notes

In order to teach how to listen to a lecture, it is essential that the teacher know what is involved in lecturing. Attempts at analyzing lecture discourse have **been** carried out by **Wijasuriya (1971)**, **M. Cook (1974)**, **J.R.S. Cook (1975)**,



Montgomery (1977), Murphy and Candlin (1979), and Dudley-Evans and Johns (in press).

Dudley-Evans and Johns (in press) note three types of lecture styles: a reading style in which the lecturer reads from notes or speaks as if s/he were reading from notes; a conversational style in which the lecturer speaks informally, with or without notes; a rhetorical style in which the lecturer acts as performer with frequent asides and digressions. Dudley-Evans and Johns focus on the individual lecturer styles, foregoing what may be conceived as an overall lecture discourse.

Other researchers have analyzed lectures to find the commonalities that underlie all lectures despite lecturer style of presentation. M. Cook (1974), for example, bases her analysis of lecture discourse on the supposition that lecture discourse is a process of maintaining and directing relevance in speech. She concludes that smooth transitions are attempted by all lecturers regardless of stylistic differences. This process of making smooth transitions involves three general rules: (1) topic continuation, (2) topic recycling, and (3) topic change. Topic continuation is the use of connectives, enabling the speaker to move from one topic to a related topic and suggesting the relevance between the two topics. As examples of topic continuation, she gives "this whole thing about \_\_\_ also applies to \_\_\_" and "the same thing took place with regard to \_\_\_." She adds that

when topic continuation is applied the speaker has a limited number of choices. S/he may (a) repeat a word or phrase from a previous utterance, (b) use a synonym for a word in a previous utterance, or (c) use a pronoun whose antecedent was in the previous utterance. Another means of topic continuation is to initially assert an intention of bringing up a number of points and then later marking those points with "the same thing", "now getting back to our four basic \_\_\_\_." The topic recycling rule is applied when the lecturer wishes to elaborate on some previous topic. Recycling can be in the form of examples, contrasts, and analogies (e.g. "\_\_\_\_is a whole separate bag of worms from\_\_\_\_" or "so I guess that the major thing this illustrates is \_\_\_\_"). Finally, at the end of an episode, topic change rules are applied to close off or limit a previous topic (e.g. "any comments or questions on \_\_\_\_?").

M. Cook's analysis does bring to light many of the actual verbal cues to lecturer intention and organization; however, she does not touch upon the many nonverbal or inferential cues that are needed to interpret lecture discourse correctly. She focusses only on the surface form of the lecture.

In an unpublished study done in 1981, I analyzed transcripts and videotapes of lectures in order to discover what cues existed to transmit the speaker's concept of the lecture goals to the students. I noted a number of emphasis markers, concluding that it was often a combination of

emphasis markers that gave a point its "emphasis weight." Some of these emphasis markers are (1) lexical markers which draw attention by organizational means ("certainly a third point we have to think about is \_\_\_"), (2) lexical markers which denote emphasis and draw attention by semantic means ("now this is astonishing"), (3) a concentration of lexical or semantic repetition ("bradychardia...only found in certain animal types like whales have it, seals have it, I'm sure dolphins have it, man also has it"). (It should be noted that lexical repetition alone has a cohering function and unless supplemented with other emphasizing markers may not play an emphasizing role.) Other emphasis markers include (4) the elicitation of frames that connote emphasis ("it is this man then whom we're going to focus on as the bearer as the revealer of this amazing way" with "bearer" and "revealer" eliciting a frame of someone bringing an important message), (5) the use of highlighting transformations (clefting, pseudo-clefting, movement rules), (6) the use of rhetorical questions which serve to highlight the information that follows by setting up an expectation. In terms of kinesics, it was noted that (7) hand position may denote emphasis by pointing or counting or by imitating the rhythm of the speech and (8) body position may visually demonstrate the relation between utterances (e.g. a lecturer is comparing two ideas and turns his body to a different side when expressing "the other side of the story").

In this study, I also attempted to analyze the lectures in terms of speech acts of (1) topic initiation (TI), (2) topic continuation (TC), and (3) topic break (TB). TI speech acts are characterized by lexical units which denote the speech act itself (e.g. "I'll talk about pidgins and creoles in general and try to focus on creole in Hawaii."), by emphasis markers, and are often preceded by TB speech acts. TC speech acts are less a distinct class but rather a more de-emphasized continuation of the topic that is raised in the TI speech act. TC serves to clarify, exemplify, define, or paraphrase the preceding ideas. Even though the boundaries between the TI and TC speech acts are vague, the functions of the TC speech act are separate. Sequencing may either proceed from the TI to TC or vice versa. Finally, TB speech acts are characterized by (1) lexical markers such as "uh...", "now", "OK", "all right", (2) longer than average pauses, or (3) a culmination of the new information in the preceding discourse often marked by a lexical cue of "so", "therefore", "as you can see."

This analysis may have relevance for the advanced lecture comprehension class. For one thing, exercises geared to pinpointing the end of an introduction and the first TI can make use of markers denoting TI speech acts. Also, knowledge of markers indicating TB can lead to an overall awareness of lecture subsections and increase the student's predictive ability concerning upcoming information.

Skills such as "re-entering" a lecture after losing attention or becoming confused can be taught by way of an awareness of markers of TB and TI speech acts along with ordering restraints imposed on each speech act. An awareness of emphasis markers and speech act functions also has ramifications for teaching note-taking skills. Note-taking, being the process by which ideas are noted so as to show the hierarchy of emphasis, needs to be a process of making value judgments while listening to the lecture. Knowledge of markers of emphasis can be a basis for teaching note-taking skills to ESL students.

Murphy and **Candlin's** (1979) analysis of engineering lecture discourse provides a **thorough** analysis of the many processes involved in lecture interpretation. In particular, they analyze the overall coherence of the discourse, do a textual analysis of the cohesion of the lecture (meaning that no attempt is made to identify structural elements above the sentence) and finally, analyze the role of kinesics in lecture discourse.

To begin with, they applied the **Sinclair/Coulthard** (1975) model of discourse analysis to their lecture corpus. They were able to identify several strategies such as "marker" ("well", "right", "now") "starter" ("well now let's get on with the engineering"), "elicitation" ("I think that most of you have met the result before, haven't you?"), "accept" ("yes ...good"), "informative" ("for the three forces to be in equilibrium, their vectors must form a closed triangle"),

"comment" ("more usually known as the triangle of forces"), "aside" ("running out of blackboard space here"), "meta-statement" ("I want to mention two types of generator"), and "conclusion" ("so there you've got three forces which are in equilibrium").

Murphy and Candlin state that lecture discourse has much in common with general classroom discourse. They found that lecturers often proceed as if involved in a two-way interaction, providing dummy responses and feedback by themselves. They also note that lectures show the same type of focussing move which is unique to teacher dominated discourse ("I want to mention..."). Although it may appear that the lecturer is talking to **him/herself**, Murphy and Candlin stress the interactive nature of the lecture. The main distinction, however, is that the lecturer always wants the floor, and **his/her** audience is not meant to join the interaction verbally.

Murphy and Candlin include in their analysis a description of J. Cook's model of discourse analysis. J. Cook looks at a lecture as being composed of a number of "expositions." These expositions are composed of an optional episode of expectation, an obligatory focal episode, an obligatory developmental episode along with a **number** of optional developmental episodes, and an obligatory **closing** episode followed, again, by optional closing episodes. Further down on that hierarchy, each episode is composed of moves, beginning with

a focussing **move**, followed by at least one other move (not including focussing or concluding **moves**), and **ending** with a concluding move. Cook's **list** of categories of moves (as reported in Candlin and Murphy 1979:17-8) is as follows:

- Focussing move
- Concluding move - a **justificatory** statement; a focal episode with a concluding function; a **summary statement**
- Describing move - subdivided into description of processes and causal sequences; previous events; operations; states
- Asserting move - assertion of fact, opinion, rule, physical law
- Relating move - **making** intratextual and **extra-**textual relationships explicit
- Summarizing move - giving a resume of the **immediately** preceding discourse
- Recommending move - giving **support** to an opinion, course of action, method, etc.
- Justifying move - offering justification for a proposition, assertion, recommendation, etc.
- Qualifying **move** - placing reservations on, partially retracting from a prior **assertion**, proposition, etc.
- Contrasting move - drawing a parallel of comparison or contrast between a previous fact, event, etc., and a second one contained in the statement that initiated the move
- Explaining move - expounding or making explicit a prior assertion, description, causal chain, etc.

J. Cook suggests teaching recognition of **the** moves within lecture 'discourse as a means of **raising** the **student's** awareness of the lecturer's organization and goals.

When Murphy and Candlin analyzed the lecture text for cohesive devices, they considered **five specific** devices: reference, substitution, ellipsis, **conjunction**, and lexical

cohesion. They divided reference items into exophoric references and endophoric references, "exophoric" referring to the context of the situation, "endophoric" referring to items within the text itself. The endophoric reference items were further broken down into anaphora and cataphora.

Anaphoric reference refers backwards in the text and may, according to Murphy and Candlin, be more difficult for the foreign student because it expects him/her to link up different parts of the text and may place an excessive load on the foreign student's short-term memory. Cataphoric reference is a warning of what is to come. These endophoric references are realized through the use of demonstrative pronouns ("the proof of that is..."), personal pronouns and possessives, comparative reference ("this case is different" implying that it is different from a preceding one) and lexicon such as "same", "similar", "other", "different", "likewise", etc. Substitution is a device whereby information is related to other information by a grammatical device such as replacement of nouns ("one" and "ones", "same"), verbs ("do" as in "John has a car. Jim doesn't."), and clauses with "so" and "not" ("Have I got that wrong? I hope not."). Ellipsis is substitution by zero ("so the magnitude of one force then defines the magnitude of the other two" where "forces" was elided after "two" ). Conjunctive elements serve the function of relating linguistic elements that occur in succession but are not related by other structural means. These conjunctive



elements relate two **elements** in an additive manner (e.g. "furthermore", "for instance"), in an adversative manner (e.g. "yet", "nevertheless"), in a causal manner (e.g. "so", "for this reason") **and in** a temporal manner (e.g. "previously", "to return to this point"). Candlin and Murphy stress the importance of adversative and causative conjunctions in particular. Some causatives, they note, such as "so", "then", "therefore", may mark concluding moves in the discourse. The causatives signal that what follows will be information that the learner should be focussed on. Adversative correction of meaning, they say, also signals important **information** in that it reflects what has preceded and focusses attention on what follows. A last device of cohesion was lexical cohesion, the practice of reiterating items in referential terms and then relexicalizing that item at the start of a new exchange.

Candlin (1978:22) stresses the need for integrating speech and visual materials **and** paralinguistic behavior:

Although **it is** generally the case that lecturers control the discorsal strings...interpreters... need to be aware of the careful and close integration of the visual, paralinguistic elements with the spoken word, **if** they are going to understand the constant **interplay** in lectures **between** what **Sinclair** calls the main and the subsidiary planes of discourse--the **essential argument** and the audience-directed subsidiary **comment**. Eye contact and particular gestures serve to clarify this interplay in lectures... and importantly...there is ample evidence to show that kinesics is culture **specific**!..we cannot assume that learners will have equal **opportunity** for interpretation of these crucial discorsal patternings.

Candlin and Murphy (1979) found that much of the research done on kinesics in dyadic interaction had relevance in the lecture situation. They note that lecturers, when making asides or when trying to appeal to the audience, change their voice quality or get physically closer to the audience. They note that lecturers often make exophoric references and use hand gestures to refer to diagrams on the board. Other hand gestures, however, are not overtly linked to something visual. They give the example of a wave of the hand from the vertical with palm facing the body, to the horizontal palm up, accomplished with a slight lowering of the forearm, conveying the meaning of "I am now going to offer the less acceptable alternative." Eye contact, a kinesic device signalling affiliation, seemed to follow completion of drawing or touching a diagram or during a crucial point in an argument. Candlin and Murphy also observe that eye contact can signal discourse boundaries in that speakers tend to look at the audience during concluding remarks. Often, eye contact was discontinued before proceeding on to the next section of the lecture either by moving from one place to another or looking down and consulting notes.

What does become clear in all the analyses, no matter how indefinable or general, is that within the context of a lecture, the lecturer does attempt to signal to the listener what aspects of the lecture are important or unimportant, and how the lecturer has organized the lecture and wants it

to be perceived. The ESL teacher can work towards helping students become aware of different acts and moves and their realizations within a lecture. An awareness of these verbal and nonverbal markers can lead, on the listener's part, to greater ease in prediction and greater ease in following the lecturer's thoughts. Not more important, yet more concrete, is the need to give students practice in dealing with cohesive devices (especially reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunctions, and syntactic devices of highlighting).

Winskowsky (1978), rather than analyze lecture discourse, analyzed her own notes to focus on note-taking discourse and the competencies that underlie successful classroom skills. She suggests six major competencies involved in acquiring classroom skills:

- (1) recognize the professor's definition of the field
  - (2) recognize course requirements
  - (3) recognize the paradigm (the discipline's way of looking at the world and how it is organized)
  - (4) recognize the professor's perspective
  - (5) recognize the professor's portrayal of the professional role
  - (6) take notes
- (Winskowsky 1978:14)

Under the competency of note-taking, she specifies fourteen conventions that were included in her notes:

- (1) includes a phrase titling a series of things
- (2) includes the nominal-complement structure--a word or phrase separated by a dash or colon from another word or phrase, holding one of the following relationships:
  - label, title, or nominal - meaning, referent, explanation, or definition

- (3) includes paragraphs of notes which cohere topically with successive indentation of lines to show sub-topical details, elaborations, expansions, and other sub-argument **structures**
  - (4) includes signal phrases or words which mark or **frame** the subsequent information (e.g. problem: when dealing w/ cognition)
  - (5) includes one line assertions, titled or **untitled**
  - (6) includes sequences of the above **argument** structures which are related topically
  - (7) includes arrows to connect or continue two parts of an argument that has a digression embedded in it
  - (8) includes reconstructing the professor's outline if he has one
  - (9) includes quotes or **near-quotes** of what the **professor** says, who he quotes, and the sources
  - (10) includes the pivotal points in an argument
  - (11) includes non-content information, usually in the margin at the top of the page
  - (12) includes the notation conventions of a given discipline
  - (13) includes charts, tables, examples, instructions, words, phrases, diagrams, illustrations, etc. that the professor puts on the board
  - (14) includes abbreviations of words that are recurrent in the discipline
- (Winskowsky 1978:35-7)

These lecture discourse and note-taking analyses serve to provide teachers **with** a more concrete base in what to teach. From this perspective, the question of how to teach can be deal: with.

#### D. Lecture Comprehension and Note-taking Pedagogy

Black (1971), Hughes (1974), Weissberg (1974), Godfrey (1975), Candlin, Kirkwood, and Moore (1975), Johns and Johns (1976), Montassir (1976), James (1977), McDonough (1977), Candlin and Murphy (1978), Jordan and Matthews (1978),

Morrison (1978), Snow and Perkins (1979), Mason (1981) and Dudley-Evans and Johns (in press) have all presented syllabuses and/or exercises attempting to deal with the teaching of lecture comprehension.

The syllabuses and materials vary most fundamentally on the level of adaptation concerning the lecture material to be used in the course. Weissberg (1974) and Montassir (1976), for example, propose the use of "mini-lectures" (two to three minute taped presentations recorded by native speakers using non-simplified vocabulary and syntax and unaltered pronunciation), James (1977) and Jordan and Matthews (1978) propose syllabuses which begin with two to three minute taped texts and proceed to longer taped texts. Snow and Perkins (1979) propose the use of both formal interviews and informal conversations as the material base for a lecture comprehension class. Johns and Johns (1976) propose focussing on tapes of semi-formal discussions of academic subjects. Morrison (1978) and Mason (1981) propose using tapes interrupted at various points for analysis and exercises. Dudley-Evans and Johns (in press) propose a team-teaching syllabus with the language teacher working hand in hand with the content teacher. Candlin, Kirkwood, and Moore (1975) propose using live, authentic, lectures on language and academic skills as the basis of their syllabus.

All stress the need of authenticity, that is, the use of language that is used in lectures, the use of cues that

are **used** in lectures, the use of paralinguistic **features** that are used in lectures, and the inclusion of **pauses**, false starts, and other **performance** features of live lectures. However, only Dudley-Evan and Johns (in press) and Candlin, **Kirkwood, and Moore** (1975) ~~do~~ actually live up to this level of authenticity. By basing their syllabuses on live lectures, they sacrifice the certainty of what will be taught and what needs to be taught. They gain, however, the realism, knowing that whatever **is** taught is actually used. Those syllabus designers who use tapes (Snow and **Perkins** 1979; **Mason** 1981; James 1977; Jordan and **Matthews** 1978) gain in **terms of** concreteness of materials and exercises, yet lose in **terms of** authenticity because all of the visual cues are missing. Those syllabuses that rely on tapes that were originally prepared in written form to focus on particular cues of organization (**Weissberg** 1974) are useful in that a segment of the overall lecture comprehension skill can be recognized clearly and **practiced**. These tapes, however, lack realism in that the lecturer is **not** talking naturally. In addition, there is no guarantee that the cues focussed on or that the style used is, **in actuality**, used **in a lecture situation**.

An **additional difference** between the various syllabuses suggested is the type and sequencing criteria of exercises. James (1977) and Jordan and **Matthews** (1978) sequence texts by beginning with a **two** to three minute lecture covering the material in general **terms**, used for dictation. **The next**

stage is a longer version of the dictation used for listening and doing exercises concerned with general ideas, details, vocabulary, and **grammar**. The last stage involves the same lecture **topic**, further expanded with exercises focussing on taking notes in outline **form**. Their **sequencing** factors seem to be the length of the **lecture** and the **difficulty** level of exercises (grasping general ideas and details and focussing on lexical and syntactic features **deemed** to be less **difficult** than note-taking).

Snow and **Perkins** (1979) also feel it necessary to give the student **contextual information** before giving the complete **lecture**. They first give students a general **summary** to read. Later, another **summary** may be given out which includes a selective list of things to listen **for**. The students listen to the tapes, take notes, do exercises, answer questions, and listen again. They note that the tape **may** be worked through in **segments** to **focus** on particular points. **Sequencing criteria** include sequencing questions from discrete point questions to questions which entail processing knowledge about the real world in addition to knowledge gotten from the tapes. Other sequencing **criteria** for exercise **formation** are making the syntax **of** the question **itself** more or less difficult, varying the topic so that students have **more** or less prior **knowledge** of the topic area, and **altering** the speed and style of **delivery of the speakers**.

Dudley-Evans and Johns (in press) appear to make

**similar** decisions about sequencing. They proceed **from understanding** the general points and details of the lecture to follow-up work which emphasizes evaluation of **information** and application of the general principles of the lecture to other tasks. Similarly, **McDonough** (1977) **distinguishes** between "localized" comprehension and "global" comprehension. Localized comprehension is concerned with **immediate** or verbatim perception and segmentation (**e.g.** lexicon, **stress**, intonation, syntax) while global comprehension is concerned with categorization, ordering, and recall over long **stretches** of discourse. He stresses that although localized comprehension is essential to global comprehension, it is global comprehension that is the ultimate goal of a lecture comprehension course.

**Montassir** (1976) in his syllabus makes three assumptions about sequencing of materials and exercises. The first is that conversational type material is easier to comprehend than lecture type material. The second is that short passages are **easier** to comprehend than long passages. The third is that listening for specific information is easier than unfocussed listening in which information **must** later be recalled from memory. His **first** two assumptions, however, may be open to argument in that conversational speech may, in actuality, be less clear in that the **phonology** is more careless and the **assumptions** about background knowledge may be more easily taken for granted. In **addition**, in conversational



speech, organization principles may be less overtly signalled. As for the second assumption, it may be possible that longer passages include more redundancy and more expansion than shorter passages so that the overall picture is clearer, allowing more time for processing.

**Morrison's** (1978) procedure involves listening to tapes and stopping at designated moments to do exercises. During the first session of listening to a tape, questions under the heading of "understanding" are dealt with (covering lexicon, idioms, structures, allusions, and implications). Other questions cover aspects of phonology such as assimilation, reduction, stress, pitch, and intonation. During the second session of listening to the same tape, questions deal with items of cohesion, reference, general comprehension, and brief note-taking.

Mason's (1981) materials also involve detailed analysis of the lecture discourse while listening to a tape. The student, at appropriate points in the tape, is introduced to rhetorical elements of exposition and cues to this rhetoric. In addition, the student is given comprehension questions and incomplete outlines to fill in. Later assignments are concerned with understanding particular facts and understanding the overall organization and logic.

Hughes (1974) does not deal with the question of sequencing but notes four types of exercises that are applicable to different aspects of the listening situation. These are

predictive and retroactive listening, construction listening, and inferential listening. In predictive listening, the student tries to predict what the speaker will say. In retroactive listening, the student enters the middle of a speech and tries to figure out what the topic of the speech is. In redundancy listening, the student has to extract the essence of a speech, removing all that is redundant. In construction listening, the student reorganizes segments of a speech based on **his/her** knowledge of **the** world, knowledge of the discourse style, and awareness of linguistic cues. Lastly, in inferential listening, the student makes inferences based on information presented orally.

Godfrey (1975) begins with paraphrase and imitation exercises aiming at reducing processing time by getting students to do more with an utterance than to simply process the forms and meanings expressed within that utterance's boundaries. He later suggests instruction in linguistic devices that specify relationships **and** attain cohesion in discourse using exercises suggested by Hughes (1974), above.

Black (1971) does not suggest a syllabus, but does present suggestions on how listening comprehension practice can be sequenced. He bases his suggestions on three criteria: type of exercises, type of material, and subject matter. His hierarchy is shown in Table One and is organized from least difficult to most difficult.

Table 1  
Sequencing For Listening Practice

Type of Exercise	Type of Material	Subject Matter
1. true/false 2. yes/no 3. fill in the blanks 4. true/false/not stated 5. classify by concept 6. correct/incorrect inferences 7. multiple choice questions 7a. comprehending factual content 7b. inference 7c. interpreting the speaker's intention 7d. interpreting emotive or figurative language 7e. developing an overall view of the entire passage	1. simplified material with standard pronunciation 2. impromptu speech with standard pronunciation 3. prepared speech with standard pronunciation 4. impromptu speech with nonstandard pronunciation 5. impromptu <b>discussion</b> at a low level of abstraction or specialization 6. carefully prepared speech 7. speech in non-standard dialects 8. impromptu <b>discussion</b> with a high level of abstraction or specialization	1. materials relating to <b>common</b> experience 2. popularizations of specialist material 3. difficult <b>specialist</b> material

Most of the listening comprehension books on the market are geared to a lower level ESL audience than the proposed syllabus and materials (e.g. Improving Aural Comprehension by Morley (1977), Developing Listening Comprehension For ESL Students: The Kingdom of Kochen by Plaister (1976), Listening Contours by Rost (1979), Listening and Note-taking by Ferguson and O'Reilly (1977). Improving Aural Comprehension (1977) focusses entirely on linguistic competence and never ties individual exercises into coherent, realistic, lecture situations. In Developing Listening Comprehension For ESL Students: The Kingdom of Kochen (1976), Plaister attempts to get beyond the solely linguistic aspect of lecture comprehension and **aims** at guiding the student to focus on key words and pass over filler words. In Listening Contours (1979), Rost also attempts to get beyond the solely **linguistic** aspect of **listening** and focusses on the organization of the lecture samples. (Rost limits himself to three organizational patterns--process, narrative, and classification.) Neither book (Plaister's nor Rost's), however, is designed for the very advanced ESL student. The lectures in both books take from one to three minutes to present and are quite controlled. The lectures in Plaister's book are written out so as to make sure that the student focusses on the cues that are necessary. The lectures in Rost's book use a higher **concentration of redundancy of** key ideas than normal speech so that the students can gain practice in noting information

when heard at a normal spoken speed. Ferguson and O'Reilly in Listening and Note-taking (1977) begin by presenting three to seven minute talks with an outline that demonstrates the organization of the talk. Only at the end of the book do students begin taking notes on their own leading from one to two sentence "talks" to five minute "lectures,"

At the same level as the proposed syllabus and materials is Listening and Note-taking by Yates (1979) and Better Listening Skills by Sims and Peterson (1981). Yates' book begins with one to three sentence utterances and ends with seven lectures of approximately ten minutes each. She focusses attention on cues, organizational patterns, and outlining. Sims and Peterson's book contains five lectures, approximately ten minutes in length. Each lecture is followed by a number of exercises focussing on vocabulary, derivations, organizational patterns, outlining, general and detail comprehension. A drawback of each of these books is the limited number of full and realistic lecture possibilities. This allows for little opportunity to gear lecture topics to students' and teachers' interests and needs. Another drawback of both books is that they depend on lecture transcripts or tapes for lecture material. The realism of the lecture is minimized by not having a live lecturer. As mentioned before, tapes and transcripts often do not realistically provide for the normal hesitations, disruptions, digressions, etc. of the live lecture. Most important, by

fixing the style and vocabulary of lecture suggestions, there is no opportunity to vary linguistic level, lecture speed, or lecture style.

Syllabuses and guidelines for teaching note-taking, in particular, have been suggested by Aaronson (1975), Otto (1979), Johns and Johns (1976), and James (1977). Many of the lecture comprehension syllabuses and materials mentioned in this chapter also include a note-taking component.

Aaronson (1975) suggests an approach to note-taking that acknowledges the student's role as **interpreter** and judge of incoming information. She suggests two **columns**: **the first column**, the "recording" **column**, records the lecturer's flow of ideas and also records the hierarchy of ideas by means of **outline form** or indentation; the second **column**, the "recall" **column**, records the student's cue words, **summaries**, topics, **questions**, key **phrases**, definitions, and **comments**.

James (1977) attempts to explain the problems that NNSs have when taking notes. He says that one problem is faulty decoding due to the **problem** of **English** stress-timed **rhythm** and arbitrary lexical stress. He says that NNSs are not used to vowel reduction and differential stress on words. A second problem is in miscomprehension due to the message being wrongly or partially decoded because of (1) incorrect predictions on the part of the student because of insufficient

or different background knowledge and (2) lack of facility with lecture discourse. He mentions four steps that the note-taker must follow in order to take **successful** notes: (1) understand the message; (2) identify important points; (3) decide when to **write**; and (4) **write** quickly and clearly. His exercises, therefore, proceed from decoding and comprehending the message, making judgments about importance of the item within the whole discourse, filling in gaps in a skeleton outline, and finally, taking notes without the aid of an outline format.

Otto (1979) in his program focusses on four goals: (1) the transfer of the spoken word to the written text; (2) listening for key words and phrases; (3) selecting relevant details; and (4) recognizing topic and main ideas. To achieve these goals, he uses a combination of **dictation** exercises, **cloze** exercises, and mini-lectures with fill-in outlines.

The note-taking and **note-reconstruction** syllabus proposed by Johns and Johns (1976) is the most detailed and structured. Their course has four main components: (1) the **elimination** of redundant material (with note **reconstitution** focussing on restoring **grammatically** redundant elements); (2) rephrasing and reordering information (e.g. using a single lexical item to express a complex idea); (3) using conventional abbreviations (for **technical** and nontechnical lexicon (e.g. w/ = "with")); and (4) using

symbolic representations of logical relationships (e.g.  $\rightarrow$  = "causes", "leads to", "brings about"). Each unit practices both note-taking and note reconstitution in both the written and spoken mode. Johns and Johns' syllabus is represented in Table Two.

Table 2  
Johns and Johns' Note-taking Syllabus

	Note-taking	Note Reconstitution
Written	Taking notes from sentences (at first only inserting symbol), progressing within each unit to taking notes from paragraph (target notes at first 'gapped': extent of gapping gradually increased).	Restoring notes already taken on sentences and paragraphs to 'full form': writing paragraphs from given notes (target paragraphs at first presented in gapped form).
Spoken	Taking notes from spoken sentences, progressing to 'mini-lectures'. Some gradual withdrawal of assistance as above.	Reading aloud from notes already taken. Telling jokes, giving short 'mini-lectures' from given notes.

(Johns and Johns 1976:227)

The above mentioned syllabuses for **listening** comprehension **and** note-taking vary in the methodology and materials used for achieving the goal of lecture comprehension and **note-taking** competence. They all, however, base some of their ideas on similar assumptions about the learning of language



as communication. Candlin (1978:40) elucidates these assumptions in the following list concerning what must be dealt with in order to help the learner cope with problems of discursal misunderstanding:

- (1) assume that learners need to be sensitized to the cultural presuppositions which imbue particular utterances, and that this sensitivity is a prerequisite to understanding language as communication.
- (2) assume that the relationship between essence and force depends on continuing evaluation of the social view of and by speaker and hearer/writer and reader.
- (3) assume that this **sense/force** relationship will be underlain by culture-specific rules of discourse (and also by some pan-cultural rules) which constitute the chief objective of language learning.
- (4) assume that such rules are realized through interaction, and as a consequence the data for language learning ought to be presented in transactional context.
- (5) assume that communication is a process of applying these rules of discourse to convey meaning via a range of linguistic and para-linguistic signs and that these signs are culturally and socially specific.
- (6) assume that deriving meaning is a process of dynamic inference.
- (7) assume that (as a consequence) meanings are plural and variable in value as the communication proceeds.
- (8) assume that identifying strategies of interpretation can both serve to elucidate discourse as well as act as a language learning objective.

These assumptions will provide the basis for the syllabus to be proposed in this thesis. Before presenting the syllabus, however, it is important to have a better idea concerning the audience for whom the syllabus is proposed. In the next chapter, a detailed needs analysis concerning the actual and perceived listening comprehension, note-taking, and production needs of university students will be presented.

## CHAPTER III

LISTENING COMPREHENSION, PRODUCTION, AND NOTE-TAKING  
NEEDS OF UNIVERSITY ESL STUDENTS WITH  
IMPLICATIONS FOR SYLLABUS DESIGN

The needs analysis was conducted in order to best be able to generalize about the audience and their perceived and actual academic listening needs. This chapter will begin with a description of the needs analysis instrument and process after which a description of the actual listening needs of the students will be presented (based on teacher and department chairman data). Next, a description of the students' own perceptions of their academic listening needs and weaknesses will be discussed. Throughout this chapter, implications for syllabus design and classroom materials and methodology will be dealt with.

Although the syllabus proposed in this thesis will only concern itself with methodology and materials for teaching lecture comprehension and **note-taking**, it seems appropriate to include in the needs analysis instrument related demands on the academic competence of the student. Therefore, questions concerning other academic listening situations are included (small classroom lecture, seminar, large amount of student interaction, **etc.**) as well as questions concerning **production** demands placed on the student — the syllabus based on this needs analysis will allot **time for** these differing demands although the materials and methodological suggestions

will focus only on lecture comprehension and note-taking.

A syllabus for an English for Academic Purposes (EAP) course in lecture comprehension and note-taking normally considers a number of student variables: age; academic level; academic background; previous exposure to English; present study situation (in country, out of country, simulataneously taking courses in English, etc.); linguistic ability (in conversational English, written English, etc.); academic goals and major; psychological factors (motivation, need, learning styles, etc.); sociological factors (prestige of English in student's home country, attitudes towards English speakers, etc.). In addition, staffing and implementation factors are normally considered (e.g. experienced or inexperienced teachers, teaching styles, available machinery, etc.).

As can be imagined, a syllabus based on these variables as realized in a particular situation would have a narrow range of applicability. Therefore, this needs analysis focusses on the much more general perspective of the listening comprehension, production, and note-taking needs of the foreign university student. The needs analysis was carried out by **administering** questionnaires **at** the University of Hawaii at Manoa but most likely has relevance to any American university. Student respondents in the needs analysis span the range of the afore-mentioned variables. Their common

factors are only (1) a common aural comprehension level at which problems in lecture comprehension are based more on **overall** discourse comprehension than on linguistic problems at the sentence level and (2) a common need for English as a means to their academic goals.

One of the goals then of this needs analysis is to determine to what degree it is practical to base a lecture comprehension and note-taking course on such a general population, Are, for example, the needs of undergraduate and graduate students so different? Are the needs of prospective natural science students so different from **prospective** liberal arts majors? It may be important to narrow down the general learner profile and delineate separate syllabuses for certain major variables. **On** the other hand, it may be that the general need for English as a means to the same goal (success in an English speaking academic **environment**) may provide a clear enough needs base for all students despite certain variables.

#### A. Needs **Analysis** Procedure

The needs analysis procedure consists of three questionnaires--student questionnaires, faculty questionnaires, and department chairman questionnaires (see Appendix A)--and personal **communication** with language teachers.

**Specifically**, needs analyses are broken down as follows:

- (1) In order to find out what actually are the

listening comprehension, production, and note-taking demands placed on the students in the university, information was obtained from

a) department statistics, b) faculty requirements, and c) students' own perceptions.

(2) In order to find out where foreign students have problems meeting these demands, information was obtained from a) faculty perceptions, b) student perceptions, and c) personal communication with language teachers.

(3) In order to find out what students themselves want most out of an EAP course in lecture comprehension and note-taking, information was obtained from a) students' responses on questionnaires and b) personal communication with language teachers.

(4) In order to find out whether courses would best be divided along subject matter lines, or graduate versus undergraduate lines, information was obtained from a) department statistics, b) faculty requirements, and c) students' own perceived needs

Student questionnaires were given to 68 persons. Of these, 42 were at the level of just beginning a course with the proposed syllabus. The remaining 26 were near the end level or median level of a course with the proposed syllabus

Faculty and **chairman** questionnaires were sent out to ten departments (History, Economics, Political Science, Agricultural Engineering, Oceanography, Travel Industry **Management**, Civil Engineering, Architecture, Philosophy, and Religion). Departments were chosen on the basis of (1) whether they offered courses required of all students, (2) whether they had a large number of foreign undergraduate or graduate students, and (3) whether they fit into the desired sample of natural science versus **humanities** subject areas. Forty-nine faculty questionnaires were returned covering 88 classes. Six department chairman questionnaires were returned. The sample for **graduate** classes covers 24 classes and 20 different teachers. The sample for undergraduate classes covers 64 classes with 38 different teachers. A **breakdown** of the sample into subject area groupings shows a graduate science group (Agricultural Engineering and Oceanography) with 9 classes and 5 different teachers and a graduate humanities group (History, Philosophy, and Religion) with 7 classes **and** 7 different teachers. Table Three demonstrates this breakdown of responses.

#### B. Analysis of **Faculty** and **Chairman** Responses with Syllabus Design Implications

The introductory question on the **faculty** questionnaire asks, "How would you describe each of your courses in terms

Table 3

## Breakdown of Faculty and Chairman Questionnaire Responses

DEPT.	TOTAL NUMBER OF FACULTY RESPONSES RETURNED	NUMBER OF COURSES COVERED			CHAIRMAN RESPONSE
		Graduate	Under- graduate	Total	
History	11	2	15	17	yes
Economics	4	1	7	8	yes
Political Science	7	5	5	10	yes
Ag. Eng.	1	2	-	2	yes
Oceanog.	5	7	-	7	no
Travel Industry Management	6	-	16	16	yes
Civil Eng.	1	2	1	3	no
Arch.	3	-	5	5	no
Phil.	2	2	2	4	no
Religion	9	3	13	16	yes

of percentage of time devoted to teacher lectures, percentage of time devoted to student presentations, percentage of time devoted to class discussion?" Table Four shows this breakdown of class time.

Table 4

Percentage of Time Devoted to Lectures, Student Presentations, and Discussions

	Overall Response	Grad. Courses	Under-grad. Courses	Grad. Science Courses	Grad. Humanities Courses
% lecture	65.97	48.84	71.68	74.71	38.33
% student presentation	8.92	21.84	4.61	4.29	25.83
% discussion	20.03	24.21	18.62	8.57	35.83
% other (lab, studio, exams, etc.)	5.08	5.11	5.07	12.43	-

It seems that the great division is not due to the fact of being undergraduate or graduate but rather, very different needs emerge across subject areas. The science graduate students are overwhelmingly confronted with lectures and only occasionally confronted with production requirements and discussion comprehension. Their class situation is closely akin to the overall undergraduate requirements. The humanities graduate students, on the other hand, differ greatly from



both the undergraduate and the science graduate students. They very definitely need presentation and discussion production and comprehension skills along with lecture comprehension skills.

A question that needs further research is whether undergraduate needs can be broken down into science versus humanities needs. Would the predominance of lectures (and the comparative unimportance of production skills) in science-oriented courses show up again or would it be that at the level of undergraduate work all courses are primarily teacher-talk? My guess would be that undergraduate work in the humanities and sciences is largely concerned with the feeding of information and it is primarily in the graduate work in the humanities that emphasis is placed on students' critical thinking and input. Department statistics concerning course offerings support this hypothesis as shown in Table Five.

For question three ("Is it necessary for students to take detailed notes in your class?"), the same dichotomy (graduate humanities students versus undergraduates and science graduate students) holds true as shown in Table Six. Although note-taking is very important for all students, it is decidedly less important for the graduate humanities student.

Questions four, five, and six give an indication of what teachers do to help their students comprehend their

Table 5

Breakdown of Department Course Offerings in Terms of  
Lecture and Discussion Style

DEPT.	GRADUATE		UNDERGRADUATE	
	% of courses mainly lecture	% of courses mainly discussion	% of courses mainly lecture	% of courses mainly discussion
History	-	100%	77%	23%
Religion	-	100%	100%	-
Poli. Sci.	20%	80%	60%	40%
Economics	56%	44%	85%	15%
Ag. Eng.	90%	10%	100%	-
Travel Industry Management	N/A	N/A	61%	39%

Table 6

Is it Necessary to Take Detailed Notes?

--

UNDERGRW.		GRAD.		GRAD. (Science)		GRAD. (Humanities)	
Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
80.657	19.35%	60%	40%	83.33%	16.67%	57.14%	42.86%

lectures. Since this is most likely a question of individual teacher style, answers to this question best serve to give an indication of what techniques would be usable in an EAP class to simulate authentic lecture technique. Question four indicates that a very high percentage of teachers give handouts to students summarizing their lectures at least occasionally (75% of graduate courses; 45.9% of undergraduate courses). Question five asks teachers what method they use to help their students receive from a lecture or discussion what they want them to receive. Some of the responses given include "questions either before or after the lecture," "outlines on overhead projector," "oral summaries," "review sheets," "diagrams," "readings to support lecture notes," "outlines on board." For question six ("Do you write essential points on the board?"), 87-88% of all respondents answered "occasionally" to "always."

Question seven ("Do you use movies or video tapes in your class?") shows that it is primarily live language that the students come into contact with. Only 20% of the graduate courses and only 30.65% of the undergraduate courses reported using media anywhere from "occasionally" to "always." The remainder used media "rarely" or "never." It seems then that the only justification of more than moderate use of tapes or films in the language class is as a teaching tool, not as a simulation of actual classroom behavior. Video tapes of lectures can most easily be justified as a teaching

tool. Movies are inauthentic in the sense that the voice is generally off screen with visuals playing the dominant part. In the same sense, tapes are inauthentic in that the voice is 'off screen' with absolutely no visuals.

In question 11, faculty were asked to check the aspects of listening comprehension, note-taking, and production that they felt were essential for success in their class. Next, they were asked to rank the four most essential skills for success in their class. Results show that the major goal of the faculty is that the students be able to listen, take notes, and participate at the same time. However, a large number of teachers place high priority on just listening or just following the speaker's train of thoughts without note-taking. Implications for syllabus design seem to be that note-taking should not be the main goal of the course, nor the deciding factor concerning passing or failing. Class time can be realistically spent listening to a lecture, taking questions, and discussing the implications of the lecture. Class time does not have to revolve around listening to lectures, taking notes, and taking tests based on those notes.

The need for students to "be able to request clarification from the teacher" was considered quite important by teachers both in this question and in question 12 concerning teachers' perceptions of foreign students' difficulties in their class. Implications for syllabus design would be

including components on the **appropriateness** of requesting clarification and analysis and practice in how to interrupt and request clarification. In terms of productive skills, teachers clearly want **their** students to "be able to raise questions and ideas that **would** generate discussion." Again, language classroom interaction should simulate this situation as much as possible. Controversial or thought provoking issues might be best for this. It is important that lecture topics cover areas that the students want to know something about or share ideas about. As with clarification skills, analysis and practice in how to take part in discussions (getting a **turn**, giving a turn, etc.) is necessary. It is interesting that understanding everyday conversations had a fairly high priority. Perhaps the teachers feel that classroom discourse is equivalent to everyday conversations. As mentioned before, it seems that movies, tapes, video tapes, etc. have little importance for success in the **university**. Other items not considered important by **the** faculty are "understanding **different** speakers," "learning test taking skills," and marginally, "**learning** to give presentations."

On the whole, then, analyses of faculty and **department** chairman **questionnaires** indicate a **possible** advantage to splitting up students into groups of undergraduates versus groups of humanities graduate students., Although statistics concerning time **allotment** for lectures, student **presentations**, discussions, amount of participation required, and note-taking

needs all group the science graduate students with the undergraduates, **common** sense seems to indicate that if numbers permit, maturity and area of interest: might indicate a beneficial separation of the two. The syllabuses for those two groups may be the same, however, differing only in content and possibly 'depth' of discussion.

The syllabus for undergraduate students and the syllabus for science graduate students should include at least  $3/4$  time listening to lectures (with moderate to heavy emphasis placed on note-taking) and  $1/4$  time spent on language production (discussion skills and optional presentation skills). The syllabus for the graduate humanities students should include approximately  $1/3$  time listening to lectures (with moderate emphasis placed on note-taking),  $1/3$  time on discussions and discussion skills, panels, and debates, and  $1/3$  time on required presentations.

Analysis of results further indicates that if the language classroom is to be authentic, aids to listening can be **and** should be used such as outlines on the board, handouts, oral summaries, **pre-** and **post-questioning**, etc. There seems no reason to make the language classroom situation **more** difficult than the real situation. Furthermore, class time spent on movies and tapes lacks the realism of the typical university class and should be avoided except for specialized needs. Video tapes of lectures, however, may act as a teaching tool as well as a simulated classroom

'event.'

Lastly, results indicate that the goal of a lecture comprehension, production, and note-taking class must be varied. Because note-taking is a highly visible and highly correctable skill, it may be tempting to place too much emphasis on it. Teachers' responses, however, suggest that listening without note-taking ("following the train of thought and organization of the speaker," "thinking critically," "getting the main idea and less important points without note-taking") is at least as important if not more important than taking notes. In addition, teachers indicate that the productive skills of asking for clarification and raising questions and ideas that generate discussion are very important skills. The emphasis is on comprehension of ideas more than transcription of facts. This, however, may be more the teachers' ideal concerning their classroom interaction and not necessarily actuality.

#### C. Analysis of Student Responses With Syllabus Design Implications

To begin with, it was found that of all respondents, 72% had never before taken a course in an English speaking university. Since the proposed syllabus is aiming at generality of situation, it would be **unfair** to claim this as being **true** beyond the situation of the University of Hawaii at **Manoa**. It seems logical, however, to gear the syllabus to

this audience and to take it for granted that students do have to learn the cultural expectations for teacher-student interaction in lectures, classrooms, and seminars. This does not mean to say that students need all study skills. They may very well have (or not have) note-taking skills, study techniques, etc. in their native language. What the students need to learn are the culturally based differences (e.g. Is it allowable to approach the lecturer with questions? Where? During class? During an appointment? How much can you expect the lecturer to go over with you individually? A whole lecture? Is it acceptable to ask a fellow student to borrow **his/her** notes? To give you the answers to an exam?).

In terms of **expected** listening situations, results show that it is only the undergraduates plus the graduate science students who expect to find themselves in lecture halls. The graduate humanities students sampled do not expect to be in that situation. The large lecture hall situation, however, proved to be quite a problem for those finding themselves in that situation. (Approximately 57% of all respondents claim in question four that the large lecture hall situation is most difficult for them giving reasons, in order of difficulty, such as note-taking **problems** due to lack of feedback and opportunity for clarification, language reception problems, and physical problems including noise, distractions, sound quality, and boredom.) Syllabus design



should include some large lecture hall experience for all undergraduates and for graduate science students. As it would be unrealistic to reserve a large lecture hall for a small class of students, one possibility would be to go as a group to a lecture situation in progress and return to class to discuss questions and notes. Another possibility would be to attend community lectures as a group, perhaps at an art museum or a community center. For the graduate humanities student syllabus, the situation need not be dealt with at all.

For all groups, however, the majority of listening situations take place in the classroom (although for undergraduates the margin is closer to 50-50 for large lecture hall versus classroom). Most of the language classroom work then can be realistically done in the classroom. Except for science graduate students and business undergraduates, students seem to feel that many of their classroom situations will or do include a lot of student talk and discussion. Although as a single group, the classroom lecture (75% teacher lecture; 25% discussion) has the largest number of responses for all groups, there are quite a large **number** of responses indicating that classroom situations (25% teacher lecture; 75% discussion) and seminars (100% discussion) are also expected or experienced. This does not mesh with faculty responses which indicate that for undergraduates, **production** (e.g. discussion, presentations) is not highly valued or

necessary. This perceived need on the part of the students may indicate their desire to speak more, or their incorrect assumption about undergraduate university curricula and expectations. Because discussion can add life to a class and provide students with confidence in their spoken ability, it seems illogical to delete it from a syllabus because it is 'unrealistic.' Therefore, even though for undergraduates language production is not a necessity, it should be allowed optional time in any syllabus considerations. It is interesting to note that the second most difficult situation indicated in question four is listening and note-taking in classroom discussions (31%). Students indicate that language reception is the major problem (different student accents, lack of ability to follow the train of thought in the discussion) and that note-taking is a problem. It seems that students do feel the need for experience or training in how classroom discussions work (how people add on to someone else's previous comment, how people interject new comments, etc.).

Question five asks students to put a check next to those skills on a list that they think they need. Then, they are asked to rank those skills from one to four indicating the four most important skill needs. Results were compiled from students who would be entering a course with the proposed syllabus. The three highest priorities (which not only have the highest number of total responses but also have the higher ranking responses) are "listening, note-taking, and

participating at the same time," "differentiating between main points and less important points," and "understanding vocabulary and idioms." Although note-taking is included in the "listening, note-taking, and participation" category, what stands out is that the other two priorities deal solely with listening. Work in the syllabus needs to focus on academic listening separate from note-taking as well as along with note-taking. "What was the speaker trying to say?" types of exercises in which the students have to paraphrase and extract the essence of a message would be useful parts of a syllabus. Vocabulary and idiom work, particularly those items common to an academic register, need to be included in a syllabus. Particular attention should be paid to those idioms that indicate discourse relationships or emphasis such as "for the most part," "with respect to," "not to speak of," "in view of," "above all," etc.

The next group of priorities begins with "organizing ideas into well-written notes." The students ~~do~~ feel that this is a needed skill. It is an especially important component of the syllabus because it is the one aspect among listening comprehension, production, and note-taking in which the students can often see marked improvement. In addition, it is the one component that ~~can~~ be most easily evaluated. Considering the high percentage of faculty who reported that it ~~is~~ necessary for students to take detailed notes in their

class (80.65% undergraduate courses; 83.33% **graduate** (science) courses; 57.14% graduate (humanities) courses), it makes sense to include note-taking as an important component of the course syllabus, although still secondary to listening.

Following priorities are "hearing the main idea of long talks without note-taking," "**understanding** speech where the speaker is not present (movies, tapes, radio, **etc.**)," and "finding the key words to note down during long talks." All of these emphasize the above two conclusions. As for "understanding speech where the speaker is not present," although faculty responses indicate that tapes and movies are rarely, if ever, used in their courses, the use of tapes and movies in the classroom could be an **interesting** diversion for the-students. In the syllabus, however, it should be kept in mind that this is **not** one of their academic needs, and would only be fulfilling what the students foresee as their need.

Two other fairly high **priorities** are "learning to raise questions or present ideas that start and contribute to class discussions" and "**learning** to give organized presentations." As **mentioned** in the analysis of faculty responses, the only ones for whom these skills are absolutely essential are the graduate humanities **students**. Therefore, for all undergraduates and for graduate science students, it should again be **kept** in mind that **these** are **not** necessarily their academic needs, but that they could be useful **in**

fulfilling a perceived need and a psychological need. Rather than making discussion skills and presentation skills a requirement in the undergraduate syllabus and in the graduate science student syllabus, it should be an option based on students' desire.

Although not **priorities**, the following skills are perceived to some degree as being a need: "hearing the main idea of short talks without note-taking," "understanding everyday conversational English," "understanding different speakers," "following the speaker's system of presentation and organization," "understanding statistics and writing them down," "listening to and participating in discussions without note-taking," "finding the key words to note down during short talks," "learning test taking skills," and "learning how to politely interrupt speakers in order to ask them to go over a point or to make a point clearer." These skills may be included as **segments** of the syllabus but certainly not as essential **components**.

When analyzing graduate student responses separately, there seems little difference. The graduate students on the whole do place a higher priority on "raising questions and ideas that **stimulate** discussion" and "giving presentations" and surprisingly "learning everyday conversational English." This **emphasis** on discussion and presentation skills is largely on the part of graduate science students, completely contradicting the faculty response of spending

little time on **presentations** and discussions in **graduate** science classes.

Questions six, seven, and eight deal with the situations the students feel they can handle upon arriving into a course with the proposed syllabus. Results show that the students do not feel they need work on getting the main idea of a lecture or discussion. **More** problems are indicated when the students need to differentiate main ideas from details. Still, there seems to be less of a feeling of difficulty here than is indicated in question five where students placed "differentiating between main points and less important points" as being a **very** high priority. At least 50% **of** students in all situations are aware of problems when it comes to **note-taking**. It is interesting to note that there seems to be little difference in amount of difficulty whether listening to a short talk, a long lecture, or a discussion. This, too, contradicts the response to question four which indicates that students found listening to a classroom discussion (mainly student participation) plus **note-taking** to be their second most difficult situation (preceded by listening and note-taking in a large lecture hall). Although this information about **students'** perceptions of their **own abilities** is important from a psychological perspective, it should be taken with a grain of salt. **From** personal experience and from talking with language teachers, many **of** these same students say that they have comprehended something, but when

asked to answer questions or **perform** a task based on that comprehension demonstrate a high degree of miscomprehension. For planning a syllabus, then, it seems necessary to incorporate the skill of differentiating between main points and less important points and discussion skills into a framework in which the students do not feel babied or unchallenged (e.g. as one or two questions among other more thought provoking questions).

Question nine deals with the problems students perceive when listening to lectures in **English**. Results were compiled for students who are approximately at the beginning point of the proposed syllabus. The greatest problems are "**speaker** talks too fast" and "speaker doesn't give me time to **think** about what I have heard." Since **it** is unlikely the case that the blame **for** these two problems is so often on the speaker, it is more likely that the student at this level is having difficulty in terms of time of processing, and not necessarily in terms of linguistic difficulty with the lexicon or **grammar** of **the** lecture. Besides practice and increased familiarity with lecture discourse, awareness of cues and practice in prediction along with awareness of the redundancy in lectures can help ease this time of processing burden.

Since students indicate "speaker uses a lot of unfamiliar vocabulary and idioms" as the next major problem, it is logical to **assume** that there is a lexical component to students' difficulty. Work on academic register **vocabulary**

and idioms and where possible, subject specific vocabulary and idioms should be incorporated into the syllabus. Work, too, on using context to predict meaning is important. In addition, students should be psychologically prepared to expect not to understand every word in a lecture. (With an awareness of the redundancy in lectures and an awareness of native speaker's inattention to individual words and segments in a message, students can be led to be more at ease with this incomplete comprehension.)

The next two major difficulties support some of the points previously made. Students have difficulties with "speaker tries to cover too much subject matter" which, although possibly being a reflection on speakers, more likely indicates a time of processing difficulty. Students also have problems with "speaker doesn't make clear what points are important and what points are unimportant." This confirms the need to begin work on the level of extracting the essence of talks, charting the relationships between ideas (support, examples, lists, etc.), analyzing the overall discourse structure of lectures and seeing how a lecturer makes a point and then talks around it and about it, and analyzing and being aware of the cues that indicate the relative importance of pieces of information within discourse. The teaching of grammatical means of focussing (Wh-cleft, pseudo-cleft, paraphrase, etc.) could prove to be useful aids in evaluating information.



Lastly, in question ten, students were asked to indicate the frequency of certain problems concerning note-taking. Almost 100% of the students responded that, at least occasionally, they "miss a lot of the lecture because (they) are writing while the teacher is talking." Many times students will try to write everything the teacher says, making no allowances for relative value of utterances. In addition, students tend to write useless non-information bearing words, or even attempt to write in complete sentences. This problem is also reflected in the high response to "I can't understand what is important to note and what is less important to note." This again raises the, by now, overly reiterated point which is that the students need to make value judgments concerning the importance of utterances within discourse as well as judgments concerning the relation between utterances within the discourse. Better note-taking would seem to be a function of better and more critical logic when listening. Attention in the syllabus needs to focus on listening to discourse and writing the minimum **number** of words usable to express the essential ideas. Attention also needs to focus on the amount of note-taking necessary depending on the situation (*i.e.* Does the situation call for comprehension of concepts? Does the situation call for memorization of facts?). Again, awareness of discourse **structure**, cues to organizational patterns, and cues to

emphasis would all aid better note-taking. Outlining would be a useful skill to teach to aid awareness of the hierarchical value of **information**. However, it seems important to stress flexibility in note-taking style rather than any one particular style. It would also be useful to include a component in the syllabus on note-taking abbreviations (word abbreviations as well as organizational abbreviations).

In the following chapter, a syllabus will be presented, taking into account all of these actual and perceived needs and their implications.

## CHAPTER IV

A SYLLABUS WITH MATERIALS AND METHODOLOGICAL  
SUGGESTIONS FOR TEACHING LECTURE  
COMPREHENSION AND NOTE-TAKING  
TO ADVANCED ESL STUDENTSA. A Listening Comprehension, Note-taking, and Production  
Syllabus For Advanced ESL Students

In preparing the syllabus design, it seemed most reasonable to base sequencing and goals on a skill-based perspective. The components of the syllabus, then, focus on what the student needs to be able to do in the language, and not necessarily on the language itself. Although different syllabuses will be presented for undergraduate students and science graduate students versus humanities graduate students, the lecture comprehension and note-taking **component** for all courses will be the same. The differences are in terms of time allotted to the different skills of lecture comprehension, note-taking, and production.

The **syllabus** will be presented in outline form divided into three major headings: time allotment, topics, and skills goals and syllabus components. If an item refers to only one group (undergraduate, science graduate, humanities graduate), it will be specified. Where no group is specified, the item refers to all three groups.

## I Time Allotment

Undergraduate Syllabus and Graduate (Science) Syllabus:  
Approximately 75% of class time should be spent on listening to lectures (occasionally in lecture halls; most often in the classroom). Of that 75%, approximately 40% of the time should include note-taking practice; approximately 35% of the time should be solely listening practice. Approximately 25% of class time (or less, if students are not receptive) should be spent on discussion or presentations with approximately 10% of that time spent on note-taking practice.

Graduate (Humanities) Syllabus:

Approximately 33% of the class time should be spent on listening to lectures in the classroom. Of that 33%, approximately 15% should include some note-taking practice. Approximately 33% of the time should be spent on discussions with approximately 10% of that time spent on note-taking. Approximately 33% of the time should be spent on student presentations with approximately 10% of that time spent on note-taking.

## II Topics

It seems impossible to have all of the lecture topics be in the students' fields of interest. Because it is important that information presented in the lectures

be new information, it is unrealistic to expect language teachers to know more about a subject than majors within a field. (Student presentations, however, can provide an opportunity for students to share their specializations in a field with others in the same field.) in addition, even with groups such as graduate science students or graduate humanities students, there will still be a wide variety of fields represented. it makes most sense to choose topics of general interest, especially controversial or thought provoking issues.

### III Skills Goals and Syllabus Components

#### A. Listening

1. The student should be able to differentiate between main points and less important points in lectures by (a) doing oral and written summaries which require extracting the essential points, (b) outlining and seeing the visual hierarchy of ideas, and (c) analyzing discourse and being made aware of cues of emphasis and grammatical means of emphasis. For the graduate humanities student, these skills would be practiced in discussion situations as well as in lecture situations.
2. The student should be able to follow the speaker's

train of thought and organizational patterns by (a) analyzing discourse (through transcriptions and on video tape) thus leading to an awareness of cues that indicate **organizational patterns** as well as the overall patterning of lecture discourse and (b) outlining. For the graduate humanities student, these skills would be practiced in discussion situations as well as in lecture situations.

3. The student should be able to make reasonable predictions about future discourse in lectures by (a) doing cloze-type exercises on lecture transcripts having words and groups of words blocked out, (b) predicting unfinished discourse during live lectures or video tapes of lectures, and (c) being made aware of the culturally based systems of logic.
4. The student should be able to comprehend vocabulary and idioms in context by (a) practice in guessing at meaning from context, (b) practice in getting the overall gist of lexically difficult messages, and (c) analysis of discourse (through lecture transcriptions and video tapes) thus gaining an **awareness of** academic register vocabulary and idioms **especially** those that indicate relationships and emphasis.

## B. Note-taking

1. The student should be able to take **lecture** notes for a variety of different purposes (**e.g.** in order to describe a concept, in order to get facts, in order to get directions) by (a) practice in taking down the **minimum** number of words to express the **most** important ideas and relationships, (b) an awareness of abbreviations expressing relationships and lexical items, and (c) by practice in A1, A2, A3, and A4 of the listening component of the syllabus.
2. The student should be able to listen to and take notes with a variety of lecturer styles (e. g. highly organized, **rambling**, fast-paced, slow-moving) by doing the same **activities** as B1 above using video **tapes** or live lectures demonstrating these different styles.
3. The student should be able to take notes in a variety of lecture environments (**e.g.** in a large lecture hall, in a **classroom**) by doing the **same** activities as B1 above in **different** environments.
4. Graduate humanities students should be able to take notes during a **discussion** by (a) doing the **same** activities as B1 above using video

tapes of live **discussions** and (b) analyzing transcripts of discussions and video tapes of discussions in order to become aware of the cues that indicate new topics or additions on to another person's previous **comment**. For the graduate science student and for the undergraduate student, this skill is optional.

5. The student should be able to rewrite haphazard notes so as to represent the organization of the lecture and make it clear for future reference by (a) learning outlining skills and (b) becoming aware of the culturally based systems of logic.

#### C. Production

1. The student should be able to ask for clarification by (a) gaining an awareness of the cultural aspects of **asking** for clarification (e.g. when you ask, who you ask, how much time can be expected) and (b) gaining an awareness of the **sociolinguistic** aspects of asking for clarification (e.g. how to **form** the request, how to interrupt).
2. The graduate humanities **student** should be able to raise questions or present ideas that start and contribute to class discussions by analyzing discourse and watching video tapes of discussions, thus becoming aware of how to enter a discussion,



how to give up a **turn**, etc. **This** skill is optional for the graduate science student and for the undergraduate student.

3. The graduate humanities student should be able to give organized presentations by (a) discussing the organization of presented lectures and (b) getting guidance in preparing and giving **his/her** own presentation. This skill is optional for the graduate science student and for the undergraduate student.

#### D. Optional Activities and Skill Goals

1. The student should be able to comprehend **discourse** in which the speaker is not present (tapes, movies, radio, etc.).
2. The student should be able to understand different speakers (accents, dialects, **etc.**).
3. The student should be able to understand statistics and write them down.
4. The student should know how to make intelligent guesses on **exams** based on a lecture.
5. The student should **know** how to answer essay **exam** questions based on a lecture.

The next section of this chapter **will** present sequencing suggestions, sample **materials**, and 'methodological suggestions based on this syllabus.

B. Materials and Methodological Suggestions For Teaching  
Lecture Comprehension and Note-taking to Advanced ESL Students

Materials development and methodological suggestions are based on Phillips' (1981) four principles of Language for Specific Purposes (LSP) methodology:

- (1) Principle of reality **control**- control of the difficulty of the task demanded of the LSP student is exercised by means of the procedure of simplification appropriate to the field of activity constituting his or her special purpose. (Phillips 1981:97).

In this case, the "special purpose" is the acquisition of interpretive competence in academic English.

- (2) Principle of non-triviality - the learning tasks required of the student must be non-trivial; that is, they must be perceived by the students as meaningfully generated by **his/her** special purpose. (Phillips 1981:99).
- (3) Principle of authenticity - the language that the student acquires through following the LSP course must be authentic; that is, it must be the language naturally generated by **his/her** special purpose. (Phillips 1981:101).
- (4) Principle of tolerance of error - errors of **content** and of formal adequacy are to be judged as unacceptable only to the extent that they entail errors of **communicative** adequacy. (Phillips 1981:103).

The principles of reality control, non-triviality, and authenticity will be adhered to in the materials by making all lectures in the form of content outlines. The actual lectures will not be written out in transcript form according to what a lecture is thought to be, but rather all lectures will be presented live, spoken spontaneously, as if giving

a 'real' lecture. For a more concrete and uniform control of materials, lectures may be put on video tape, still abiding by the same rules of presenting a lecture from outline notes, and not using a word-for-word transcription.

The last principle, tolerance of error, will need to be put into practice by the classroom teacher. What this means in the context of lecture comprehension and note-taking is that linguistic form need not be corrected, except when it interferes with the communicative goal of interpreting the lecture, taking notes that interpret the lecture correctly, and taking part in activities based on the lecture or notes (*e.g.* discussion, test taking, essay writing).

The materials for the course will be sequenced into four stages:

- (1) Stage One aims at training awareness of factors affecting lecture comprehension;
- (2) Stage Two aims at introducing students to the concept of judging the relative value of **information** in discourse and noting the minimum number of words to represent the ideas and their relative value;
- (3) Stage Three aims at introducing students to the logic of lectures so as to increase their predictive and evaluative abilities;
- (4) Stage Four aims at giving students the **opportunity** to practice the skills they have learned in less controlled and longer situations.

Stage One exercises include transcripts of **actual** lectures with some **intact** and others with blanks for practicing predictive skills. There are three activities involved in this stage. First, using transcripts of **actual** lectures, **students** cross out non-essential words, circle cues of emphasis or de-emphasis and cues to organization, **and** pinpoint context cues for figuring out unknown vocabulary. The following is a sample transcript with one possible interpretation of essential versus non-essential information and cue words:

Lecture Transcript - Language

<sup>← cue to topic introduction</sup>  
 let's first look at one aspect of language.. <sup>← cue to topic introduction</sup> I want to look  
 at the sociological or sociolinguistic way of looking at  
 language... <sup>← cue to beginning a topic???</sup> all right from this point of view some linguists  
 have come up with the idea that language is a game...\*  
~~football, soccer, baseball...~~ each person who speaks in any  
 particular language or any community knows all the rules of  
 this game... ~~they know how to pl. ♪~~ ...somebody who comes from  
 a different one ~~as you know well~~ may not know all the rules  
 so you have some problems with communication.. <sup>← cue???</sup> now because  
 we said language is a game doesn't necessarily mean that we  
 play it for fun...we usually play it for very serious reasons...  
 most of the time... ~~although sometimes we do play it for fun...~~  
~~sometimes we tell jokes and things like that... hmmm~~...but  
 the rules...no matter what we do are very well defined... ~~you~~

~~may not know what they are but they're very clear rules of~~  
~~what you can do and what you can't do in any situation...~~  
 usually in any use of language people are trying to accomplish  
 something... ~~trying to do something...~~ that's why they talk...  
~~sometimes you just talk to yourself for no reason... some~~  
~~crazy people talk for no reason but most people talk because~~  
 they want to accomplish something. ~~(basically)~~ <sup>cue of emphasis</sup> some linguists  
 have set up ~~(five)~~ <sup>cue of organization</sup> categories of accomplishing things... we use  
 language to describe... ~~tell about the world that we see...~~  
~~there's a chair over there... there's a person over here...~~  
~~someone is from China... or whatever...~~ ~~(another)~~ <sup>cue of organization</sup> thing that we  
 use it for is to tell people to do something... ~~please close~~  
~~the door... please open the door... do your homework... do this...~~  
~~do that...~~ now we might not always say do it but we have ~~...~~ <sup>of organization</sup>  
 of telling people to do something... ~~(another way a third way~~  
 is we use language to tell people what we're going to do...  
~~I'm going to tell you about language... I'm going to open the~~  
~~door...~~ ~~(another)~~ <sup>cue of organization</sup> way to look at language... ~~(two other ways)~~ <sup>cue of organization</sup>... one  
 is to tell about feelings... ~~express what's inside of us about~~  
~~the world... not only that there is a chair but that I don't~~  
~~like that chair or I do like that chair...~~ and ~~(the fifth way)~~  
~~or the fifth thing~~ <sup>cue of organization</sup> we use is to change the world... certain  
~~things that you say change the world... if I say you fail this~~  
~~course... that language changes the world... just my four words~~  
~~make you unhappy and hate me... something has changed because~~  
~~of my words and nothing else except those words... so we can~~



need more than A) one  
B) two person to play language...

usually A) a person  
B) somebody talk to somebody else or A) to the  
B) some-

A)  
B) body talk to a \_\_\_\_\_ group of people...sometimes you talk

to yourself but that's more A) unlike  
B) unusual than usual except

if you're thinking not outright talking...it's a game because

it's A) usually ...something that we A) play  
B) rules together.. B) play

A) with one A) factor A) -  
B) - ...another B) - it's like a B) -

is that the players A) play A) who is  
B) - ...one person B) -

a new person comes into A) a group of  
B) - ...three or four

persons are standing together they may all be playing...one

may leave and a substitute A) the other  
B) may come in ...so it's

like a game in that A) sense A) important  
B) way ... B) another thing is

of course like I said, you're out to win something just like

A) in any other game we do  
B) you want to win the game you want to kick the ball in

the goal ...we're usually

out to accomplish something...something tangible...A) required  
B) -

or something intangible, like emotional satisfaction...

something to that effect...OK...another thing A) concerning  
B) to notice

A) language

B) - is that everybody has his own style of

A) play

A) players have different styles

B) doing things like B) A goes to bed early; 3 takes

of playing games

a bath at night etc. just like

that some speakers are very good at certain ways of speaking

and have certain individual styles of speaking...everybody is

A) different

B) speaking in his own style nobody speaks the

same...also, like a soccer player or like any game player you

can change your style... A) similarly, you can choose your  
B) -

A) style of play

B) -...so styles change as well

as the fact that each person has his own style...all right and

the last thing is that we have rules for the game...just like

we have rules now...when I talk you A) listen  
B) listen to me

unless I give you some signal that says it's time for you to

talk or I stop talking...there are very definite rules for

not interrupting and A) -  
B) disturb...and for all kinds of

things...we all know these rules but we probably A) -  
B) may not

A) -

B) know all the rules of language...when you're



talking about football you can say it's **played** in a field so

big so wide you can't kick the ball off the field...it has

many A) rules B) rules and everybody can learn those A) rules B) rules

and tell us what they are...language is a little different...

if I asked you for some of the rules of languages A) you eight B) you may

A) not know how to explain it  
B) not know how they work ...but

there are very definite rules and we all know what they are...

the only time problems come in is when you know Chinese or

Korean rules and I know American rules and we don't A) know B) know

A) each other rules  
B) each other's ...then we have A) problem B) problem

and lack of A) communication B) communication . we don't know each other's

A) rules B) rules ...for example...if you know A) volleyball B) how to play basket-

A) -  
B) ball and you try to play with the rules of

a soccer game...of course A) you cannot play B) you cannot kick the ball into the

A) -  
B) net ...you're not going to be

able to accomplish what you want to accomplish...so...in terms

of the sociolinguistic way of looking at language...language

is a kind of rule-governed behavior...of interaction between

people...like a A) -  
B) game ...everybody knows the A) -  
B) rules

they're mutually intelligible...we all know within a given

community we know what A) -  
B) the rules are ... A) -  
B) we

knows how to play...now the big question for you probably

and for me if I'm trying to learn a language... A) is to  
B) is it

A) learn the rules of the game  
B) possible for me to learn all the rules ?

...so part of the definition...we can say is a rule-governed

social behavior is one way of looking at language from a

sociological kind of viewpoint.

The teacher's role in this activity is to get students to see what cues they used to predict what was coming. Where students can't predict, the teacher can discuss concepts of repetition, parallelism, reference, repeated organizational patterns (such as repeatedly making a statement and then comparing it to a sports game), cliches, etc. As stated in the principle of tolerance of error, the teacher need not correct students or even provide answers except where the student's answer is illogical in terms of meaning.

The thira activity in Stage One is to show a video tape

of a lecture (five to ten minutes) and have students note or discuss any non-linguistic or **paralinguistic** cues of emphasis or **non-emphasis** they notice or hear. The goal is to get students to be looking beyond the words, not necessarily to come up with an uncontestable rule.

Stage One serves to introduce students to the concepts of cues, organizational patterns, redundancy, and expansion by looking at transcripts--a concrete representation of the sounds and words that pass by quickly when spoken. In Stage Two, the students begin to listen, still noting cues, organizational patterns, redundancy, and expansion. They use this knowledge at this point to choose what to note, writing as few words as possible to express the most information, and to judge the relative value of information in the discourse.

Stage Two has two main parts. The first one involves having students listen to one to three minute talks and having them note (or discuss) words that carry content--the minimum number of words usable to note the main idea in a form that represents visually **the** relative importance and relation **between** different points. These one to three **minute** segments are related and consecutive and make up part of a **longer** lecture. Two segments **from** a larger grouping on "earthquakes" **follow**. The teacher giving these talks has the freedom of stopping and discussing at **different junctures--more** often, if the students are overwhelmed; less often, if

it seems too easy

### Stage Two Material

1. **What** I'd like to talk about today is earthquakes--what scientists know or think about the causes of earthquakes, what developments have occurred concerning the prediction of earthquakes. As you **may** already know, earthquakes are one of the most unpredictable **of** natural occurrences. Most often, they strike without **specific** warning. One such unexpected earthquake occurred in Italy in December 1980; another occurred in Algeria in October 1980. In 1976, an earthquake measuring 8.2 **on** the Richter Scale occurred 90 miles southeast **of** Peking, killing as many as 650,000 people. This earthquake also had caught seismologists by surprise. It almost seems that at the present level of research, nature always surprises man.

2. Even so, as time passes, the earth's behavior **is** becoming much less mysterious. Less than 300 years ago, as late as 1750, the Bishop **of** London told his followers that two recent quakes **had** been **warnings** from an angry deity. **Today**, **scientists**, thinking that they're somewhat closer to an answer, prefer another explanation. **This** explanation is **known** as the theory of plate tectonics (write on board).

In talk number one, the teacher might begin by asking what the organization and goal of **that** section of the talk

was. Students might bring up the idea that one of the goals was to outline the direction **of** the talk ("what I'd like to talk about today...") or to get people **interested** in the talk (by discussing the damage done by earthquakes), or to hint at the tone of the talk ("at the present level of research, nature always surprises man"). In **terms** of rhetorical organization, a student might bring up the idea that the lecturer makes a statement ("they strike **without** specific warning") and then gives examples to back up that statement.

The teacher might then proceed by asking students what notes they took or asking students to write their notes on the board. The quality of notes should be judged on the basis of conciseness combined with accurate representation **of** important ideas. For **example**, for the section in talk number one, "What I'd like to talk about today is earthquakes-- what scientists know or think about the causes **of** earthquakes, what developments have occurred concerning the **prediction** of earthquakes," one student writes (1)

EARTHQUAKES .

Causes    Predicting

Another **writes** (2) EARTHQUAKES - what are causes? how to predict? Another writes (3) what scientists think about causes **of** earthquakes, what developments concern prediction **of** earthquakes? Teachers and students can see that the first representation is the **most** concise and also visually represents **that** the main **topic** is "earthquakes" with subtopics being

"causes" and "prediction." In addition, the shape of the notes (the column type approach) predicts ahead allowing room for later information to be incorporated. The second representation uses a few more words and is not as visually clear. The third representation uses way too many words and does not have any visual emphasis.

At the end of talk number one, the teacher might ask the students where they think the talk is heading. They will probably predict that the body of the lecture will begin with either the causes or prediction of earthquakes. The teacher should accept any logical possibility. The goal is to have students feel free to guess. Instead of going directly into all of talk number two, the teacher may begin slowly with, for example, only the first sentence, allowing **students** to modify their original guesses. Talk number two begins with, "Even so, as time passes, the earth's behavior is becoming much less mysterious." After asking whether there are any **further** predictions of lecture direction or any **modifications** of previous **predictions**, the teacher may point out the cue "even so" (a cue that the following information is somewhat of a contradiction of the previous **statement** that "nature always surprises man") or the cue "as time passes" (a reference to time up to the modern day). Students may be able to **guess** that the talk will continue about theories of **earthquake** causes or prediction in the past to the present. The teacher may now

continue the rest of talk number two, and follow the same procedure of **examining** people's notes and discussing the best **representation**. Again, at the end of talk number two, the teacher may ask for predictions concerning lecture direction.

The second part of Stage **Two** is also involved in **extracting** the essence from a talk--this time, not in the **form** of notes, but in the **form** of a two to three sentence **summary** of a five to ten minute talk. **Judgment** of **summaries** is based on whether the student saw the general **organizing** principles of the **lecture**, eliminating the details. A sample lecture followed by examples of student **summaries** follows:

Lecture: Understanding Headaches

Introduction: Headaches can be debilitating, **socially**,  
physically, and psychologically

General causes of headaches: **disease** of sinuses,  
teeth, eyes, brain, infections, injuries, **etc.**

**Many** types of headaches

I Causes and **treatment** of specific types of headaches

- A. tension headache - due to **muscle** contraction brought on by anxiety, stress - treatment by lying **down**, relaxing, hot showers, heating pads, aspirin
- B. withdrawal headache - due to body cells getting **used** to substances such as caffeine, nicotine, alcohol, **and then** getting inadequate **supply** - treatment by high fluid intake - otherwise will go away over **time**

- C. Migraine headache - believed to be tied to blood vessels in head opening and closing - most painful - treatment by aspirin, codeine, see doctor

II How to tell if headache is serious - when to see doctor

- A. if different pattern from usual headache
- B. if tied to other trouble (e.g. fever, dizziness)
- C. if headache is associated with seizures
- D. if headache follows a head injury

III Which pain medicine is best?

- A. aspirin
- B. buffered aspirin
- C. decongestants

Sample summaries:

- (1) There are three kinds of headaches: tension, withdrawal and migraine. You should treat them by seeing a physician and finding the right cure for each headache.
- (2) The lecture talks about what causes a headache. It explains the differences and what (1) tension, (2) withdrawal, and (3) migraine headaches are and how one should treat them. The talk explains what a serious headache is and how one should seek advice from a doctor or which medicine is best to use for an everyday headache.



In summary number one, the student noticed the organizing point of talking about three kinds of headaches but did not notice that the causes and treatments for each one of them was discussed. In addition, she had misinterpreted the lecture, stating that they should all be treated by seeing a physician. She also missed two other subsections of the lecture--how to tell if the headache is serious and what pain reliever to use. The second summary, on the other hand, avoids the details but gives a concise description of the general organization of the talk.

At this point in the course, lectures containing information of a statistical nature and practice noting numbers might be included. In preparation for this, practice in listening to numbers in isolation may be introduced. Later, lectures containing a lot of statistics should be used so that students can use all of the strategies available for interpreting statistics (expectations, redundancy, etc.).

The goal of Stage Three is to introduce students to the overall discourse of lectures. In order to introduce the concept of discourse coherence (the manner in which different speech acts are strung together), this stage begins by taping a lecture and playing it back line by line (or two lines at a time) constantly stopping and asking: Where is the speaker heading (in a general sense)? What will come next? How do you know? Is this important information? The following demonstrates an idealized interaction. (In the classroom,

the teacher would most likely give more clues to elicit these ideas and would probably give many of his/her own ideas concerning analysis.)

Lecture Segment      Teacher-Student Interaction

Let's turn to	T: <b>Where</b> is the speaker heading?
the <u>Tao Te</u>	S: He'll look at what's in the book...
<u>Ching</u> itself...	the ideas in the book...
	T: <b>What</b> will come next?
	S: one main idea from the book? the first page of the book? the book's organization?
	T: <b>How</b> do you know?
	S: "turn to the book itself"...so he's not talking about the <b>background</b> of the book...he wants to look at the content of the book...
	T: Is this important information?
	S: Yes...the lecturer is telling us his focus... <u>directing our attention...</u>
now...the center	T: <b>Where</b> is the speaker heading?
of this book is	S: <b>he</b> wants to talk about what "Tao"
in this word	means...wants to <b>talk</b> about how whole
"Tao" (written on	book relates to "Tao"
board)...this is	T: <b>What</b> will come next?
the heart...	S: a definition of "Tao"?...what "Tao" is?

T: How do you know?

S: he uses words like "center", wrote the word on the board...stresses "this is the heart"

T: Is this important information?

S: yes...further subcategorizes topic from Tao Te Ching to "Tao"

---

so...if you can

T: Where is the speaker heading?

know what this

S: ...how can you know what this word means...

word is trying

T: What will come next?

to say...and the

S: he says the way is not by sitting down and intellectualizing...must be by feeling...

way you know it

T: How do you know?

is not by sitting

S: first he says we can know what "Tao" is but then he tells us how not to find out...he must intend to tell us later how we can find out...

down and intel-

T: Is this important information?

lectually grasp-

S: maybe...it seems that the important information will come...this is leading up to it...

---

ing...

the way you know

T: Where is the speaker heading?

is the way of

S: he's going to tell a story about

letting go..,

"letting go" and relate that to the

you remember the Tao Te Ching...  
 famous story I T: What will come next?  
 told you about S: a **story** about "letting go"...

the professor who T: How do you know?  
 came to the S: he asks students if they **remember..**  
 Zen monk... just in case they don't, he'll  
 probably retell it...also "the way  
 you know is the way of letting go"  
 is important information..he wants  
 to stress it by giving examples and  
 expanding on the idea...

T: Is this important information?  
 S: "the way you know is the way of  
 letting go" is very important...the  
 story is just support...

---

The remainder of the materials and activities for Stage Three involve lectures printed in outline form, grouped under six different rhetorical headings: (1) define/describe, (2) deductive/hypothesis-proof, (3) inductive, (4) enumerative/exemplification, (5) chronological/historical/process, and (6) classification. Each rhetorical heading begins with a description in outline form of that rhetorical pattern. In addition, for each rhetorical heading, there is a list of sample cues or vocabulary applicable to that style. For each heading, there is a choice of lectures,

varying in length, topic, and lexical complexity. However, because the lectures are in outline **form**, the teacher giving the lecture has the freedom to make the lecture more or less difficult by **altering his/her** style of speaking, speed of speaking, number of tangents, choice of vocabulary, **amount** of redundancy, etc. Lastly, as a means of contextualization, each lecture begins and ends with discussion questions. At the beginning, these discussion questions serve to give the student the cultural background knowledge required for understanding the lecture. At the end, the **discussion** serves to tie the talk together and give it personal relevance, **applying** it to other areas and ideas.

For each style, a sequence might be as follows:

Lecture one (of that style) - ten minutes; listen without note-taking; **summarize** orally or in writing; discuss organization of lecture; listen to the same lecture again; take notes and compare in groups; have groups **rewrite** notes into a format in which the hierarchy of information is visually clear.

Lecture two (of **that** style) - (optional) - ten minutes; analyze the lecture line by **line**; **discuss clues** that tell the student how to organize this lecture on paper and in **his/her head**; with each line, discuss what might be noted or what might follow.

Lecture Three (of that style) - ten to fifteen minutes  
 (possibly including tangents); listen  
 and take notes; collect notes; do exer-  
 cises based on content or discuss notes.

Black's (1971) hierarchy of listening exercises and situations ranked from least difficult to most difficult (discussed on pages 44-5 above) would be useful criteria for judging exercise sequences and lecture presentation style.

At this stage, the teacher might stress that lectures rarely fall into any one category of rhetorical style. Rather than giving the student set rules of lecture discourse, the teacher is giving the student some insight into the underlying processes of lecture coherence. It is through exposure to these styles in comparative isolation that the student will more easily see the different styles in a longer, less organized lecture.

Samples from the chapter "Inductive Style" follow:

#### Inductive Organizational Style Outline

(Introduction):

Statement of intended topic:

Anecdote(s), narrative(s), test description(s), observation(s)  
 based on above topic:

Conclusions based on the above anecdote(s), narrative(s),  
test description(s), observation(s):

(Summary of points covered):

---

Sample Vocabulary Cues For Conclusions in the  
Inductive Organizational Pattern

Thus,

Therefore,

As a conclusion,

To conclude,

This { shows  
demonstrates  
implies  
... } that

{ Taking all of this into account,  
Based on X  
If we examine X more closely } we can { see  
conclude }

{ Obviously,  
Clearly ,  
Logically, } X { tells } us  
{ shows  
... }

It is { ~~obvious~~  
obvio  
**easy to see**  
... } that

What we have seen is that

What this demonstrates is that

What this shows is that

What can we conclude?

What does this show?

### Sample Lecture in the Inductive Style

Pre-Lecture Discussion: What do you know about the changing role of women in the U.S.? What about in your countries? Is the trend good or bad? How do you personally feel for yourself or your wife?

--

Introduction: many opinions about changing role of women; often an emotionally charged subject; women now feel that they have control over the direction of their lives but this, too, may cause conflict; in fact, some people say that women's liberation puts more strain on women than ever before;



in any case, women now must often decide a major question: Should I work/pursue a career? Or should I stay at home and raise a family? Or should I do both?

I Should a woman work, stay home, or do both?

A. One factor to take into account when making this decision--which is emotionally and physically more beneficial?

1. Physical

- a. Previously, it was thought that men's higher heart attack rate was due to their working, usually in more stressful jobs than women
- b. Now, however, with 50% of women in job market and still an uneven heart attack rate--this theory has lost credibility
- c. In February 1980, a test showed that women who have joined the work force appear to be at no greater risk than non-working women (for heart disease)

2. Emotional

- a. a study done at three universities and colleges-participants
  - (1) compared working women who are or who have ever been married and housewives
  - (2) employed women (mean age 33) ranged from

secretaries to professionals and executives

- (3) most of women in both groups were college, educated
- (4) for purposes of another part of study, most were in consciousness raising groups

b. Procedure

- (1) test was designed to study who was emotionally stronger
- (2) emotional strength = degree of psychological distress to which someone reacts to a life crisis
- (3) criteria for judging psychological distress
  - (a) anxiety
  - (b) irritability
  - (c) somatic complaints
  - (d) depression
  - (e) problems in thinking and concentrating

c. Results

- (1) Though housewives generally experience lower levels of stressful life events than employed women, they seem to react to life crises with more psychological

distress than employed women.

- (a) employed women **have** more stressful situations in their lives-- both at work and in their marriages
- (b) employed women show fewer signs of psychological distress

## II Conclusions

- A. the test seems to imply that employment may equip women better for coping with stressful life events than does staying at home
- B. the researchers caution that other factors--social class, job status--may contribute to these differences
  - 1. the results **may** apply only to certain types of women in certain situations

Discussion: Does this experiment sound logical to you? Do you see anything wrong in the methodology of the experiment? Do the conclusions seem logical to you? Why?

Vocabulary:

trend, an emotionally charged subject, strain, stress, to lose credibility, to be at no greater risk, consciousness raising group, distress, life crisis, criteria, anxiety, ~~ir~~responsibility, somatic/psychosomatic complaints, depression,

cope with life events

### Comprehension Exercises

1. In one or two sentences, summarize the essence of the lecture.
2. How did the researchers define "emotional strength"?
3. What criteria did the researchers use for judging "psychological distress"?
4. True or False?
  - a. The test compared working women who have never been married and housewives.
  - b. The working women were generally professionals and executives.
  - c. Host of the working women in the test were college educated while **most** of the housewives were not.
  - d. Employed women experience more stressful events in their lives than housewives (according to the test).
  - e. Housewives show more signs of psychological distress when reaching to life crises than employed women.
  - f. The test seems to show that employment has negative effects on a person's mental health.
  - g. The researchers feel that this research applies to all women.

5. Write a one page essay on either of the following topics.
- a. This talk concluded with the idea that **employment** may equip women **better** to cope with life's stress than if they had stayed at home. Yet, nowhere in the talk are reasons **given** as to why this might be so. If the conclusion sounds logical to you, **discuss** some of your own hypotheses as to why employment equips **women** better to cope with life's stress.
  - b. This talk concluded with the idea that employment may equip women better to cope with life's stress than if they had stayed at home. Does this sound logical to you? If not, discuss your doubts and skepticism about the experiment. Discuss some of your own hypotheses as to why employment does not or might not equip women to cope better with life's stress.

#### Note-taking Activities

1. In order of **importance**, note the details that you remember or wrote,
2. If you were to rewrite your notes, how might you concisely write them so that important points stand out and important relationships are clear?

or

Using the outline of inductive organizational style as a guide, how might you organize your notes?

Inductive Organizational Style	Notes
(Introduction)	
Statement of intended topic	
Anecdote(s), narrative(s), test description(s), observation(s) <u>based on above topic</u>	
Conclusions based on the above anecdote(s), narrative(s), test description(s), observation (s)	
(summary of points covered)	

Activities based on the lecture are important. Quizzes concerning the content of lectures can provide feedback to the teacher and student on how much the student understood and whether the student's problems center around missing general points or missing details. Furthermore, practice in quiz taking can bring to light some of the academic skills of guessing, eliminating choices, etc. Other academic activities can be the answering of essay questions and the discussion of

how best to present essay answers. Practice in raising questions for discussion and taking part in discussions or preparing a case for a debate based on the content of the lectures can also be classroom activities.

Stage Four gives the students opportunity to practice skills of listening and note-taking in less controlled and longer situations. At this stage, lectures are not grouped into discourse styles. A sequence for lecture presentation might be as follows:

- (1) listening without **note-taking--immediate** recall of subject and details **for** later discussion.
- (2) listening with optional note-taking. Context should be given and **listening** strategies and note-taking styles **appropriate** for that context should be discussed (e. g. "You are in an anthropology class in which the professor stresses the general principles discussed in class and is not terrible concerned with specific examples."). Discussion, **test-taking**, or comprehension activities follow.
- (3) section by section listening with class discussion of **organizational** style, cues, notes, etc. Stress the interplay of **organizational** patterns.
- (4) listening and note-taking **with** group work in **re-writing**. Discussion and **comparison** of notes.

it is at this stage that different **media** might be **used** such as slides, video tapes, and **films**. In **addition**, different

lecture **situations** and styles may be simulated: in a large lecture hall or a classroom; giving a lecture with or without allowing audience interruption; giving a highly organized lecture or giving a lecture with **numerous** tangents, etc.

At the end of these four stages, the student should be able to carry out the following skills detailed in the listening comprehension, note-taking, and production syllabus for advanced ESL students on pages 77-83 above:

I. Listening to lectures

- A. The student should be able to differentiate between main points and less important points.
- B. The student should be able to follow the speaker's train of thought and organizational pattern.
- C. The student should be able to make reasonable predictions about future discourse.
- D. The student should be able to comprehend vocabulary and idioms in context.

11. Note-taking

- A. The student should be able to take lecture notes for a variety of different purposes.
- B. The student should be able to take notes from a variety of lecturer styles.
- C. The student should be able to take notes in a variety of lecture environments.
- D. The student should be able to rewrite haphazard notes so as to represent the **organization** of the lecture and make it clear for future reference.



## CHAPTER V

## CONCLUSION

The syllabus and materials presented in this thesis attempt to incorporate four areas of research: (1) the pedagogical concepts concerning teaching lecture **compre-**hension to **NSs and NNSs**; (2) the theoretical concepts explored in the field of **psycholinguistics**; (3) **lecture** discourse analyses; (4) the results obtained from a needs analysis concerning the listening comprehension, **note-**taking, and production needs of university students.

In terms of skills to be developed, the syllabus attempts to expand the **NNS's** knowledge of the phonemic, syntactic, semantic, and paralinguistic codes of the language of academic lectures. It attempts to expand the **NNS's** abilities to comprehend the lecturer's logic and make associations, inferences, and evaluations that need to be made, whether as a **function** of the rhetorical **structure** of the lecture or as a function of the cultural **background** assumed in the lecture content. It attempts to reduce the **NNS's** time of processing by an awareness of repetition, paraphrase, overall discourse style, cues to prediction of content, and cues of emphasis and de-emphasis.

Studies in the discourse of lectures provide the teacher with an awareness of what might be taking place during **lecture** discourse and can serve as guidelines to classroom teaching

with the assumption that "identifying strategies of interpretation can both serve to elucidate discourse as well as act as a language learning objective" (Candlin 1978:40). These strategies of interpretation include awareness of cohering **and** cohesive devices of lectures (lexical, syntactic, and paralinguistic) as well as an awareness of devices that serve to emphasize information (lexical, syntactic, **para-**linguistic, and organizational cues). It should be noted, however, that the teaching of lecture comprehension cannot be accomplished solely by analyzing the strategies of listening. Input and practice must be extensive, with discussion of strategies serving to facilitate and impose order on incoming **information**.

Studies in the cognitive processes involved in lecture comprehension and note-taking are further removed from actual classroom interaction than the discourse analyses and skill-based analyses of lecture comprehension and note-taking. However, models of comprehension such as "schema" models, "analysis by synthesis" models, and "depth of processing" models do provide the teacher with knowledge of why **s/he** is teaching what **s/he** teaches. Hypothesizing that comprehension involves mapping incoming information against some schema presupposes that the listener's schema is compatible or flexible enough to incorporate the **lecturer's** schema. Hypothesizing that comprehension is a process of analysis and hypothesis finding and testing suggests the importance of

guessing and predicting when listening to lectures. **An** awareness of how culture may affect the mapping process or the hypothesis finding and testing process suggests the need to expand the **NNS's** cultural awareness by giving context to topics and **elucidating** various assumptions that **NSs** would make while listening to a lecture.

In terms of actual materials, the syllabus stresses realism and relevance to the student's academic situation. **For** this reason, outlines of lectures to be presented 'live' by a lecturer are used rather than using tapes or lecture transcripts. In this way, the language, the cues, the kinesics, and the many haphazard performance features of live **lectures** (pauses, hesitations, false **starts**, **etc.**) are guaranteed to be realistic. To further stress the realism, aids to lecture comprehension (handouts, review sheets, oral **summaries**, outlines on the board) should accompany lecture presentations. Exercises are varied, some focussing on **localized** comprehension, others, on global comprehension. Within the **global** comprehension exercises, tasks vary from answering **true/false** questions about concrete examples to making inferences to **answering** essay questions **incorporating** outside knowledge.

**Note-taking** is taken to be a **by-product** and a manifestation of interpretive competence. In **order** to **take** notes, the **NNS** needs all of the skills involved in listening mentioned above, and, in addition, needs further time for evaluating

what needs to be **noted** and judging how best to represent the material visually so that the hierarchy of information is clear. The syllabus attempts to practice and develop these skills by adding, along with listening strategies, other strategies specifically applicable to note-taking: using cues of emphasis; using symbols and abbreviations that simplify representing ideas and words; using organizational short cuts that visually represent what information is important or less important (outlines, indentation, categorization, **etc.**).

The syllabus and materials suggested in this thesis cannot, at this point, be evaluated empirically in terms of effectiveness in increasing lecture comprehension and **note-taking** skills in the classroom. Murphy and **Candlin** (1979: 68-71) do, however, suggest some criteria for evaluating lecture comprehension and note-taking materials and syllabuses.

<u>Murphy and Candlin's Criteria</u>	<u>Proposed Syllabus and Materials</u>
(1) Is each text for use a piece of spoken <b>dis-</b> course?	Yes. Transcripts used in Stage One are used as a vehicle to understanding authentic lectures. After Stage <b>One</b> , all lectures are presented live or spoken from outlines or on video tape.

(2) Is there **accompanying** visual material?

Depends on teacher. It is suggested in the syllabus that teachers incorporate into their lectures the **same** aids used by subject matter teachers (e.g. handouts, outlines on overhead projectors, diagrams).

(3) Do the materials simulate the **role/** place of a lecture within the academic study scheme?

Yes. **The** syllabus stresses that activities based on the lecture content need to be done in order to avoid the practice of confusing listening and testing. **These** activities should be based on demands that would normally be found in the academic **environment** which include taking quizzes, writing essays, asking questions to stimulate discussion, taking part in discussions, and debating.

(4) Is there provision in the syllabus for teaching and giving practice in reference, **conjunction,**

Yes. The syllabus stresses focussing attention on lecture discourse which includes these aspects of cohesion. By

substitution, and ellipsis?

- (5) Is there provision for teaching and practice in **recognition** of discourse features and their **communicative** function: moves of focussing, describing, concluding, **etc.**, acts such as the marker, conclusion, aside?

- (6) How is note-taking integrated with other elements of the course? What provision is made for teaching it? ("The teaching of this **skill** will need to progress through various stages, **from** guided exercises to free ones...practice in reducing the

analyzing discourse in segments or through transcripts, **realistic** practice is attained.

Yes. As with the cohesive devices mentioned above, the syllabus also stresses cohering devices and how the parts of the **lecture** are put together rhetorically.

Note-taking is integrated into the syllabus as both a by-product of interpretive competence and a manifestation of interpretive competence. It is introduced in a sequenced manner beginning with noting the minimum number of words in the most concise representative form to express a 30 second **segment** of **speech**.

redundancy of the recorded message; use of abbreviations and signs...learning to exploit lulls, pauses, asides to record the notes', reinterpretation of the notes..."

Learning how to use cues, predictions, pauses, etc. is gained through stopping lectures at varying points and discussing notes, and reasons for noting. Note-taking is not seen as the essence of the syllabus, but is rather perceived as an important academic skill.

Further research and evaluation do need to be done concerning points mentioned in this thesis and the syllabus and materials. First, it still has to be empirically proven that analysis and awareness of strategies of listening can lead to better listening. Research comparing two groups-- one given instruction and guidance in analysis eventually leading to listening to full lectures; the other, given only equivalent times of exposure listening to lectures--could tell more about whether learning to listen is a matter of exposure or a matter of strategy development.

Even if the need for strategy development is acknowledged, research needs to be done into whether these strategies are teachable and also whether and how these **strategies** differ with **NNSs** of different languages. Some questions that need to be answered are: Do all literate people have **approximately**

the same schema for listening to lectures? Is there a lecture schema? If so, what exactly is it? Do lecture schemas vary from culture to culture? Can analyses of notes made by NNSs help define some of the problems of misinterpretation and clarify what types of schemas are used? Will teaching of cues and the organization of lectures be of use to the NNS when listening? Are schemas so ingrained that awareness of new schemas will only be of analytical concern but of little relevance when processing information? In terms of giving cultural background and information and cultural frames for topics, are those skills that can only be gained by direct experience and time in the culture?

This thesis is an attempt to provide a syllabus that would not only practice but would also teach. The exercises and sequencing are based on theories of what occurs when listening, yet no empirical tests have been done to determine which strategies and exercises are, in fact, used by and useful to the student when s/he listens to lectures and takes notes. The syllabus does, however, provide the student with a stronger base in knowing what s/he needs to do when listening and note-taking, and provides the teacher and students with a clearer view of the ultimate goal and the **steps** and reasons for each step leading to that goal.



## Appendix A: Needs Analysis Questionnaires

Form A: FOR DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSON

LISTENING COMPREHENSION AND NOTE-TAKING NEEDS OF STUDENTS  
AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII AT MANOA

DEPARTMENT \_\_\_\_\_ CHAIRPERSON \_\_\_\_\_

	Graduate	Undergraduate
Total majoring in dept. (as of Fall 1981)		
Total foreign students majoring in dept. (as of Fall 1981)		
Total number of students taking courses in dept. (as of Fall 1981) *		
Total number of foreign students taking courses in dept. (as of Fall 1981)		

Among the courses offered by your department, approximately what percentage are:

	Graauate	Undergraauate
100% lecture (in a large lecture hall)?		
lecture (in a large lecture hall) plus lab?		
approx. 75% classroom lecture; 25% class discussion?		
approx. 25% classroom lecture; 75% class discussion?		
100% class discussion (seminar format)?		

\* Do not include native speakers of English under heading 'foreign student' (e.g. from U.K., Australia, etc.)

If the above divisions are not applicable to your department, how would you best describe the breakdown of courses offered by your department?

Graduate:

Undergraduate:

	Graduate	Undergraduate
Approx. how many students are there in one lecture section (in a large hall)?		
Approx. how many students are there in one classroom lecture section?		
Approx. how many students are there in one lab section?		
Approx. how many students are there in one seminar section?		

Additional comments about class size not covered above:

Comments about foreign students' needs, preparation, etc. in your department (especially in terms of listening comprehension and note-taking ability):

## FORM B: FOR TEACHING STAFF

LISTENING COPPREHENSION AND NOTE-TAKING NEEDS OF STUDENTS  
AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII AT MANOA

DEPARTMENT \_\_\_\_\_ NAME \_\_\_\_\_

Description of courses presently teaching:

Course Number	Grad. or Undergrad.?	Hours/Week	Number of Students	Number of foreign Students

How would you describe each of the above courses in terms of percentage of time **devoted** to teacher lectures, percentage of time devoted to **student** presentations, **percentage** of time devoted ,to class dissussion?

Course Number	Lectures	Student Presentations	Class Discussion	Other? (Specify)

For the following questions, **if** individual courses vary, please specify course numbers.

1. Do you require active class participation?  Yes  
 a minimum amount of participation is sufficient  
 No
- Can a student pass your course without taking part in class **discussions**?  Yes  
 No

2. Do you require student presentations?  Yes  
 No  
 If so, please describe the number, type, length, and expected preparation.
3. is it necessary for students to take detailed notes in your class?  Yes  
 No  
 If not, what kind of notes (if any) do the students need to take? Why might they not need detailed notes?
4. Do you give handouts to your students summarizing the main points of a lecture?  Yes. For all lectures.  
 Often  
 Occasionally. For exceptionally hard or important lectures.  
 Rarely  
 Never
5. Do you use any method to help your students receive from a lecture or discussion what you want them to get (e.g. visual aids, outlines, review sheets, an oral summary at the end of a lecture)? Please explain any method used and the frequency of use (often, occasionally, rarely, never, always).
6. Do you write essential points on the blackboard?  Yes. Always  
 Often  
 Occasionally. For exceptionally hard or important points.  
 Rarely  
 Never
7. Do you use movies or video tapes in your class? Specify which.  Yes. Often  
 Occasionally  
 Rarely  
 Never

8. If a student read and understood the text for your course but did not follow lectures or class discussions, could s/he pass your course?
- Yes.  
 Yes, but the student will have missed so much that s/he can only pass minimally (a 'D')  
 No.
9. Rate the following skills in terms of their importance for success in your course (with '1' being the most important).
- Reading Comprehension  
 Writing  
 Listening Comprehension and Note-taking  
 Speaking
10. What is the minimum listening comprehension and note-taking competency you expect from your students?
11. What aspects of listening comprehension and note-taking do you think it would be most important for the ELI to work on in the ELI listening comprehension classes? Put a check next to those skills you think would be essential for success in your class. Put a '1', '2', '3', and '4' next to the four most essential skills for success in your class.
- Hearing the main idea of long talks (20+ min.) without note-taking  
 Understanding everyday conversational English  
 Understanding speech where the speaker is not present (movies, tapes, radio, etc.)  
 Comprehending main points and less important points without **note-taking**  
 **Understanding** different speakers (accents, speed of presentation, etc.)  
 Understanding statistics and **writing** them down  
 Listening to and participating in **discussions** without note-taking  
 Organizing ideas into well **written** notes  
 Listening, note-taking, and participating at the same **time**  
 Learning test-taking skills  
 Learning how to give presentations  
 Following the speaker's train of thought or organization

- Being able to request clarification from the teacher
- Being able to raise questions and ideas that would generate discussion in class
- Other \_\_\_\_\_

12. Of the foreign students you have had or have in your classes, what do you think their largest obstacle was or is in terms of listening comprehension, participation, note-taking, etc.?

13. Additional comments:

## ELI STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

LISTENING COMPREHENSION AND NOTE-TAKING NEEDS OF STUDENTS AT  
THE UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII AT MANOA

ELI \_\_\_ Section \_\_\_

1. Are you a graduate or undergraduate student?

What is your major?

2. Have you ever taken classes for credit at an American or British university? \_\_\_ If so, what were your experiences in those classes?

3. Put a "1" next to the situation that you are most often in (or expect to be in). Put a "2" next to your second most
- common situation**
- (or expected situation).

\_\_\_ lecture class in a large lecture hall (100% teacher talk)

\_\_\_ ~~lecture~~ class in a large lecture hall (100% teacher talk **plus** lab for questions and discussions concerning **lecture**.)

\_\_\_ classroom with 15-30 students (approximately 75% teacher lecture and 25% class discussion)

\_\_\_ classroom with 15-30 students (approximately 25% teacher lecture and 75% student discussion)

\_\_\_ seminar (fewer than 15 people) (100% class discussion)

\_\_\_ Other \_\_\_\_\_

4. Which listening and note-taking situation is most difficult for you?

\_\_\_ listening to a lecture in a large lecture hall and taking notes

\_\_\_ listening to a lecture in a classroom (15-30 students) and taking notes. Some opportunity for student questions and small amount of discussion.

\_\_\_ listening to a **classroom** discussion (mainly student participation) and taking notes.

\_\_\_ Other \_\_\_\_\_

Why is the situation you chose most difficult for you?

5. Put a check next to those skills that you think you need.

Put a "1", "2", "3", and "4" next to the four most important skills for you (in that order--"1", being the most important).

- Hearing the main idea of short talks (5-10 min.) without note-taking.
- Hearing the main ideas of long talks (20+ min.) without note-taking.
- Understanding everyday conversational English.
- Understanding speech where the speaker is not present (movies, tapes, radio, etc.)
- Differentiating between main points and less important points.
- Following the speaker's system of presentation and organization.
- Understanding different speakers (accents, speed of presentation).
- Understanding vocabulary and idioms.
- Understanding statistics and writing them down.
- Listening to and participating in discussions without note-taking.
- Finding the key words to note down during short talks (5-10 min.).
- Finding the key words to note down during long talks (20+ min.).
- Organizing ideas into well-written notes.
- Listening, note-taking, and participating at the same time
- Learning test-taking skills.
- Learning how to politely interrupt speakers in order to ask them to go over a point or to make a point clearer.
- Learning to raise questions or present ideas that start and contribute to class discussions.
- Learning to give organized presentations.
- Other \_\_\_\_\_

6. With a 5-10 minute lecture, can you now:

get the main idea? \_\_\_\_\_  
 differentiate between \_\_\_\_\_ main ideas and details? \_\_\_\_\_  
 organize these ideas into useful notes? \_\_\_\_\_

7. With a 20 minute or longer lecture, can you now:

get the main idea? \_\_\_\_\_  
 differentiate between main ideas and details? \_\_\_\_\_  
 organize these ideas into useful notes? \_\_\_\_\_

8. With a class discussion, can you now:

follow the main ideas that people are presenting? \_\_\_\_\_



differentiate between main ideas and details? —  
 organize those ideas into useful notes? —

9. Below are a list of possible problems concerning the speaker that you might have when listening to lectures in English. Check how often you have each problem.

	How often do you have this problem?				
	Always	Often	Occasionally	Rarely	Never
A. Speaker talks too fast.					
B. Speaker's handwriting on blackboard is unclear.					
C. Speaker speaks too low or pronounces unclearly.					
D. Speaker talks in an unfamiliar accent.					
E. Speaker's logic and organization of the lecture is unclear.					
F. Speaker <b>doesn't</b> make clear what points are important and what points are <b>unimportant</b> .					
G. Speaker uses a lot of unfamiliar vocabulary and idioms					
H. Speaker <b>seems</b> to get off topic too often					

	How often do you have this problem?				
	Always	Often	Occasionally	Rarely	Never
I. Speaker doesn't give me time to think about what I have heard.					
J. Speaker tries to cover too much subject matter.					
K. Other problems? _____ _____ _____					

10. Below are a list of problem concerning note-taking that you may have when listening to lectures in English. how often you have each problem.

	How often do you have this problem?				
	Always	Often	Occasionally	Rarely	Never
A. I write too much.					
B. I miss a lot of the lecture because I am writing while the teacher is talking.					
C. I write too little and don't write major points.					
D. I can't understand what is important to note and what is less important to note.					

	How often do you have this problem?				
	Always	Often	Occasionally	Rarely	Never
E. I can't understand my notes a week later.					
F. Other problems _____ _____					

11. What help with lecture comprehension and note-taking do you hope to gain through this course?

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aaronson, Shirley. 1975. Note-taking improvement: a combined auditory, functional, and psychological approach. Journal of Reading 19, 1:8-12.
- Adams, M. and A. Collins. 1979. A schema theoretic view of reading. In R. Freedle (Ed.). New Directions in Discourse Processing, Vol. 2. New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Co.
- Bartlett, F. 1932. Remembering: A Study in Experimental and Social Psychology. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Black, C. 1971. Graded practice in advanced listening comprehension. English Language Teaching 15, 2:171-8
- Brown, J. and G. Carlson. 1953. Brown-Carlson Listening Comprehension Test, Evaluation, and Adjustment Series, Grades 9-13. Chicago, Illinois: World Book Company.
- Candlin, Christopher. 1978. Discoursal patterning and the equalizing of interpretive opportunity. Paper prepared for the Conference on English as an International and Auxiliary Language, East-West Culture Learning Institute, Honolulu, Hawaii, April 1-15, 1978.
- Candlin, C., M. Kirkwood, and H. Moore. 1979. Developing study skills in English. In English For Academic Study With Special Reference to Science and Technology: Problems and Perspectives. An ETIC Occasional Paper. London: British Council Publication.
- Carroll, J. 1972. Defining language comprehension: some speculations. In J. Carroll and R. Freedle (Eds.). Language Comprehension and the Acquisition of Knowledge Washington D.C.: V.H. Winston and Sons.
- Carroll, J. and R. Freedle. 1972. Language comprehension and the acquisition of knowledge: some reflections. In J. Carroll and R. Freedle (Eds.). Language Comprehension and the Acquisition of Knowledge. Washington D.C.: V.H. Winston and Sons.
- Carton, Aaron. 1971. Inferencing: a process in using and learning language. In P. Pimsleur and T. Quinn (Eds.). The Psychology of Second Language Learning: Papers From the Second International Congress of Applied Linguistics. Massachusetts: Cambridge University Press.

- Chafe, Wallace. 1972. Discourse **structure** and human knowledge. In J. Carroll and R. Freedle (Eds.). Language Comurehension and the Acquisition of knowledge. Washington D.C.: V.H. Winston and Sons.
- Clark, Milton. 1973. Hierarchical Structure of Comprehension Skills. Hawthorne, Australia: Australian Council for Educational Research.
- Clements, P. 1979. The effects of staging on recall from prose. In R. Freedle (Ed.). New Directions in Discourse Processing, Vol. 2. New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Co.
- Cook, J.R.S. 1975. A Communicative Approach to the Analysis of Extended Monologue Discourse and its Relevance to the Development of Teaching Materials for ES?. Unpublished M. Litt. Thesis, University of Edinburgh, Scotland.
- Cook, M. 1974. Transitional speech features in the college lecture. CATESOL Occasional Paper #1. ERIC # 127 795
- Craik, F. and R. Lockhart. 1972. Levels of processing: a framework for memory research. Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior 11:671-84
- Crothers, E. 1972. Memory structure and the recall of discourse. In J. Carroll and R. Freedle (Eds.). Language Comprehension and the Acquisition of Knowledge. Washington D.C.: V.H. Winston and Sons.
- Dudley-Evans, A. and T.F. Johns. In Dress. A team **teaching** approach to lecture **comprehension** for overseas students. In The Teaching of **Listening Comprehension.** London: **British Council Publication.**
- Ferguson, N. and M. O'Reilly. 1977. Listening and Note-taking. London: Evans Bros. Ltd.
- Fessenden, Seth. 1955. Levels of listening: a theory. In S. Duker (Ed.). 1966. Listening: Readings Vol.1. New York: Scarecrow Press.
- Fredericksen, C. 1979. Semantic processing units in understanding texts. In R. **Freedle** (Ed. ). New Directions in Discourse Processing Vol. 2. New-Jersey: **Ablex Publishing Co.**
- Freedle, R.** 1972. Language users as fallible **information** processers. In J. Carroll and R. Freedle (Eds.). Language Comprehension and the Acquisition of Knowledge. Washington D.C.: V.H. Winston and Sons.

- Godfrey, D. 1975. Listening instruction and practice for advanced second language students. Language Learning 27, 1:109-22
- Gomulicki, B.R. 1956. Recall as an abstractive process. Acta Psychologica 12:77-94
- Gumperz, J.J. 1977. The conversational analysis of inter-ethnic communication. In E. Lamar Ross (Ed.). Interethnic Communication: Proceedings of the Southern Anthropological Society. Atlanta, Georgia: University of Georgia Press.
- Halle, M. and K. Stevens. 1967. Remarks on analysis by synthesis and distinctive features. In W. Wathan-Dunn (Ed.). Models for the Perception of Speech and Visual Form. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Hartley, J. and I. Davies. 1978. Note-taking: a critical review. Programmed Learning and Educational Technology 15, 3:207-24
- Heaton, J.B. 1977. Keep it short--note-taking for learners of ESL. In S. Holden (Ed.). English for Specific Purposes. London: Modern English Publications.
- Herschenhorn, S. 1979. Teaching listening comprehension using live language. In M. Celce-Murcia and L. McIntosh (Eds.). Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers.
- Housel, T. and S. Acker. 1979. Schema theory: can it connect communication's discourse? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, May 1979. ERIC # ED 177 614
- Hughes, Glyn. 1974. Aspects of listening comprehension. Audiovisual Language Journal 12:75-9
- Hymes, D. 1966. On communicative competence. In C.J. Brumfit and K. Johnson (Eds.). The Communicative Approach to Language Teaching. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- James, K. 1977. Note-taking in lectures: problems and strategies. In A.P. Cowie and J.B. Heaton (Eds.). English for Academic Purposes. Reading, England: A BAAL/SELMOUS Publication.

- Johns, T.F. and C.M. Johns. 1976. The current programme of materials development in English for academic purposes at the universities of Birmingham and Aston. In J. Richards (Ed.). Teaching English For Science and Technology. Singapore: SEAMEO Regional English Centre Publication.
- Johnson, W. 1949. Do you know how to listen? In S. Duker (Ed.). 1966. Listening: Readings Vol. 1. New York: Scarecrow Press.
- Jordan, R.R. and A. Matthews. 1978. English for academic purposes: practice material for the listening comprehension and writing needs of overseas students. In ELT Documents: English For Specific Purposes. An ETIC Publication. London: British Council.
- Kaplan, R. 1966. Cultural thought patterns in intercultural education. Language Learning 16:1-20
- Keech, M. 1980. An investigation of some of the English language problems of overseas students at the National College of Agricultural Engineering, Silsoe. In Aspects of ESP. Occasional paper #22, Essex University, England. ERIC # ED 191 332
- Kintsch, W. 1970. Learning, Memory, and Conceptual Processes. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1976. Comprehending stories. In P. Carpenter and M. Just (Eds.). Cognitive Processes in Comprehension: Proceedings of the Twelfth Carnegie-Mellon Symposium on Cognition. New Jersey: Erlbaum Assoc. Pub.
- Kirk, Tim. 1979. The listening comprehension programme at the Asian Institute of Technology. PASAA: A Journal of Language Teaching and Linguistics in Thailand
- Lao, R. 1965. Memory span as a factor in second language learning. IRAL 3, 2:123-9
- Mason, Abelle. 1981. Improving lecture comprehension: the rhetorical approach. Demonstration/ workshop presented at TESOL 1981 conference, Detroit, Michigan, March 3-8, 1981
- McConkie, G. and B. Meyer. 1972. What is recalled after hearing a passage? Journal of Educational Psychology 65, 1:109-17

- McDonough, J. 1977. English for academic purposes: some factors in listening comprehension. In Languages For Special Purposes #4. Autonomous Metropolitan University, Mexico City, Mexico. ERIC # ED 148 104
- Melvin, B. and W. Rivers. 1976. In one ear and out the other: implications of memory studies for language learning. In J. Fanselow and R. Crymes (Eds.). On TESOL 76. Washington D.C.: TESOL.
- Meyer, Bonnie. 1979. What is remembered from prose: a function of passage structure. In R. Freedle (Ed.). New Directions in Discourse Processing, Vol. 2. New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Co.
- Montassir, Jan Demming. 1976. A complete listening comprehension program for English language university preparation. In J. Fanselow and R. Crymes (Eds.). On TESOL 76. Washington D.C.: TESOL.
- Montgomery, M. 1977. Some aspects of discourse structure and cohesion in selected science lectures. Unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Birmingham, England.
- Morley, J. 1977. Improving Aural Comprehension. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Morray, M. 1980. Pebbles in the ears: listening comprehension in ESP programs. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Western Speech Communications Association, Portland, Oregon, February 16-20, 1980. ERIC # ED 193 916
- Morrison, J. 1974. An investigation of problems in listening comprehension encountered by overseas students in the first year of post graduate studies in science in the University of Newcastle upon Tyne and the implications for teaching. Unpublished M. Ed. thesis, University of Newcastle upon Tyne, England.
- Morrison, J. 1978. Designing a course in advanced listening comprehension. In R. Mackay (Ed. ). English For Specific Purposes. London: Longman, Inc.
- Murphy, D. and C. Candlin. 1979. Engineering lecture discourse and listening comprehension. In Practical Papers in English Language Education Vol. 2. University of Lancaster, England.



- Oakeshott-Taylor, J. 1979. Cloze procedure and foreign language skills. IRAL 17, 2:150-8
- Otto, Stanley. 1979. Listening for note-taking in EST. TESOL Quarterly 13, 3:319-27
- Phillips, M. 1981. Toward a theory of LSP methodology. In R. Mackay and J. Palmer (Eds.). Languages For Specific Purposes: Program Design and Evaluation. Rowley, Xassachusetts: Newbury House Publishers.
- Plaister, T. 1976. Developing Listening Comprehension For ESL Students: The Kingdom of Kochen. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc.
- Rankin, Paul Tory. 1926. Listening ability and its components. In S. Duker (Ed.). 1966. Listening: Readings Vol. 1. New York: Scarecrow Press Inc.
- Rivers, W. 1966. Listening comprehension. Modern Language Journal 50, 4: 196-202
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1971. Linguistic and psychological factors in speech perception and their implications for teaching materials. In P. Pimsleur and T. Quinn (Eds.). The Psychology of Second Language Learning: Papers from the Second International Congress of Applied Linguistics. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Cambridge University Press.
- Rost, Michael. 1979. Listening Contours. Tucson, Arizona: Lingual House Publishing Co.
- Scribner, S. 1979. Modes of thinking and ways of speaking: culture and logic reconsidered. In R. Freedle (Ed.). New Directions in Discourse Processing Vol. 2. New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Co.
- Sinclair, J. and R. Coulthard. 1975. Towards an Analysis of Discourse. London: Oxford University Press.
- Sims, J. and P. Peterson. 1981. Better Listening Skills. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc.
- Slater, S. 1980. The organization of pre-sessional courses with special reference to seminar skills. In F. Chambers and J. McDonough (Eds.). Aspects of English For Specific Purposes. Occasional paper #22, Essex University, Colchester, England. ERIC # ED 191 332

- Snow, B. and K. Perkins. 1979. The teaching of listening comprehension and communication activities. TESOL Quarterly 13, 1:51-63
- Spearitt, D. 1962. Listening Comprehension: A Factorial Analysis. Melbourne, Australia: Council for Educational Research.
- Stanley, John. 1978. Teaching listening comprehension. TESOL Quarterly 12, 3:285-95
- Tannen, Deborah. 1979. What's in a frame? Surface evidence for underlying expectations. In R. Freedle (Ed.). New Directions in Discourse Processing Vol. 2. New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Co.
- Trabasso, Tom. 1972. Mental operations in language comprehension. In J. Carroll and R. Freedle (Eds.). Language Comprehension and the Acquisition of Knowledge. Washington D.C.: V.H. Winston and Sons.
- Warren, W., D. Nicholas, and T. Trabasso. 1979. Event chains and inference in understanding narratives. In R. Freedle (Ed.). New Directions in Discourse Processing Vol. 2. New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Co.
- Weissberg, R. 1974. The microlecture: training in extended listening. English Language Teaching Forum 12, 3:27-30
- Wijasuriya, B.S. 1971. The occurrence of discourse markers and inter-sentence connectives in university lectures and their place in the testing and teaching of listening comprehension in EFL. Unpublished M. Ed. thesis. University of Manchester, England.
- Winograd, T. 1972. Understanding natural language. Cognitive Psychology 3: 1-191
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1977. Understanding discourse. in P. Carpenter and M. Just (Eds.). Cognitive Processes in Comprehension: Proceedings of the Twelfth Carnegie-Mellon Symposium on Cognition. New Jersey: Erlbaum Assoc. Pub.
- Winskowsky, C. 1978. Acquisition of the academic register as a second language: an investigation of classroom skills. Unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Hawaii at Manoa, Honolulu, Hawaii.

Van Dijk, T. 1977a. Semantic macro structures and knowledge frames in discourse comprehension. In P. Carpenter and M. Just (Eds.). Cognitive Processes in Comprehension: Proceedings of the Twelfth Carnegie-Mellon Symposium on Cognition. New Jersey: Erlbaum Assoc. Pub.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1977b. Text and Context: Explorations in the Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse. London: Longman, Inc.

Yates, V. 1979. Listening and Note-taking. New York: McGraw Hill Inc.