

A Foreigner in a Japanese High School Language Laboratory

Cary Duval

The native speaker has been a part of English language teaching in Japan since the Meiji Period when Japan first opened herself to the outside world. However, native speakers were hired by the new government or by the equally new colleges founded by the new intellectual leaders of the country. Men like Fukuzawa and Okuma and other leaders were very eager to have Japan learn from and about the outside world. So in came teachers and technicians and with them the native English teacher. They have been here ever since with the possible exception of the World War Two period.

Most of these teachers have been and continue to be employed by both private and public universities. The number of teachers at these schools has been growing and now most of the universities in the major cities, if not the entire country, can offer at least their English majors a few courses from native speakers.

However, the employment of the native English teacher in schools below the college level is a relatively new development. Until recently, teaching by native teachers at the high school and junior high school had been largely restricted to a few "mission schools" (Christian missionary associated schools). In the last few years many of the other private schools, both Buddhist and others, have started to hire foreigners to teach some of their English classes. Even the Education

Ministry (Mombusho) has recently begun to hire foreign advisors, whom they send to different schools to assist in the task of teaching English.

I have no exact figures on how many foreigners are teaching at the high school level, but one can assume that their numbers are small relative to the total number of high schools in Japan. As a result of both their small number and relatively recent arrival, it is only natural that the role that they are asked to play in each of their respective schools has been slightly different. In fact, it would be fair to state, I think, that most high schools do not really know how to utilize their foreign teachers' talents and skills to the full advantage of the students and the schools themselves. This is not an indictment, only an observation that the position of the forerign teacher here is too new to fit comfortably into the mainstream of high school life.

Many schools are placing their foreign teachers in such obvious native teacher roles as English-speaking society advisor, home-stay-program instructor, pronunciation teacher, and English conversation teacher, and some are placing them in charge of the language laboratory. This latter position is where I was placed when I started to teach at Bunkyo Daigaku Fuzoku High School.

The idea for this paper was the result of the problems I had adjusting to the situations I found in the high school and in adapting my teaching methods and philosophy to the laboratory. Basically, this is a record of my own problems and the methods I chose to overcome them, and my own analysis of what worked and what did not, and theories of why they did not. I offer these experiences only in the hope that they could perhaps be of some help or guidance to other English

teachers who may find themselves in a similar situation.

First, I think that I should describe the facilities that are available to me in the Bunkyo LL so you will know more about the situation I work in. There are fifty student's booths equipped with headsets and four television/videotape monitors which are suspended from the ceiling. There is also a master console which is connected to the regular assortment of cassette decks (two), open reel deck (one) video players (two), and television/video monitor (one). The control panel itself is fairly standard having most of the normal modes of operation. In addition, there is a good selection of tapes.

Having been placed in charge of a rather impressive array of hardware and software, I had to find a way or ways to best use it to serve the students. In other words, I had to choose the best methods and techniques to fulfill the school's goals. The only limitation I was given in this area was the selection of the text book. This meant that I could use any supplementary material and any approach I deemed necessary to improve the student's English ability.

Given this situation, I had to first decide which direction I should take with the language laboratory, whether I should use it to support and supplement the classroom English or whether I should make it a completely independent part of their English language experience. Both approaches have inherent advantages and disadvantages. The former has the benefit of reinforcing the grammatical structures and vocabulary that the students learn in the classroom. Under ideal conditions one could teach a lesson on present simple tense, for example, in the classroom using reading and writing materials and then introduce the students to similar present tense material through

video or audio tapes in the laboratory. This could result in a more comprehensive and deeper understanding of how to use the given grammatical structures in conversational or practical situations.

The problem with this reinforcement approach, as I saw it, was that of coordinating the work and the materials of the two classes. The time and the effort it would take the teachers to coordinate the regular English class with the laboratory would overload both of them. Also, in the Bunkyo situation I was in charge of the laboratory for the entire first-year class, and would have had to coordinate the LL work with several teachers and not just one, thereby multiplying the problems. Then, too, there would be the normal problem of finding mutually compatible materials because of the different purposes and areas of responsibilities of the two classes.

However, if I had chosen to teach laboratory class as an independent entity I would have freed myself and the regular classroom teachers, in this case all Japanese, from the burden of coordinating their work. This would have allowed the other teachers and myself to spend more time preparing and teaching our own specialties. Beyond this was my strongly held belief that as a native speaker teaching in a high school, I had a rather unique chance to add to the students' education an ingredient other than language alone. I could present them with cultural aspects of American English (i.e. paralinguistic differences). It was my desire to use my uniqueness to seek and fulfill the responsibilities that a foreign teacher should. Thus I felt that the best way to do this was to make the LL an independent part of the English experience.

Having once decided to separate the laboratory from the regular

course of study, I found that I still had the difficult task of choosing what approach and methods to use in the laboratory.

The language laboratory has, I think, a rather poor image. It brings to mind listening comprehension, pronunciation, and grammar drills, with the students repeating dutifully, if tediously, the drills on the tape. This rote memory method in language learning seems to have been replaced by the newer theories which emphasize communicative exercises. This has given rise to the general feeling among English teachers (especially native speakers) that "...their own classroom presentations are far more productive."¹ and have led many to believe that "...the language laboratory is ill-suited for presentation of highly communicative exercises, since information flows only in one direction."²

I must admit that this was close to my own image of the language laboratory. Thus it seemed that I would have to find some way to reconcile my own philosophy of teaching English as a communicative skill and what apparently was the antithesis of it. The question was how much of my own philosophy I could really adapt to the language laboratory to give the students an effective and meaningful learning experience.

During my search for goals I also had to take into consideration the hard facts of the high school situation. I would be in charge of between forty-two and forty-four students per class with only one fifty minute class per week. Due to holidays, exam days and half days, the school calendar consisted of between twenty-eight and thirty-four meetings per class, depending on what days and what period they were held. Now, if one were able to spend the entire fifty minutes

teaching for all of the thirty-four meetings a year, teaching only forty-two students, one would be able to give only 40.47 minutes of individual attention to each student a year, or 1.2 minutes per class. Given this amount of time to work in one could hardly think that he could teach the students to converse in practical English conversation very well, if at all.

If conversing or communicating well in English were not feasible goals, then what should the goal be? I decided that if my main goal was out of reach, then I would have to establish goals that were within the students' range, but at the same time could be used as way stations on the road to effective English conversation, which I hoped would be their final destination. I decided, of course, that I would have to improve their aural skills, pronunciation, and vocabulary, and at the same time make them able to use a variety of everyday expressions in a limited number of situations. My specific goal was to make the students able to respond to simple questions, or-questions, tag questions and interrogative questions. Furthermore, the students should be trained to respond to and make all of these questions in the present, past and future tenses with an acceptable degree of accuracy. Also, I wanted them to be able to make their own conversations using these same structures.

As for passive skills I wanted them to be able to distinguish [s/sh] , [l/r] , [th/sh] , [f/h] and [f/v/b] sounds, and difficult vowel sounds like those in [bird/bard] , [beat/bet] , [bat/but] ,etc. I also wanted them to be able to pronounce these same sounds. However, let me stress here that although pronunciation was to be a part of the lesson, I wanted it to be taught through the dialogue and not as

pronunciation alone. In other words, the emphasis was to be on the communicative skills of expressing themselves and responding to verbal communication with the correct response. Pronunciation would be emphasized only insofar as it interfered with communication. This same criterion would also apply to intonation and rhythm.

I was given the book *Elementary LL English Course* by Kenichi Ando, Isao Ogata, Hiroshi Asano, and Katsusuke Shimizu, published by Taishukan Press. I found this book to be rather useful because its basically simple format allows one to use supplemental material very easily and creatively. It follows a very standard format with an introductory dialogue, an expanded dialogue, new words and phrases, an aural section, review section (also mostly aural in nature), a drill section, and finally another dialogue section. The only major criticisms that I have are that perhaps the authors should have included a story section in each lesson and introduced more new words either through the expanded dialogue or the drill section. The drill section also could have been a little longer.

In presenting the book to my classes I usually preview the new lesson with the students, making sure that they understand all new grammatical structures and words that will be presented therein. This is often done with the students' books closed and while I write the new grammar points on the whiteboard and pronounce the new words. Once the preview is completed I play the tape and have the students repeat after it. While the students are doing this I will be listening at the console to several students' repetition by using the monitoring switch. At this time I will correct the students individually and note the problems for presentation to the whole class later.

After I have played the tape, I review the lesson, especially the basic dialogue section because it is written in the student's books and is therefore easy for them to understand. When I have finished reviewing it thoroughly, I select two or three students to take the different parts of the conversation. To do this, I usually have the students keep their headphones on, and instruct certain students to broadcast to the others. This allows the other students to listen to the dialogue and, more importantly, to my corrections of their mispronunciations.

Having had my students (never more than two or three pairs) present the dialogue, I then try to show the class its practical application. To do this I often use props in the lesson. For example, let's take a lesson about time:

1. A. What's the time now?
 B. It's seven fifty.
2. A. Is our bus comming soon?
 B. I hope so.
3. A. Are we late?
 B. Yes. Let's hurry.³

In this case I will hold up a clock with a different time (e.g. five thirty) and a picture of a train. The students are then expected to make the appropriate changes in the dialogue.

I also usually present at this time the different ways that one can use to tell the time (i.e. half past, a quarter after, a quarter to, etc.). I also try to make the lesson a little more interesting by introducing old or new styles of transportation with a picture of a stagecoach or a spaceship. Then the students enter the transfer stage where they

make their own conversations using these new constructions, expressions and words.

For this practice I use the pair practice mode. This allows the students sitting next to each other in the paired booths to communicate with each other, allowing all of them to practice the dialogue at the same time. While they are practicing the dialogue I can listen to them practice and make any necessary corrections. This lessens the burden of individual corrections and makes the students more interested in the lesson. Once they have practiced enough, I will have them present a dialogue, either their own or from the book. This presentation is usually broadcasted, but sometimes I make the students act out the dialogue in the front of the room. This is done to get the students moving, to keep them alert, and to improve their confidence and projection.

There are benefits and drawbacks to the use of the pair practice mode. The benefits are, of course, efficiency and student interaction, which I stated above. The drawback is a drop in discipline. I have found that many of the girls are more eager to speak Japanese with their friends than to seriously study English. However, I have found that if one can switch in on enough conversations, and give them interesting words to use in their dialogues, then the Japanese conversations can be controlled.

After I have reviewed the dialogue I review the words and phrases. Once again I have the students use them in their own sentences. I cannot go over the expanded dialogue very well because there is no copy in either the teacher's or the student's text. However, I do often play the tape once again so the students to see how the words are

used in the dialogue. This is helpful in preparing the students for the review section, which reviews the expanded dialogue. I almost never spend any time on the listening comprehension section because I believe that the review section makes it redundant, and, too, I can easily make up my own questions to cover the same area. These three sections are, I think, best treated as one unit since they are all interrelated.

The pattern drill section is the section to which I devote much time, for this is one of the most useful ways, if not the only way, to introduce to beginning students new grammatical forms and to improve their rhythm and intonation. This type of exercise can also be useful in building vocabulary and even in improving pronunciation. Although it has been much maligned, I still think that pattern practice can be a useful tool and is almost necessary for the level of most of my students. However, it is, or can be, very boring for the students if it is not kept at a quick pace. I do not stay on drills for very long and try to make it interesting and/or relative to the students by my choice of substitutions, for example:

S. I must run to the station.

Cue. Macdonald's.

S. I must run to Mscdonald's.

The dialogue practice section of the lesson is another section which I often go over with the students. This section is designed as a typical oral/aural exercise with the tape first introducing the new dialogue in its entirety, while the students listen. After the introduction, the students then repeat the dialogue following the tape. The tape then instructs the students to take part "A", which is in the book, and the

tape takes "B", which has only a Japanese translation of the English. This procedure is then reversed with the students taking part "B". Finally the tape reviews the dialogue.

These are the procedures I use to present the six sections of each lesson. However, I don't always follow these procedures for every lesson. Rather, I look at the material offered in each lesson and decide which sections to emphasize and how much time I should spend on a given lesson. A long or difficult lesson might be broken down into two fifty minute classes, while a shorter or easier lesson might not even take the entire fifty minutes. In either case, I sometimes choose to delete one or more of the redundant sections. For example, I will often cover only one dialogue, choosing either the main dialogue or the dialogue practice to go over in class. Seldom do I find it necessary to have the students go over two of the dialogues, but there are times when I find that the students need more practice with the same structures. It is then that the extra dialogues are convenient.

I have found that most of the lessons in the book can be done in a day, and in fact I have found much resistance among the students if I try to spend too much time on one lesson. One must remember, I think, that high school students are a part of the "throwaway" generation. That is they want everything new and anything from last week seems antiquated. It is only natural that they want to move on to the next lesson even though they may not be able to understand or apply the material in the lesson of the previous week.

In order to overcome this resistance, I have tried to link the lessons together to show the students that each lesson is a building block upon which the others rest. One way I do this is to have the students

make their own conversations for situations which we have already covered. Another way I try to keep the material from previous lessons fresh in their minds is to make them use it, or at least parts of it, in the following classes. In order to achieve this objective, I have had much success with the "Gee! I don't know." exercise. For example, the lesson on time is reviewed in this manner:

- T. What time is it?
S1. Gee! I don't know.
T. Ask Hiroko.
S1. Hiroko, what time is it?
S2. It's two o'clock.

This particular exercise makes the students listen to the teacher closely and then quickly and clearly ask a classmate the question. One can also do a similar exercise with tag questions (i.e. This isn't Hiroko's pen, is it?). I have found them both to be good warm up exercises and rather effective reviews.

The simple structure of *Elementary LL* also allows the teacher to add material from other sources to enhance, reinforce or expand the grammatical structures and vocabulary presented in the lessons. One of the more useful ways one can do this is, I believe, by the use of video tapes. Video allows the students to see English speakers interacting with one another. They can see them walking, talking and reacting to a situation. In essence, it presents the student with "... chunks of authentic language in a controlled environment."⁴

However, because the students are so familiar with television they may think of the video as just another game and not really pay attention to what is transpiring on the screen. How, then, one may

ask, can one make the students pay attention? There are several ways which I have found to be effective. The first is to preview the material that they will see and hear in the video. This means, of course, that the teacher should have previewed the tape to become familiar with it. One should also select a few of the most important grammatical structures, words and phrases which will be heard on the tape so that the students know what is going on.

In addition to previewing the video material with the students, one should also prepare some questions to help guide the students, or some questions that actually make them listen to the tape for the answers (i.e. cloze exercise). These questions can be written on the board or on papers given to the students. One might even decide to give grades to the students or at least mark their papers to show them how important the video is.

Once I have given out or written the questions on the board, I let the students watch the video. I often stop it at key points to ask the students if they have the answers to the key questions, and/or ask simpler questions which I feel they should be able to answer after watching the tape. At the end of the class I go over the questions with the students. When I have given out question sheets I will have them exchange their papers with one another for marking. Then I go over the questions by having the students try to answer them. I help them with answers when I feel that they are becoming uninterested or there is an actual shortage of time. I have found this method to be very valuable, as it gives the students a good review and allows them to see and hopefully understand their mistakes while the video is still fresh in their minds.

_____ A FOREIGNER IN A JAPANESE HIGH SCHOOL _____
LANGUAGE LABORATORY

In choosing a video, I usually try to find one that adds to or supplements material that the students have already covered, or previews materials that they will soon be covering in the laboratory book. For example, I will usually follow up lesson seven of *Elementary LL*, which is about hobbies and school activities, with a tape about hobbies. In this particular case I have used a tape of the television program "Watch and Listen" with Richard Showstack, called "Idols" which is, interestingly enough, about cheerleaders. The tape shows several scenes of American cheerleaders at professional football games, after which Richard interviews three high school cheerleaders from The American School in Japan about how they became cheerleaders.

During the interview of the cheerleaders Richard uses many interrogative questions such as "What do you have to do to become a cheerleader?", "How often do you have to practice?", and "Who is your idol?". He also asks many other questions that interviewers typically ask, giving the students a good example of a question and answer dialogue. Peripherally, it also introduces a little of the culture of an American high school and points out the differences between it and a Japanese high school. In addition, this tape can be used to teach several new words and phrases such as "respect", "admire" and "difficult routine". It can even teach the students a different meaning for "idols" than that of the singers they are used to.

As for reviewing the video, I recommend that you do so right after you have had the students reexchange their papers. This is so that the students can have the immediate reinforcement of watching and/or listening for what they missed the first time. However, due to time limitations you might want to divide the presentation into two days.

When I have done this, I have found that preparing another sheet of questions for the students to answer is helpful. These questions should, I think, be a little easier than those of the day before. I often have used questions that I had asked orally, but had not included on the previous question sheet. I also would recommend some kind of cloze exercise. I do not think that a tape warrants more than two days and I have, in fact, found that the students' resistance to a second day is sometimes overpowering.

Now, I must turn to pronunciation, which many people say is one of the skills which can be taught well in the language laboratory. I have found that the LL does have certain advantages. One of these is the isolation afforded by the head phones and microphones. They allow the student to concentrate on pronunciation unimpeded by the noise of a regular classroom. Also, the microphones seem to have the effect of curing the shy student of the "stage fright" caused by speaking in front of other students. I have found that I can give individual attention to students' pronunciation problems more efficiently than in a regular classroom.

I must admit that I believe that there are many benefits to good pronunciation and that they "...can include absence of distraction from the subject matter in hand, leading to more effective and satisfactory communication".⁵ Although I believe this to be true, I am not willing to spend time on pronunciation that they will not have a chance to use in class. As I have already stated, I do not teach pronunciation by itself, but through the language. This means that I try to make pronunciation drills relevant to the student by using words which appear in the lessons or that have been introduced to them in other

ways. I try to stress certain troublesome sounds, when they occur in the text, and the sound that the students are confusing it with. For example, if the word "see" is presented in a lesson, I will present a drill to help the students with the [sh] and [s] sounds. This is often done in choral repetition with a few students asked to repeat individually.

Another exercise that I often use is, of course, the tongue twister. I know that I am not the first, nor will I be the last, to use them, but I think that even though their use is not original, they can be a useful tool and make the class interesting or even pleasant for the students. I introduce them in a rather usual manner, through choral repetition, calling on a few students to repeat individually, as mentioned previously. However, as this method can soon become tiresome, I have tried to have the students use them in games.

One game which I think has proven useful is a game I call "the message game". In this game I often make a tongue twister the message. To play this game, I usually begin by dividing the class into teams and having them line up. I then have the first person in each line come to the front of the room to receive the "message", which can be either written or spoken or both. Once the "messengers" have been given the message, they are sent back to their teams and verbally deliver it to the second in line and the second to the third, etc. The first team to deliver the "message" to the last member of their team accurately wins. This game is good because it gets the students to help one another with pronunciation. Although this may seem to be like the blind leading the blind, it does have a favorable effect, in that it gets the students talking to one another in English.

Along with pronunciation, I think that I should mention how I treat rhythm and intonation. I realize that both are important for communication and therefore should, I think, receive some laboratory time. The question is how much. Since the students do have a lot of drill and dialogue practice, there is considerable carry-over from the choral repetition of these. Thus the students do not need to devote much time on intonation or rhythm by themselves. The only practice that I do work on is that for the intonational questions. I usually have the students practice changing statements into questions just by using the rising intonation. For example:

- T. This is a coat.
- S. This is a coat.
- T. Box.
- S. This is a box.
- T. Make a question.
- S. This is a box? (with correct intonation, of course)

Also at this time I give the students listening comprehension drills to see if they can understand when I am making a statement or expressing doubt (questioning) about something. In order to do this I pass out answer sheets with "question" and "statement" written next to each number. Then I just read statements with regular or rising intonation while the students mark their sheets accordingly. Afterwards, I let the students exchange their papers for marking as I go over the answers with them, which is, as mentioned previously, always a good review.

I will now address the matter of testing. Bunkyo High School

requires that I give both a midterm and final examination for each of the three terms in the academic year. The language laboratory makes up sixteen percent of the whole English grade. This percentage may seem to be rather small, but I have found that it reflects actual conditions. It is not so large as to intimidate the students, but is large enough to make them realize that the language laboratory is a part of their studies and not a time to play. I think that it is an effective "apple" for the students, giving them some motivation to pay attention in the LL. More importantly, I think it shows the students that the school supports the language laboratory and what is taught in it.

One might argue, as many teachers do, about the validity of tests and how useful they are in judging the abilities or skills of the students in the use of English, and how difficult it is to place a grade on these. My own teaching philosophy runs counter to testing in general, but in practice I have found that tests can be useful tools to grade my own teaching skills.

I think it is far too easy for a teacher, myself included, to say he or she taught something when in fact the students are unable to use or apply that which supposedly was taught. A well-designed test can, in my opinion, help the teacher to find out how well the material he presented has been learned or how well he has actually taught. At the very least, a good test can point out the areas that need more practice or review, and areas that seem to have been mastered. It is in this spirit that I make my tests and view their results.

The subject of grading language skills is even more controversial than that of testing. Many people think that it is like grading a person on how fast he runs the hundred-yard dash or paints "Starry Night".

And just as we can not all be Carl Lewises or Van Goughs, neither can we all learn a language with the same ease and fluency. Therefore, it is very difficult for me to give grades, but just as a fine arts teacher must give a grade in the high school situation, so do I. I can, however, find many benefits to giving grades. They do, as I have mentioned before, give the student an "apple", a clear and concrete goal to aim for. This is especially necessary with high school students for whom abstract goals are rather difficult to understand.

Perhaps the best way to solve the problem is to give some grades for doing classroom work or homework; that is, for doing it and not for quality. This would allow the students to get points just for trying and not be penalized by their lack of ability. This would benefit the students in two ways; it would reduce the pressure on them to perform well on the test, and at the same time encourage them to do the studying necessary to improve their English. I do give some points for class work, but I give more weight to the test, in order to make the students try a little harder.

Having thus explained my testing philosophy, let me turn to the test itself. Since testing for oral comprehension would be impossible, given the number of students, I decided to use a listening comprehension test in a multiple-choice format. My tests are usually divided into three sections. The first section tests the students' ability to distinguish the sounds that we have gone over in class. For example, the sounds of [s] and [sh] could be tested by me giving three cue words like, "sham", "sam", and "sham". The students would mark their answer sheets "A", "B", "C" or "D". The students, having been told to mark their papers according to the order in which they hear them,

would mark the second letter or "B". If they thought that they were all the same, they would mark "D".

The second section of the test was designed with a verbal cue and a written answer. The first half of the section would have questions which the students would listen to and mark the correct response. The other half of the section would have an answer for the cue, and the students would have to choose the correct question for it. Here are some examples:

Ex. 1 Oral cue: How was the movie?

- Answer sheet:
- A. It is fine.
 - B. Why did they go?
 - C. Where did they go?
 - D. None of the above.

Ex. 2 Oral cue: They went to the beach.

- Answer sheet:
- A. Did they go to the beach?
 - B. Why did they go to the beach?
 - C. Where did they go?
 - D. None of the above.

In example one the students would, of course, mark letter "D", and letter "C" in example two.

The third section of the test is a story section. In this section I read a short story which I have selected or written for their level. After I have read the story to the students (once or twice depending on the degree of difficulty), I ask several questions and they must mark their papers "A", "B", "C", or "D". This section is the most difficult section, but I think it is the most valuable because it tests the students' ability to absorb verbal communication and respond to questions based on it

correctly. This has proven to be a very good way to test the students on tag questions and interrogative questions.

I recognize that this kind of testing has many drawbacks, such as its extreme emphasis on listening comprehension, reading and grammar. I think, however, it is valid because I design the test to the students' listening level and only use grammatical structures which I have introduced in the class.

In my one and a half years at Bunkyo I have come to the conclusion that the language laboratory can be a valuable and vital part of the students English experience. The LL allows the teacher to isolate students and work on their individual problems while at the same time leaving the other students free to practice. This makes it easier to teach a large group of students in a limited amount of time. It also can be very interesting for the students because of its flexibility.

It is because of these factors that I think it is arguably the best position for a foreigner at the high school level. I did not find that the LL restricted my methods; contrarily, it seemed to complement them. If one keeps an open mind and uses his or hers creativity, the LL can be a challenging and rewarding experience for both students and teachers.

Footnotes

1. Richard S. Epting and J. Donald Bowen, "The Language Lab For Teaching Listening Comprehension and Related Skills", *Teaching English as Second or Foreign Language*, ed. Marianne Celce-Murcia and Lois McIntosh (Rowley: Newbury House, 1979) p.74

2. Ibid. p. 75.

3. *Elementary LL English Course*(Tokyo: Taishukan Press, 1974)

p. 11.

4. Frances Mcknight, "Video and English Language Teaching in Britain", *Video Application in English Language Teaching*, ed John McGovern (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1983) p. 2.

5. Peter MacCarthy, *The Teaching of Pronunciation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978) p. 9