ON THE STRUCTURE OF TEXT
AND ITS PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

ROBERT B. KAPLAN

University of Southern California

Despite some assumptions to the contrary, writing is a most complex process. It is constrained by the syntactic structures employed to create it, by the logic of its message, and by the purpose (and, thus, the audience) for which it was created. It differs in significant ways from oral text, on historical grounds, on the basis that it lacks a significant feed-back loop, and on the basis that it has complex sociological implications for a society which chooses to adopt it. The functions of writing (i.e., with and without composing; as an act of reporting or as an act of problem solving) are only beginning to be understood. If writing really is as complex as it would appear from these considerations, writing course can only focus on some aspects of writing. The question concerning what a writing course can reasonably encompass is an important one for teachers, for materials writers, and for language test developers.

Widdowson writes:

> Traditionally, language teaching has focused attention on the linguistic sign as symbol, on the development of systematic knowledge. This... is a necessary but not a sufficient condition for the understanding of language in use. If learners are to acquire the ability to achieve meaning through the language they are learning, then a further condition has to be met. They need to be engaged with texts, whether they participate or not, so as to mediate purposeful interaction. They need, in other words, to develop interpretative and interactive procedures for the realization of the indexical and signalling functions of linguistic signs in texts (1984: 136).

This extremely interesting statement includes a number of terms which, perhaps, require definition; however, I take such items as *sign* and Widdowson's distinction between *use* and *usage* to be sufficiently well established that I may save space and eschew defining them. Perhaps the most troublesome term in Widdowson's statement is *text*. In the same collection of essays from which the previous quotation is taken, Widdowson differentiates between *text* and *discourse*.

> ... Meaning is not contained in texts: it is a function of the discourse that is created from the text by interactive procedures. The text is the *product* of the writer's efforts, actual and perceptible on the page, but it has to be reconverted into the interactive *process* of discourse before meaning can be realized. The text may be genuine in that it represents the record of the writer's interaction but it has to be authenticated as discourse by the reader. Genuineness is a property of the text as a product. Authenticity is a property of the discourse as a process... The meaning that is thus derived from a text can never be total or complete because it is

conditional on the extent to which different kinds of knowledge of writer and reader correspond, and the extent to which the reader is prepared to engage in the interaction on the writer's terms (1984: 51).

This is an important distinction; it echoes Halliday's notion that a text has to be instantiated by a reader. Widdowson's interest, in the essay from which I am quoting, is primarily in reading. It is important to note that, in speaking of the reading process, Widdowson says that text must be *reconverted* before its meaning can be realized. Clearly, the implication is that in the writing, the writer *converts* discoursal meaning into text; only if that is so may the reader *reconvert* text into discoursal meaning. That, in turn, suggests that text must have certain characteristics. It must, of course, fall within the grammatical constraints of the language in which it is written; but those constraints constitute a very broad band. Chomsky used a nonsensical sentence to illustrate the importance of grammaticality; he wrote:

Sentences (1) and (2) are equally nonsensical, but any speaker of English will recognize that only the former is grammatical.

(1) Colorless green ideas sleep furiously.
(2) Furiously sleep ideas green colorless (1957: 15).

While there is no question that (1) is nonsensical and grammatical, (2) is only nonsensical and ungrammatical in certain contexts. In other contexts, it may take on grammaticality and even some sense:

<div align="center">

Furiously sleep ideas,
green and colorless.

Not all the Leah's
who may children bless
will wake them from that sleep,
nor lessen fury's keep.

</div>

(Not, perhaps, the most profound bit of verse in the language, but one in which (2) does appear to be grammatical and even to make a bit of sense; certainly, there are more legitimate verses which do not necessarily make more sense). As Widdowson points out, "... attention on linguistic sign as symbol [and] on the development of systematic knowledge... is a necessary but not a sufficient condition for the understanding of language in use." Thus, a text must be grammatical, but the boundaries of what is grammatical are very broad, and grammaticality is necessary but not sufficient.

Enkvist (in press) writes that "a text is a string of language around which the receptor can build a coherent, non-contradictory universe of discourse." This notion imposes a logical, rather than a grammatical, constraint on the characteristics of text. This is a particularly complex constraint, for two reasons; first, because there are times when we are willing to suspend logical rules:

<div align="center">

Hey diddle, diddle,
the cat and the fiddle,
the cow jumped over the moon,
the little dog laughed
to see such sport,
and the dish ran away with the spoon.

</div>

and second because what we mean by *logic* is not entirely independent of the language in which it is expressed. (The latter point is not so easily illustrated, but cf., Kaplan *et al.*, 1983.) Nevertheless, normally, a text must provide one who would instantiate it with a fair shot; it may not pose a contradictory, incoherent universe. Such a statement as:

> It rained so hard the day I left,
> the weather it was fine...

is normally not acceptable in a text on the grounds that it posits a contradictory universe. That is not to say that a text cannot stretch its boundaries; e.g.,

> Once upon a time, there was a beautiful young princess who lived in a castle in a far away kingdom. The castle was built by her uncle Hernando...

This text is a *tour de force*, created for its comic effect (see appendix); the opening phrase evokes the opening of the children's fairy tale, and that implication is confirmed by the reference in the main clause to a "beautiful young princess," the stuff of which fairy tales are made. The *castle*, object of a preposition in a locative phrase, also belongs to the fairy tale ambiance. But suddenly, the castle becomes the subject/topic of the next sentence; granted that English is fairly free in relation to the source of grammatical subjects, still there are rules governing the topic/comment sequence and focus. While fairy tales are concerned with castles, they rarely tell us who built them, and princesses rarely have uncles named *Hernando* who have real-world professions like architecture. This example text is cohesive, but not entirely coherent. Nevertheless, texts normally need to be both cohesive and coherent, and they need to present a universe which we can accept in terms of our sense-experience.

There is still a third constraint on text; it has to have a discernable purpose. The reader needs to be able to find in the meaning of the text as it becomes instantiated into discourse some purpose for its existence. A text may exist to inform or to amuse, to teach or to moralize, but it cannot merely exist. Its purpose may not be profound —it may be a piece of fluff, a shimmering display of verbal pyrotechnics— but it must have a discernable purpose. That notion can be expressed in another way; a text must be addressed by someone to someone else. The matter of addressing may be superficial and obvious —for example in a letter where the addressee is identified by name and the sender signs at the end— or it may be complex, as in the case of this article, written by an unknown North American and addressed to a body of potential readers absolutely unknown to the author. But in that sense of *communication* between human actors lies the essence of purpose, because human actors are likely to have some purpose in addressing each other. The problem, again, may be that the range of available purposes can only be defined in culture-bound categories. Some such categories transcend cultural limitations— all cultures, for example, have the didactic function, though there is some difference about what may be included in that function.

The kind of text I am most concerned about is written text. Written text is not simply oral text transcribed; on the contrary, there is a growing body of evidence to show that written and oral texts are significantly different (Biber, 1984; Grabe, 1984; Neu, 1985) in linguistic terms. Undoubtedly, both oral and written language share the same lexicon and grammar in any given language, but the frequency of occurrence and the distribution of features is likely to be quite different. There is also historical

evidence that oral and written texts are different. The history of oral language is probably as old as the human species. Archeological evidence suggests that human physical development made possible the production of what we conceive of as speech perhaps as long ago in the evolutionary process as 100,000 years, and complex call systems which preceded what we call speech probably existed for a million years or more. But written language developed no more than 10,000 years ago.

As the species evolved to the point at which what we mean by speech became possible, the predisposition and the capacity (physical and mental) became part of the human genetic system. It is now widely believed that all human children are born with a natural, biologically conditioned predisposition to acquire language, and that all it takes to trigger that predisposition is the existence of a linguistic environment. There is evidence that child language acquisition is self-appetitive and self-rewarding, that it is essentially impervious to teaching, and that it is enhanced by a rich linguistic environment and by the visible approval of caretakers in the environment. But this language which is acquired is oral. Indeed, no human population is known that does not have oral language, and any imperfection in the oral language system marks the boundaries of the normal for human populations; those who lack speech are, by definition, abnormal.

Written language is quite different in its origins. It appeared only about 10,000 years ago, and it appeared only among some human populations. Over time, it has not become universal in the human population; there are still large numbers of human beings who do not have written language but who function and are recognized as normal human beings. The invention of writing may be regarded as a post-biological evolutionary step; there have been two such additional steps —the invention of printing and the invention of automated word-processing— and these additional steps have developed in progressively smaller sub-sets of the human population. Unlike spoken language, which is acquired from birth in all human populations, written language must be taught anew in each generation and exists only among those populations in which it is taught (Kaplan, 1984).

These differences between oral and written language have implications both for the development of human societies and for pedagogic assumptions underlying educational practices in some societies. In terms of development, it seems clear that primarily orate societies —ones in which no written language is available— are quite different in significant ways from literate societies— those in which a written language is available. In orate societies, information is stored in living memory. Of necessity, when information is retrieved from living memory, it is variably retrieved, depending on the conditions under which retrieval occurs, the audience for whom retrieval is activated, and the instant condition of the owner of the memory. Because retrieval is variable, the permanence of fact and the immutability of truth are different in degree. In literate societies information may be stored in unchanging text formats.

Once a text can be written down, it can be retrieved any number of times in precisely the same way over time and over space, subject only to such external forces as censorship —that is, the modification of a written text. Furthermore, once a text becomes fixed in writing it becomes possible to comment upon the form of the text as well as upon the content of the text; commentary on some texts now exceeds exponentially the length of the original. Once text becomes fixed in written form, the facts that it

contains also become fixed and invariable, and the truth which it conveys becomes immutable.

There is another side to this technology: like any other technology, this one too is, by definition, value laden. In orate societies, the possessor of memory is a very important figure in the society, but in literate societies, anyone who can read can have access to information. The possessor of memory can choose to whom s/he will reveal what is remembered, but in a literate society the choice is quite different, and a different portion of the society takes on the role of gate-keeper. In the contemporary world, in which scientific and technical information is critical to improving the standard of living of large numbers of people, literacy becomes a significant political concern.

Not only is there a difference in the way text can be treated, depending upon whether it is oral or literate, but the *process* of converting discourse into text (the writer's responsibility) and of reconverting text into discourse (the reader's responsibility) is also different. Written text appears to be much more planned than oral text; there is an obvious reason for this phenomenon. In oral interactions, there is a substantial feedback loop —the listener may ask questions, may signal comprehension (or the lack of it) by gestures, posture, eye-contact, may inflect his/her responses to signal agreement or disagreement; in short, may use a vast panoply of signalling devices (including back-channel mechanisms) to maintain the interaction. But in written interactions, the entire feed-back mechanism is absent. Except in the case of an exchange of letters —where the interlocutors can "converse in writing" and where the feed-back loop is extended in time— there is almost no feed-back from reader to writer. (While I would hope that you, gentle reader, would in fact write to me with your reactions to what I am saying, long experience convinces me that the likelihood of such an interaction is not great.)

To complicate the matter, there is often a failure to differentiate various levels of interaction. In oral interaction, one recognizes the existence of a phatic level, and one pays scant attention to utterances clearly at that level; in written interaction, all text takes on a sort of majesty— a seriousness not necessarily in keeping with the level of the content. This too may have a historical explanation. Writing came into existence long before accessible tools for writing came into existence; early writing required inscribing text into some more or less permanent substance —initially, probably, stone or wood, neither of which were terribly portable nor terribly easy to inscribe. Thus, only very important things were written— oaths, curses, blessings, and the like. Only after writing had existed for some time did men discover its use to keep track of things —to preserve inventories— and this function did not become available until men had also discovered clay tablets and other softer, less-permanent means of inscription. Paper and ink are latecomers indeed, in historical terms, and technologies like the printing press and the word processor —which have made written text pervasive in some societies— are respectively no more than 500 and 50 years old. (The value-ladenness of the word processor has yet to be evaluated, it is so recent.)

Thus, it appears that the ability to produce written text is not acquired as is the ability to produce oral text; that the existence of written text (let alone the new technologies it has engendered) creates social and cultural change for those who possess it, and that the recognition of different levels of written text has yet fully to emerge. Each of these carries important pedagogical implications.

First, if the ability to produce text is learned rather than acquired, there is the

implication that the writing process must be taught. There are important questions whether extensive reading helps to inculcate the writing process, whether writing is best learned by imitation, and whether the learning of any writing genre will produce the ability to produce all the other genres. These questions have not satisfactorily been answered. The evidence that current answers are not entirely satisfactory lies in the world-wide *crie* that mother-tongue literacy is on the decline. The issue is complicated by the emergence of non-metropolitan varieties of standard languages (e.g., English, French, Spanish, etc.) in areas where the standard is a second —or foreign— language (e.g., in Francophone Africa, in the Philippines, etc.) and where the non-metropolitan variety is the carrier of quantities of written text (i.e., the emergence of L_2 literatures; cf., Kachru, 1985). It is further complicated by the uncritical acceptance of the notion that literacy is universally a good thing.

Second, the introduction of literacy into a previously orate area, and the teaching of writing under these circumstances, must proceed with the full recognition that it is a revolutionary activity— that it is going to introduce disruptive and irreversible change into that society. The introduction of written text as a significant carrier of information will inevitably change the social order by creating a new elite (those who can read) and undermining an existing elite (those who can remember). There are significant problems associated with the introduction of literacy; literacy creates a need for written text. If a social group is able to read, it will demand something to read; thus, it is not enough to introduce literacy, but it is also necessary to create a stock of texts to be read. In the case of the newly emerging L_2 literatures, there are significant problems about the register in which texts will be produced (including issues of the standardization of spelling and grammar), and there are further complex questions regarding the means of distribution (cf., Kaplan *et al.*, 1984).

Third, research has yet to give serious attention to what is meant by the term *write*. At present, the term is taken to cover a wide variety of activities. It is not in and of itself important to differentiate the wide variety of activities covered under the term, but there is a strong pedagogical argument which requires the recognition that there is a variety of activities, that these several activities probably require different teaching strategies, that they are learned at differing rates, that they become accessible to somewhat different audiences at differing points in the educational process, and that they result in quite different skills. While it is impossible here to develop a full taxonomy of the activities subsumed under the general term *writing*, it may be useful at least to suggest the major headings under which differing activities may fall (cf., Kaplan, 1983). In the broadest sense one may differentiate between activities which involve writing without composing vs. activities which involve writing through composing. Writing without composing would include such activities as making lists, filling simple forms, addressing envelopes, but it would also include such real-world (as opposed to classroom) activities as taking dictation, doing basic translation, and the like —activities where the composing has been done by someone else and the "writer" is constrained by the original author's composing. Writing through composing would include that type of writing which involves only reporting what the writer already knows vs. that type of writing in which the writing process becomes the heuristic process through which the writer solves a problem. It would also be necessary to impose a second-order structure on this taxonomy; writing activities are differentiated by audience. It is possible for a

writer to address him/herself, to address a small group of known others, or to address an undesignated group of unknown others. This second-order constraint permits the development of a grid, perhaps like the following:

	writing without composing	writing through composing	
to self	list, reminder	diary	
to known other(s)	form filling envelope address	letter	
to unknown other(s)	form filling	article	reporting
		novel, poem	heuristic act

Obviously, this little grid is far from complete; it is only intended to suggest that there is a complex set of activities, and that such a set of activities is divisible. Furthermore, still another set of constraints exist; on the left side of the grid, a knowledge of spelling and basic sentence grammar is necessary and sufficient, but on the right side of the grid such a knowledge, while necessary, is not sufficient. In short, writing through composing requires a number of skills not normally included in an SL or FL curriculum; indeed, a number of skills which are not yet well defined or well understood.

By analogy, one may argue that there are at least three types of activities involved: *kinesic*, *tactic*, and *legeric*. Kinesic activities are primarily muscular; they relate to the basic skills involved in the manipulation of a writing stick of some sort and in the manipulations of a keyboard of some sort (whether of a compositor, or a typewriter, or a computer). Tactic activities involve the ability to operate within a closed system. If one arrives in a strange city, hires a cab, and instructs the driver to take one to some particular location in the city, the driver goes through a complex navigational process, relating the two locations in space and selecting a route from one to the other in the light of available streets, traffic patterns relative to time of day, construction, etc. But the number of alternatives available to the driver is finite, and the choices the driver must make are located within a closed system; the driver, therefore, engages in tactic activities. Legeric activities involve the ability to operate within an open system. If one goes to see a physician complaining of a particular discomfort, and the physician, on the basis of laboratory tests, a physical examination, but also experience and intuition, is able to diagnose the condition and to prescribe a treatment which in time results in alleviation of the symptoms, the physician may be said to operate in an open system. The potential alternatives are virtually infinite, and the physician has engaged in legeric activities. In the North American society, it is clear which of the types we value most; physicians are paid considerably more than taxi drivers, and the period of training for physicians is considerably greater than it is for taxi drivers (cf., Kaplan, 1979). (While it is true that professional athletes are paid even more than physicians, it is only partially their kinesic ability which is being rewarded; rather, what is valued is their experience and intuition, though admittedly their experience and intuition are of a different type than are those of the physician.) Thus, tactic activity may be related to

the kind of ability involved in writing without composing and in writing through composing at the level of reporting, while legeric activity may be related to writing through composing as a heuristic process. Again, it is clear that a great novel is far more widely read than a technical clinical report and that the novel produces far more income for its author than does the clinical report.

Writing, then, is far more complex than it appears, and it should be clear that while grammatical and orthographic accuracy is necessary to the writing process, it is certainly not sufficient. Indeed, what one hopes is emerging from the discussion so far is a notion that a written text is a very complex structure operating simultaneously at many levels. It involves the *appropriate* identification of an audience so that there is a significant coincidence of the universes of world experience possessed by author and reader in the absence of a feed-back loop, the *appropriate* choices of rhetorical form, of grammatical structure, and of lexical content so that all three levels interact with content to increase potential communication, both instantiated within the *appropriate* level of activity.

All of this is probably too much to include in a basic course in composition. What then ought to be included in such a course? One must assume, I think, that the learner has already acquired a sufficient lexicon to express at least some of the ideas s/he may hold; further, it is necessary to assume that the learner has sufficient a priori control of the syntactic system so that the composition course does not become a grammar course instead. If one assumes that a composition course is not primarily a vocabulary course and/or a grammar course, then and only then does it become possible to teach composition in a composition course. The content of such a course probably ought to include some exploration of the notion of audience. Inexperienced writers learning a second or foreign language have no sense of audience and tend to treat written text as though it were transcribed spoken text (that is, as though extensive feed-back mechanisms were available). Experienced writers trying to learn to write in a second or foreign language bring with them their experience of audience from their L_1; unfortunately, the constraints they understand and carry over may be inappropriate to the L_2. Hinds (in press), for example, argues the possibility of a typology of languages based on how particular languages assign responsibility. English is a language in which heavy responsibility lies on the writer to make him/herself clear, while Japanese places the responsibility to understand on the reader and permits the writer only to suggest what s/he has in mind.

In addition to the issue of audience, it seems to me that a composition course can examine the structure of text in the language being learned. Such an examination is *not* a study of grammar; rather, it is a study of the relationship among sentences in an extended piece of discourse. Each language has mechanisms to mark the discourse topic (e.g., in some languages through a topic-marking particle, in some through fronting, in some through coincidence between sentence topic and discourse topic in bloc-initial structures, in some languages some combination of these and other devices, etc.). Each language has permissible sequences of sentences (e.g., in English, a bloc which begins with a passive structure is likely to continue to use the passive). Each language has mechanisms to deal with anaphoric reference, with collocation, with *metatextual* inclusions, and the like (cf., Lautamatti, in press). These devices can be examined by reading authentic examples and by practice in writing about real topics so

that native-speaking readers may comment on the relative success of the author's control of the various devices. The reading, however, cannot be unguided; rather, the teacher needs to help the learner see how devices operate. And the writing cannot be unguided; the teacher needs to help the learner understand whether s/he is using devices effectively.

Further, the composition course can deal with the various *preferred* rhetorical forms. It is likely (still undemonstrated, but certainly open to empirical investigation) that all languages use all of the available rhetorical modes, but it is unlikely that all languages use all modes in the same ways, for the same purposes, with the same frequency. There is some evidence that all languages do indeed contain a narrative/descriptive mode, but there is also some evidence that knowledge of that mode does not help much in the composing of expository texts. These differences help to account for culturally marked differentiation in perceptions about the ownership of ideas and of language; in English, there is great concern about plagiarism, and the precise number of words that constitute a violation of someone's ownership is prescribed in law, while other societies have very different constraints. Indeed, in some cultures, the ability to repeat someone else's ideas in precisely the same words is the greatest compliment to the original author and a perfectly appropriate mode of scholarship. (This notion, I think, has some relationship to the position of the society along the orate/literate continuum, but this comment must be regarded as purely speculative at this point.) Further, learners need to recognize not only that argument is different from other rhetorical modes, but also that the structure of argument is language specific (cf., Connor, in press).

In those societies in which the written mode has taken on extraordinary prominence, the ability to write has acquired extraordinary meaning. Trueba writes:

> Issues... regarding "language handicaps" and "academic underachievement" are social phenomena that surface in the form of linguistic deviance and are then "interpreted by the experts." The traditional assessment of concept formation is based on the assumption that, if a child does not demonstrate in an appropriate linguistic form that s/he recognizes a concept (or concepts) and its (their) interrelationships in those domains "all normal children" know, the child is handicapped. A perfectly normal child who has just arrived from a linguistically, socially and/or culturally different [environment], by not being able to produce in... written text the expected linguistic forms, becomes *ipso facto* "abnormal" in the eyes of the educator (in press: 48).

What he suggests is that a learner is judged "abnormal" in literate societies if that learner is unable to produce coherent and cohesive written text at a level appropriate to the learner. Further, Trueba suggests that the origin of the learner is irrelevant to the judgment; the learner may derive from a linguistically, socially, or culturally different environment, but the point is that such an environment may be across the world in another continent or across the street in another sub-culture. Blacks and Chicanos in the United States are, for the most part, not illiterate, but their literacy deviates significantly from the Standard American English norm. Kachru and others (B. B. Kachru, 1982, Y. Kachru, 1983, Pattanayak, 1981; cf., Kaplan *et al.*, 1984) have begun to explore the existence of non-native Englishes both as a source of creativity and as a source of problem.

As Widdowson has pointed out, learners of a second or foreign language must

move beyond a concern with linguistic sign as symbol and on to a concern with text; in other words, they need "to develop interpretative and interactional procedures for the realization of the indexical and signalling functions of linguistic signs in texts" (1984: 136). The skills implicit in the procedures suggested by Widdowson start in the composition classroom; to the extent that the composition classroom is only a slightly more advanced level in the study of grammar and vocabulary, it will fail to achieve these needs. The composition classroom should become a place where text is studied —in order to achieve understanding of text, of the ways in which linguistic signs signal meaning in texts. That does not mean that composition classrooms should become places where literature is studied. This is not to say that there is no place for the study of literature in SL or FL curricula; rather, this is to say that the study of literature is a still higher order activity, to be undertaken after the learner has some sense of composing, and not in lieu of learning to *compose* and *de-compose* —to *convert* and *reconvert*— between discourse and prose. It is clear that the mediation between author, text, and reader, constitutes a process in which the text itself is the product; that is, the writer converts discourse (his/her ideas) —through a complex process involving considerations of audience, considerations of rhetorical types, considerations of the sort discussed in this article —into text (product), and the reader, at some other point in time and perhaps some other point in space, reconverts the writer's text back into discourse —through another equally complex process in which the coincidence of world views is hopefully relatively high. The composition classroom deals with all stages of this model, although it concentrates on that part of the model concerned with the conversion of the writer's discourse into text. Since it is difficult to perceive the conversion process in operation except as it is manifested in the product, composition classroom attention has traditionally tended to be on the product. This is not to suggest that the product —the text— should henceforth be ignored; rather, it seems to me, focus in the composition classroom needs to be equally on the conversion process and on the product. In order to achieve that focus, it is also necessary to give some attention to the corollary process —the process of reconverting text to discourse, the reading process. As Lautamatti (in press) observes, "The development of discourse topic within an extensive piece of discourse may be thought of in terms of succession of hierarchically ordered sub-topics, each of which contributes to the discourse topic, and is treated as a sequence of ideas, expressed in the written language as sentences." It is the flow of ideas, of topics and sub-topics, that is at the heart of the composition class, and the study of sentences is necessary only to the extent that these ideas, these topics and sub-topics, happen to be coded as sentences in the product text.

Conceiving of text in the way we have been talking about it here has pedagogical implications; I am convinced that the conception of text as a multidimensional product of a complex conversion process provides a more powerful way of looking at text than has been readily available in the past, and I am convinced that the pedagogical approach implicit in such a view of text has considerable promise in terms of producing learners who are not merely functionally literate but who are capable of composing in the target language. More than that, I am convinced that the skills involved in composing text will help learners to become involved in what Widdowson (1977) calls the "dynamic process of meaning creation" at all levels of the language.

REFERENCES

BIBER, D. 1984. A model of textual relations within the written and spoken modes. Los Angeles, CA: University of Southern California. Ph. D. diss.

CHOMSKY, N. 1957. *Syntactic structures*. The Hague: Mouton.

CONNOR, U. In press. Argumentative patterns in student essays: Cross-cultural differences. In U. Connor and R.B. Kaplan (eds.), *Writing across languages: Analysis of L₂ texts*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

ENKVIST, N.E. In press. Text linguistics for the applier: An orientation. In U. Connor and R.B. Kaplan (eds.), *Writing across languages: Analysis of L₂ texts*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

GRABE, W. 1984. Toward defining expository prose within a theory of text construction. Los Angeles, CA: University of Southern California. Ph. D. diss.

HINDS, J. In press. Reader versus writer responsibility: A new typology. In U. Connor and R.B. Kaplan (eds.), *Writing across languages: Analysis of L₂ texts*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

KACHRU, B.B. 1982. *The other tongue: English across cultures*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

KACHRU, B.B. 1985. *The alchemy of English: The spread, functions, and models of non-native Englishes.* Oxford: Pergamon.

KACHRU, Y. 1983. English and Hindi. In R.B. Kaplan, A. d'Anglejan, J R. Cowan, B.B. Kachru, and G.R. Tucker (eds.), *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, III*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House. 50-77.

KAPLAN, R.B. 1979. Towards a theory of applied linguistics. In E.C. Polomé, W. Winter, and M.A. Jazayery (eds.), *Linguistic and literary studies in honor of Professor Archibald A. Hill*. The Hague: Mouton.

KAPLAN, R.B. 1982. Reading and writing, technology and planning: To do what and with what and to whom. In J.E. Alatis, H.H. Stern, and P. Strevens (eds.), *Applied linguistics and the preparation of second language teachers: Toward a rationale*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press. [Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics.]

KAPLAN, R.B. 1984. Reading and writing: Assumptions and presuppositions. *The American Language Journal 2,2*: 39-48.

KAPLAN, R.B., d'ANGLEJAN, A., COWAN, J R., KACHRU, B.B. and TUCKER, G.R. (eds.). 1984. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, IV*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

KAPLAN, R.B., d'Anglejan, A., Cowan, J R., Kachru, B.B. and Tucker, G.R. (eds.), 1984. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, IV*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

LAUTAMATTI, L. In press. Observations on the development of the topic of simplified discourse. In U. Connor and R.B. Kaplan (eds.), *Writing across languages: Analysis of L₂ texts*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

NEU, J. 1985. A multivariate linguistic analysis of business negotiations. Los Angeles, CA: University of Southern California. Ph. D. diss.

PATTANAYAK, D.P. 1981. *Multilingualism and mother-tongue education*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.

TRUEBA, H.T. In press. Bilingualism and bilingual education. In R.B. Kaplan, A. d'Anglejan, J R. Cowan. B.B. Kachru, G.R. Tucker, and H.G. Widdowson (eds.), Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, VI. New York: Cambridge University Press.

WIDDOWSON, H.G. 1977. Description du langage scientifique. *Le français dans le monde 129*: 15-21.

WIDDOWSON, H.G. 1979. *Explorations in applied linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

WIDDOWSON, H.G. 1984. *Explorations in applied linguistics 2*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

APPENDIX

Once upon a time there was a lovely young princess who lived in a castle in a far off mythical kingdom. The castle was designed by her uncle Hernando who was an architect in a nearby city. He was also a fine family man and was once an excellent swimmer. He competed against

Johnny Weismuller many times during the late 1920's. This was the time of the great depression during which many huge fortunes were lost. Fortunes that occasionally equalled the amount of treasure brought back from the orient many centuries ago by Marco Polo. Or perhaps the total salaries, operating expenses, and advertising budget of the Kansas City Chiefs, Radio City Music Hall and Arlene's Dancing Dalmatians. Next door to Hernando's office was a tattoo parlour. Many of our country's brave young fighting men went there for tattoos of their mothers, Barney Google and Eleanor Roosevelt. It was these same young men who displayed such courage on Bataan and Iwo Jima. The courage that made this country safe for you, me, our children, zoo animals and restoring old Hudsons as a hobby.

[Broomhilda]