# OPPORTUNITIES FOR EXPRESSING HIS THOUGHT CLEARLY IN WRITING AND SPEAKING, AND READING AND LISTENING WITH UNDERSTANDING 

By Eliza U. Griño*

### 1.0 Preliminary Statement.

There are other ways than language by which man may effect communication with others, but when we speak of communication skills, we invariably think of language and the various versions by which its use is made manifest.

It seems to me that we belabor the point somewhat when we insist on saying again why we think that language is important, but if for no other reason, we must make sure that we all agree to certain assumptions and assertions as valid points of departure for our discussion.

We believe that language is man's most precious possession. It is not difficult to conceive of man's sense for history and his consequent reaching out to influence (if not to touch) the future as having emerged with the invention of language. Two other gains are just as important as the expansion of human identity over and through time: the growth in awareness of a self - and other selves - and the multiplication of interaction between individuals, which makes community life - its institutions, its arts, its sciences, even its joys (and, alas! its sorrows) - possible.

Today, our preoccupations in life are no less than they ever were. We still want to feel that man can transcend the limits of time and space and selfhood. Today, more than ever, we need the continuity of information that language

[^0]provides, for communication (verbal communication, that is) - seems to be our last instrument of hope for peace and well-being in community life.

The word communication in itself has no magic to realize our hope, nor even does language. If they did, we would not hear comments like: "I don't understand what you are saying." "Oh, I thought you said..." "Why, I thought the man was praising her." "I knew the answer but I couldn't express myself." "I am afraid to speak because they might laugh at me." And other such comments.

Communication is not even one process, as its word form may lead us to believe. We often speak of the language arts - and comprehend four such; listening, speaking, reading, and writing. We should regroup these under two larger headings, according to how man utilizes these forms of communication, and call listening and reading (for comprehension) the receptive arts; and speaking (including interpretative reading) and writing the expressive arts. With the receptive arts man receives messages. His reaction to these messages will depend upon whether he derives a meaning or not. The success of the communication will depend upon how accurately he divines the intended meaning of the speaker.

A speaker who feels responsible for the success of communication in a given situation uses such devices as are provided by the expressive arts to make sure that his meaning will be not only understood but also not misunderstood.

Every language is an accumulated body of such devices or signals, developed into an intricate system by a speech community to whom that language is native. Why a particular speech community should have chosen to speak in one set way in preference to innumerable other ways is an entirely arbitrary choice strengthened by acceptance and use. It is not for the learner of that language to ask why people speak the way they do, but how they do it and under what circumstances. This he must do if he wants to operate the language successfully.

It is too bad that all the peoples of the world do not all speak one language. We can think of many advantages that could accrue from such a condition. In the forseable future, however, we expect peoples to be speaking languages and learning languages. A language in capital letters we will not hear - but a common language, or languages, can be used to allow communication through barriers of culture and varied habits of thought and expression. In the future, therefore, we expect men to be, at the least, bilingual, with a different linguistic tool for every different need. This is a necessity that modern life imposes. The grace with which we accept the fact and the degree of competence with which we meet the situation will surely measure the success which we may achieve in modern life.

A language, again we are sorry to say, is not a unity. Although it has a reality apart from the speech of the peoples who speak it, it is as various as the various communities - nay, even persons, who speak it. Fortunately the variedness is only to such a degree that the language used can be recognized underneath these different forms. There is not one major language that one can name that does not have its dialects. Certainly, not English nor Spanish. This fact is pointed out because in school we insist upon certain forms or patterns as though they were the language incarnate. The truth of the matter is that our teaching is based on the assumption that we have chosen the speech of a particular dialectal community with whom we want to establish communication, or whose speech we think has the most usefulness for us.

If we want to learn a language (or languages), therefore, the first step is to choose one of its (or their) forms. For economy's sake, we should choose the form that has the greatest acceptability not only within the speech community (or communities) where it is the native speech but also within other communities which speak other variants of the language. How do we know that we have correctly learned the language of our choice? Our goal in learning
a language is reached when our speech, oral or written, is such that, like clear glass, it reflects the image of our ideas or intentions without distortion as to call attention to itself. As we should learn so we should teach.

We have been saying so far that LANGUAGE is an important tool in the civilization of man; that it is indispensable to his survival; that its usefulness is in proportion to the depth of our insight into its signalling system and the completeness of our control of that system; that we have to accept the phenomenal variety of its manifested aspects and maintain personal and community well-being in spite of it, and so teach. To help make successful individuals, we must teach those who come to us to express their thoughts clearly in speaking and writing and, to listen and read with understanding.

All these has been said for two reasons: first, to establish a rationale for a philosophy of language instruction that will inform the actuations of the Department of English in this University and, I hope, of its other departments of languages; second, to set a background against which to evaluate the findings derived from faculty responses to the questionnaire on the main and the specific objectives of language teaching.

At the outset, a basic fault in the presentation of this particular study is admitted: there was a shift in point of view in the course of the discussion. In the evaluation of the importance of the specific objectives, the faculty were asked to think in terms of communication in language in general. Then when they were asked to give their opinion about where emphasis should be given, they were asked to consider communication in English. It is presumed that this not-so-subtle change colored the thinking of the respondents for the rest of the responses.

This study tried to find answers to a set of questions:

1. How pervasive is this objective?
2. What communication skills are felt to be most needful in the teaching of the sciences? the arts? social studies?

| Opportunities | for Expressing His Thought Clearly in |
| :--- | ---: |
| Writing and Speaking, and Reading and |  |
| Griño | Listening with Understanding |

3. What communication skills are felt to be least useful in each kind of study?
4. How do opinions of the general body compare with the program of instruction of each language department?
5. Should more emphasis be given this objective in the total school program?
6. Where should additional emphasis be put? How much more emphasis should be given?
7. If it is felt that the objective has not been wellrealized, what factors may be suspected as the probable causes?
8. What have individual teachers done so far to realize this educational objective?
9. What have been felt as other measures which need to be attended to in order to realize this objective?
2.0 Procedure. A questionnaire was sent to the teachers at Central Philippine University, which they were requested to answer. They were asked to indicate the amount of emphasis given in their particular courses to those aspects of effectiveness in communication which were listed in the questionnaire, according to the following scale values:

None: No relation to course as now given
Little: Only indirect relation to course; occasional reference and comment when logical
Some: Direct but limited relation to course; deliberately included as a significant though minor aspect
Much: One of several major aspects of the course; a planned and scheduled feature.
Most: The principal objective or aspect of the course
There were 104 sets of responses to the questionnaire. These were divided into three groups. Group I, with 40 cases, comprised the teachers of social studies; Group II, with 40 cases, comprised the teachers of mathematics and the science, whether pure or applied; Group III, with 24
cases, included all teachers of language and literature. Teachers of nursing subjects were arbitrarily assigned to Group II. The teacher of any subject that was not definitely identified as the study of a language or its literature but is allied to it was assigned to Group I.

In the analysis, trends or responses for each group were sought as well as those of the general body as a whole.

### 3.0 The Findings.

3.1 Relative emphasis of different aspects of communication. [Table I] As was to be expected, the tabulation of the responses showed that this particular objective pervades all instruction. It was interesting to note that there was not one item among the minor objectives that was not given much or the most emphasis by all the groups. To be definite, only five items did not have any entry for "most" and these responses were in the social studies group. When we consider the fact that the minor objectives included some having to do with the study and interpretation of it is worthy to note that the science group had not less than not less than $15 \%$, say they give "much" to "most" emphasis to all the listed objectives.

Among the social science teachers, only seven items were considered irrelevant by large groups. These groups, however, were no more than $15 \%-30 \%$ of the total number. On the other hand, all of the objectives were given "much" or "most" emphasis by $13 \%-65 \%$ of the group.

Some $15-33 \%$ of the 40 in Group II were of the opinion that eight items had no relation to their subjects or courses. From 15-68\% of the whole group however, considered all of the objectives of major importance and gave them from "much" to "most" emphasis.

The responses to this question by the teachers of the language arts and literature were excluded for obvious reasons.

Five objectives were considered to be of prime importance by more than $50 \%$ of the social studies teachers. This observation is derived from the number of responses recorded under the "much" or "most" column.

The items are the following, in the order of their reported importance:
(8) the development of the ability to use library facilities fully;
(9) the development of the ability to evaluate sources of information;
(15) the development of the ability to organize supporting information around a main idea:
(7) the development of the skill to find specific information;
(2) the development of skills necessary for critical thinking.
From $42-45 \%$ added the following five to the first five:
(1) the development of skills necessary for accurate listening;
(3) the development of attitudes necessary for appreciative listening;
(6) the development of the ability to grasp the central idea of passage;
(12) the development of the ability to gather details relevant to the idea to be expanded.
Only three objectives were considered very important by more than $50 \%$, for the study of the sciences and mathematics. These are, in the order of their frequency;
(8) the development of the ability to use library facilities fully;
(7) the development of the skill to find specific information;
(6) the development of the ability to grasp the central idea of a passage.
From $42-48 \%$ of the 40 in Group II considered seven others to be very important:
(1) the development of skills necessary for accurate listening;
(2) the development of skills necessary for critical

## listening;

(3) the development of attitudes necessary for appreciative listening ;
(9) the development of the ability to evaluate sources of information;
(13) the development of the ability to organize supporting information around a main idea;
(15) the development of the ability to realize emphatic presentation by the proper choice of device;
(26) the development of mastery in the spelling of common words.

Among the language arts and literature teachers themselves, there was not one item that was considered by all as most important. The two most important for $80 \%$ of these teachers were:
(18) development of mastery in the correct selection and use of grammatical features or forms ;
(29) development of mastery in the use of writing mechanics.

Otherwise, the distribution of the responses was skewed, to show the understandable bias of the group: every item was considered important by no less than $50 \%$ of the group.

To bring all the phases of this part of the investigation into the perspective of a total picture, all these figures were compared with each other and the general tabulation, Group I, Group II and the general group concur in the majority opinion that the development of the ability to use library facilities fully is of the utmost importance. Sixtynine out of 104 cases checked much or most. One wonders how closely related this opinion is to the problem of lack of textbooks. [Table II]

Second in importance for the general group is Item 7; development of the skill to find specific information, so considered by 65 teachers. It is second, too, in the list of objectives considered important by the group. It is fourth in the list of the social studies group.

Item 6: development of the ability to grasp the cen-
tral idea of a passage read, was the third important objective - 60 teachers checked it so. This objective is one of the three that ranked sixth in the list of the social studies group. It is also third in the science group list.

Fourth in importance according to the general tabulation was Item 9 : the development of the ability to evaluate sources of information. This is second in the social studies list and fourth in the science group list. Firty-eight teachers so marked this item. Two objectives take fifth place: Items 2 and 13. The former is the development of the ability to organize supporting information around a main idea. Item 2 is also fifth in importance in the social studies list. Item 13 is third in importance there. In the science group list, Item 2 is one of two in the fifth place: Item 13 is one of two in the fourth place.

A repetition of the objectives which have just been cited and the addition of three others which were also considered important by about one half of the total number of cases will show how closely related they are to the realizing of the objective of developing critical thinking. To repeat:

Item 8: development of the ability to use library facilities fully;
Item 7: development of the skills to find specific information;
Item 6: development of the ability to grasp the central idea of a passage read;
Item 9: development of the ability to evaluate sources of information;
Item 2: development of skills necessary for critical thinking;
Item 13: development of the ability to organize supporting information around a main idea;
Item 1: development of skills necessary for accurate listening;
Item 3: development of attitudes necessary for appreciative listening;

Item 26: development of mastery in the spelling of common words.

A closer study of the same items, and the whole list, in fact, further revealed that the twenty-nine so-called specific objectives are not co-equal. For example, what may be considered "skills necessary for critical thinking" are the objectives numbered $6,9,12,13,18$, and 28 . Some of these, if not all, may also be considered "skills necessary for accurate thinking" (Item 1) and even for appreciative listening (Item 3). Other such inter-relationships may also be found.

A skill which is necessary to the development of the ability to use library facilities fully has not been appreciated by the first groups although it is highly regarded by the language and literature teachers. This is referred to in Item 5.

It is also interesting to note that what was reported to be the preoccupation of the language arts teachers - mastery in the correct selection and use of grammatical features or forms, and mastery in the use of the mechanics of writing (that is, if the difference between a vote of 20 for these items against that of 19 for the next highest is a difference that is real and important) - are not in the list of the nine most important objectives, according to the general body of respondents. Item 29 is tenth. Item 18 is twelfth. The figures are conjectured to mean that other teachers would rather leave such objectives as 18 and 29 for language teachers to stress; that the involvement of science and social studies teachers in such matters even to the extent that they have so far gone is a commentary on the inefficient learning of the basic tools of expression (or language), if not on the inefficiency of the teacher or on both - or on the existence of deep roots of troubles that cannot be readily associated with this observed condition.
3.2 Additional emphasis on different aspects of communication [Table III]. How much additional emphasis should be given to this general objective? Fifteen per cent of the
social studies teachers placed themselves on record as recommending that this objective be given the most. Seventyfive per cent of the group recommended from much to the most emphasis. This same opinion is concured in by $65 \%$ of the science and mathematics teachers.

Where should the additional emphasis be applied? The language teachers should be forgiven if $83 \%$ of them recommended an expanded program in English; but 70\% of the social studies teachers and $60 \%$ of the science and mathematics teachers gave the same recommendation.

Help from teachers of other courses is requested by $70 \%$ of the language teachers and advised by $63 \%$ of the social studies teachers and by $40 \%$ of the science teachers. Fifty per cent of the social science group were convinced that they themselves should give much additional emphasis to the language arts in their own teaching.

An interesting admission is registered by the language teachers, $70 \%$ of whom felt that they should give much additional emphasis to the language arts in their teaching. It is hard to tell at his instant whether to attribue his response to the outpouring of an awakening messianic zeal or a confession of slackness in the past. But let us give the language arts teachers the benefit of the doubt and believe that they want to put forth herculean efforts to make decisive against near-illiteracy on this campus.

About $40 \%$ of the non-language teachers already give some attention to communication skills in their teaching, and about $35 \%$ give much attention to it. The reaction of $25 \%$ of the language teachers who said they gave only some emphasis to the objective and of one who gave but little attention to it is incomprehensible, unless, as we intimated before, the latter responses were given with communication in English in mind, and only the spoken phase at that.
3.3 Instructional blocks [Table IV]. The greatest block to the effective learning of the communication skills in English, according to teacher opinion, was the students' lack
of practice in the use of the language outside the classroom. Second to it was the proneness of teachers to converse with their students in the dialect. Aside from these two, all the other factors cited were considered by more than $50 \%$ of the cases to have much to do with the failure of instruction in the communication skills, and in this order: third, nonEnglish teachers were too concerned with their own subjects and did not care about the application of skills developed in English classes. Fourth, teachers and students felt that so long as they understood one another, matters of correctness were of minor consequence. Fifth, there was no convincing policy concerning the status of the languages which were taught in school. Sixth, the broad objective had not been properly defined. Seventh, much of the work in the English classes was oriented to nonfunctional, theoretical aspects of instruction.

Some teachers suggested other causes, which they felt, were not comprehend by the questionnaire, like

1. Not much attempt at reading;
2. Not much attempt at original work;
3. Limited study required;
4. No encouragement to classroom participation;
5. No definite university policy about language used;
6. Poor foundation.

### 3.4 Contributions towards fulfillment of the objectives.

 [Table V] How or what does each teacher contribute to the fulfillment of the broad objective?All the suggested ways have been tried by some teacher or other, but there tended to be favorite methods for each group.

The Social Studies group reported a preference for informal discussion. Thirty-six teachers, or $90 \%$ of the group, used this method. Thirty-one teachers, or $90 \%$ of the group, used this method. Thirty-one teachers or $78 \%$ used the lecture method. The use of audio-visual aids was a poor third, being used by only $60 \%$ of the group. Read-
ing by fellow students was used by $55 \%$ of the group.
The science and mathematics teachers also tended to favor the first three given by the social studies teachers, as the percentages of responses show: $85 \%$ for the first, $83 \%$ for the second, and $55 \%$ for the third. This group preferred panel discussion to reading by fellow students.

The language and literature teachers themselves preferred the use of audio-visual aids - $83 \%$ of them said that they had used such aids. Informal discussion and reading by fellow students had been used by $66 \%$ of them; $54 \%$ had used lectures. Others mentioned dramas and debates as methods not comprehended by the ones just mentioned.

A question that needs answering at this point is: Is the choice of activity the best for the fulfillment of the objective in the course? For example, what correlation is there between the preference for lecturing and informal discussion, and the results of teaching in the science and mathematics subjects?

Ninety-one teachers or $87 \%$ of the total group reported that, in order to teach students to listen effectively, they first had to teach them to concentrate, even just to listen. Some teachers had already been complaining about the shortness of the span of their students' attention. If almost all of us agree that this problem is widespread and that attention is basic to learning, this report calls for further study as to the cause of inattention.

Teaching students to associate word with meaning engaged the attention of $83 \%$ of the communications teachers and $75 \%$ of those who teach social studies, and $60 \%$ of the science teachers.

A startling report is that $63 \%$ of the science teachers taught students how to read between the lines, an activity reported by only $63 \%$ of the communications teachers and $\mathbf{5 5 \%}$ of the social studies teachers. It was quite a surprise to discover there is that much suggestive literature to in-
terpret in the so-called exact sciences.
About $75 \%$ of the language and literature teachers would rather teach students how to grasp meaping from context, although $65 \%$ of them also taught students how to summarize and organize ideas that were presented, and how to evaluate meanings and make judgment. Grasping clues from context had not been exploited by the social studies group and had been attended to only $25 \%$ of the science teachers. About $55 \%$ of these two groups, however, taught the two other skills.

We will recall that we reported at the beginning the pervasiveness of this general objective. We will also recall that among those considered highly important by Groups I and II were the abilities to evaluate sources of information and to organize supporting information around a main idea. No more than two in Group I said that evaluating sources of information had no relation to their subject. Only one in each of both groups answered thus for the development of the ability to organize supporting information around a main idea. In contrast, we will repeat that only $55 \%$ reported that they actually taught students how to acquire these skills.

If only half of those who believe in the necessity of realizing certain objectives actually implement their belief, then we can discern another source of difficulty.

Providing experiences which make for appreciative listening is rightly the burden of language and literature teachers; so, when other teachers report that they, too, have taken up the burden, teachers of communication skills have reason to rejoice. A very gratifying report is that of the social studies group, $80 \%$ of whom said that they taught students to be aware of word and feeling in oral communication. A half of the science teachers also did. About half of both groups also taught students to appreciate the oral aspects of language.

The most-used techniques for the enrichment of student vocabulary was to insist on the use of vocabulary pertinent to the course, and then to use synonyms for re-
peated ideas. Language teachers used all these, and also considered the teaching of roots suffixes and prefixes quite important. An added suggestion was to encourage more reading. These responses bring to mind a question: How do we interpret "to encourage the use of..." in terms of classroom activities?

### 3.5 Sundry Observations.

Some other observations need to be given at this point in order to round out exploration of the significance of this broad objective and of the skills and abilities that it demands.

Present thinking about language instruction persuades us to believe that effective instruction in a language other than the native speech of the learner demands that we parallel, refine, systematize and telescope the way a child learns his native speech. There should be two stages in this study: the mastery of the language and the masterful use of that language. By the first we mean the learning and the automatic use of the signalling structures of the language: its significant sounds which include not only its vowel and its consonants, but also its stresses, pauses, and melody; and its habits of combining these into longer stretches of speech which we popularly call words, phrases, and sentences. This stage should come early. In fact, the most functional ones should be - and can be - made automatic very early. One observation with grave educational implications needs to be pointed out here. The perfect learning of speech sounds is an achievement that usually belongs to the very young child. This capacity rapidly decreases with age, with the earlier acquisition of altogether different speech habits, and with the greater play of negative social factors. So, for the college student who learns a language for the first time, many factors work to make the perfect mastery of the sound system impossible. If it is a readiness of speech which we desire of him, the task will take great effort and will be
rewarding only in a pervading atmosphere that is kind to language learning. Having been shown the error of their former practices, many American educators are now putting their foreign language program in the elementary grades.

For the student who comes to college believing he has learned to use English but does not realize that he has learned it wrong, the task of learning to use the language well is doubled, to say the least. The implications for us who catch these students very late are frustration and rending of the heart, for three reasons: first, it is difficult to remove the stigma from stratification and exclusion from the peer group, however good the intention of the measure; second, we see so little gain for all our efforts; third, all of us are kept from teaching what we ought at the level and sphere in which we are teaching. For example, many of the things we teach in language classes in college are best learned in the elementary grades. Therefore, those who cause this sad state of affairs are criminal. Their crime we should be convinced, is against the state - for condemning generations of children to a state of living deprived of what they could have achieved if those to whom the best of their formative years were given kept faith with their duty and the challenge inherent in that duty.

This angry protest is not to say that we will throw up our hands and say, "What's the use?" We cannot af-" ford to give up on language. Rather, it is pointed out that we should recognize these next few years to be twilight years for language teaching - there is so much inefficient learning to put up with. This also is a warning: we had better teach language well at the very start if we expect to see future generations well-equipped to derive the most from the vast store of information which is open only to the truly literate.

## APPENDIX

TABLE I

## RELATIVE EMPHASIS ON SPECIFIC LANGUAGE SKILLS

DEGREES
0 F
E M P HASIS

| N ONE |  |  |  | LIT TLE |  |  | S OME |  |  | M U C H |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Grp 1 | Gro 2 | Grp 3 | Grp 1 | $\operatorname{Grp}^{2}$ | Grp 3. | ${ }_{\text {Grp }} 1$ | Grp 2 | Grp 3 | Grp 1 | Grp 2 | Grp 3 | Grp |
|  | 3 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 10 | 2 | 8 | 13 | 4 | 15 | 15 | 11 | 3 |
|  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 5 | 0 | 9 | 18 | 6 | 116 | 12 | 10 | 4 |
|  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 2 | 14 | -16 | 3 | 115 | 12 | 13 | 2 |
|  | 2 | 2 | 0 | 14 | 10 | 4 | 11 | 11 | 2 | 8 | 13 | 13 | 0 |
|  | 6 | 9 | 0 | 14 | 11 | 3 | 112 | 10 | 2 | 6 | 6 | 14 | 0 |
|  | 2 | 2 | 1 | 8 | 2 | 0 | \| 13 | 14 | 4 | 13 | 17 | 12 | 5 |
|  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 4 | 2 | \| 10 | 7 | 2 | \| 15 | 18 | 15 | 6 |
|  | 2 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 16 | 9 | 5 | 120 | 18 | 13 | 6 |
|  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 11 | 15 | 5 | 17 | 14 | 14 | 6 |
|  | 3 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 11 | 3 | 11 | 16 | 3 . | - 6 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
|  | 4 | 3 | 1 | 8 | 8 | 2 | 12 | 17 | 6 | 5 | 7 | 11 | 8 |
|  | 1 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 7 | 1 | 12 | 8 | 7 | 13 | 8 | 10 | 4 |
|  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 1.6 | 3 | 113 | 18 | 4 | 117 | 11 | 8 | 5 |
|  | 3 | 2 | 1 | 10 | 6 | 3 | 13 | 18 | 4 | 8 | 6 | 11 |  |
|  | 4 | 3 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 3 | 16 | 10 | 6 | 10 | 12 | 9 | 2 |
|  | 1 | 6 | 0 | 13 | 11 | 2 | 13 | 13 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 9 | 3 |
|  | 1 | 3 | 3 | 14 | 15 | 3 | 12 | 10 | 4 | \| 10 | 9 | 9 | 1 |
|  | 2 | 3 | 0 | 12 | 15 | 2 | 12 | 10 | 1 | 7 | 9 | 10 | 4 |
|  | 7 | 10 | 2 | 11 | 12 | 2 | 12 | 8 | 3 | 6 | 8 | 6 | 3 |
|  | 4 | 10 | 5 | 13 | 13 | 2 | 11 | 8 | 4 | 9 | 6 | 9 | 0 |
|  | 7 | 10 | 1 | 13 | 13 | 2 | 10 | 6 | 2 | 9 | 6 | 14 | 1 |
|  | 2 | 3 | 0 | 9 | 15 | 3 | 15 | 11 | 1 | 12 | 7 | 9 | 1 |
|  | 12 | 13 | 1 | 10 | 12 | 3 | 7 | 7 | 4 | 8 | 3 | 13 | 0 |
|  | 5 | 3 | - | 7 | 16 | 3 | 14 | 8 | 3 | 10 | 8 | 5 | 2 |
|  | 11 | 11 | 4 | 111 | 10 | 2 | 12 | 111 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 9 | 0 |
|  | 6 | 4 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 1 | 7 | \|14 | 4 | 13 | 13 | 8 | 5 |
|  | 10 | 11 | 1 | 5 | 9 | 5 | 12 | $\mid 10$ | 5 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 4 |
|  | 2 | 5 | 0 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 112 | 116 | 4 | \| 11 | 9 | 9 | 5 |
|  | 5 | 4 ! | 2 | 9 | 11 | 0 | 8 | 113 | 2 | 111 | 8 | 111 | 5 |

TABLE II
ITEMS CONSIDERED IMPORTANT² BY GROUPS I \& II

| Percentage of Responses | Group I | Items | Group II | Items |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A. Considered "important" by | Items | 8-26 | Items | 8-27 |
|  | " | 9-23 | " | $7-26$ |
| at least $50 \%$ of the group | " | 15-22 | " | 6-21 |
|  | " | 7-21 |  |  |
|  | " | 2-20 |  |  |
| B. Also considered "important" | Items | 1-18 | Items | $9-19$ |
|  | " | 6-18 | " | 13-19 |
| by $42-48 \%$ of the group | " | 26-18 | " | 1-17 |
|  | " | - | " | $2-17$ |
|  | " | 3-17 | " | 15-17 |
|  | " | $2-17$ | " | $26-17$ |
|  | " |  | " | $3-16$ |

2 By "important" is meant an item checked at the "much" or "most" column.

TABLE III

## RELATIVE EMPHASIS ON COMMUNICATIONS SKILLS

A
Teacher Opinion on How Much Additional Emphasis to Give to This Broad Objective in CPU, Especially with Referene to Its Instructional Program


B
Teacher Opinion on Where to Put Additional Emphasis in the Realization of the Third Objective

| Item | NONE |  |  | LITTLE |  |  | SOME |  |  | MUCH |  |  | most |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Grp 1 | Grp 2 | Grp 3 | Grp 1 | Grp 2 | Grp 3 | Grp 1 | Grp 2 | Grp 3 | Grp 1 | Grp 2 | Grp 3 | Grp 1 | Grp 2 | Grp 3 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 10 | 8 | 2 | 20 | 17 | 11 | . 8 | 7 | 13 |
| 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 12 | 14 | 5 | 17 | 14 | 13 | 8 | 4 | 5 |
| 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 11 | 3 | 11 | 12 | 3 | 14 | 12 | 10 | 6 | 3 |  |

Reports on How Much Teachers Give This Objective in Their Teaching


TABLE IV
ACHER OPINIONS ABOUT WHAT INSTRUCTIONAL BLOCKS PREVENT EFFI IMPLEMENTATION OF THIS BROAD OBJECTIVE ${ }^{6}$

a, Appendix A. p. 4, II-A

Opportunities for Expressing His Thought Clearly in Writing and Speaking, and Reading and
Griño Listening with Understanding

TABLE V
SPECIFIC TEACHER CONTRIBUTION TO THE FULFILLMENT OF THE NARROWER OBJECTIVES PERTINENT TO COMMUNICATION

| Items | Grp 1 | Grp 2 | Grp 3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

1. By guided experience in listening to:
a. Informal discussion ........ $|36| 34 \mid 16$
b. Panel discussion ............ 16

|  | 21 |
| :--- | :--- |

c. Audio-visual aids ...........| 24 | 22 | 20

| d. reading by fellow student.. | 22 | 20 | 16 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

e. radio programs ............. | 10 | 10 | 7
f. lectures ..................... 31 | 33 | 13

2. By teaching skills necessary for listening, such as:
a. developing the will to listen, to concentrate

| 53 | 35 |
| :--- | :--- |

23
b. getting meaning from speaker's gestures' intonation ........ | 16 | 14 | 10

| c. listening between the lines.. | 22 | 25 | 15 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

d. grasping clues to meaning from context ...............| 17 | 2118
e. associating meaning with words ..... $30 \quad 24$ ..... 20 I
f. summarizing and organizing ideas listened to ..... 20 | 22 ..... 15

g. identifying a speaker's purpose or viewpoint ..... | 15 | 16 |
| :--- | :--- | ..... 10

h. anticipating: sequence of ideas or outcomes ..... 12 ..... | 15 | 10 |
| :--- | :--- |

i. evaluating meanings and making judgments ..... | 24 | 23 |
| :--- | :--- | ..... 15

j. identifying a speaker's per- suasive technique ..... 11 ..... 12 ..... 8

k. others ..... | 11 | 0 |
| :--- | :--- | ..... 3

| Items | Grp 1 | Grp 2 | Grp 3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

3. By providing experiences which make for appreciative listening, such as:

| a. awareness of word and feeling |
| :--- |
| in oral communication $\ldots \ldots$ |

b. appreciation of the oral aspects of language $\ldots . . . . . . . . . . .|14| 21 \mid 17$
c. awareness of the "lilt" of language $\ldots \ldots . . . . . . . . . . . .|15| 11 \mid 17$
d. awareness of different types of literature ................. | 13

4. By providing for vocabulary growth by
a. teaching roots, suffixes, pre-
fixes $\ldots . . \ldots . . . . . . . . .$. | 14 | 18 | 18

c. using synonyms in repeating ideas

| 22 | 25 | 17 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |

d. insisting on vocabulary per| tinent to the course $\ldots . . .$. . |
| :--- |

e. encouraging the use of the dictionary | 30 | 36 | 19 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |

f. others 1 0 0
5. By teaching the significance of
a. the purpose of the writer or speaker

| 17 | 17 | 14 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 12 | 9 | 5 |

b. propaganda techniques 12 | 9 | 5 |
| :--- | :--- |

c. relative value of sources of materials, etc. $\ldots . . . . . .|25| 27 \mid 13$
d. differentiation between fact


| e. organization of ideas $\ldots . .$. | 23 | 29 | 19 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

f. others ......................| 0 | | 6 |


[^0]:    .* Professor Griño is presently Chairman, Department of English, Central Philippine University. She has just returned from a year's research-study as a Fulbright-Hayes research scholar, working with Dr. H. A. Gleason, Jr., Hartford Seminary. She was also a former Barbour Scholar, University of Michigan, where she specialized in English language and linguistics.

