

Linguistic Society of America

Language and Bilingualism: More Tests of Tests by John W. Oller,; Steve Chesarek; Robert Scott

Review by: Antony John Kunnan

Language, Vol. 70, No. 1 (Mar., 1994), p. 216

Published by: [Linguistic Society of America](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/416781>

Accessed: 03/05/2014 04:22

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Linguistic Society of America is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Language*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

for many other data' (87). Except for M's claim that 'the TEXT is the focal point for analysis' (135), her approach has strong affinities with the 'human linguistics' of Victor H. Yngve (e.g. *Linguistics as a science*, Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1986:47), which focuses on 'COMMUNICATING INDIVIDUALS and their properties' [in both cases, emphasis added].

Appendices provide a detailed description of data collection procedures (157–61) and floor plans showing the site (162–63). A list of references (167–76) and separate author (177–78) and subject (179–80) indices are also included. Like many books which began as Ph.D. dissertations, this one shows some weaknesses in these latter areas. Although the book was published in 1991, only twelve of the references come after 1985 (the year the field work was completed)—and four of these refer to M's own work. As a result, numerous relevant and important sources are excluded (e.g. John M. Swales' *Genre analysis: English in research and academic settings*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990). In addition, the subject index underdifferentiates some major headings; for instance, 'e-mail' has 23 page-number references, and 'e-messages' has 18. Since the book is not intended as a general overview, however, these are not serious flaws. [DOUGLAS W. COLEMAN, *The University of Toledo*.]

Language and bilingualism: More tests of tests. By JOHN W. OLLER, JR., with STEVE CHESAREK and ROBERT SCOTT. Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 1991. Pp. xiii, 175. Cloth \$29.50.

As a sequel to *Language in education: Testing the tests*, by John Oller & Kyle Perkins (Newbury House, 1978), and *Issues in language testing research*, by John Oller (Newbury House, 1983), this volume attempts to address an important question left unresolved earlier: 'What part does language proficiency play in education in general, and, more particularly, in educational or other mental tests?' (3). O proposes that semiosis or representation of language (in the broad sense) integrates linguistic, kinesic, and sensory-motor systems, and he provides three sources of evidence: general theoretical considerations (Ch. 2), biological ar-

guments (Ch. 3), and logical analysis of intelligence test items (Ch. 4). In Ch. 2 he argues strongly that 'intelligence is the capacity for semiosis or representation' (30), and he continues with illustrations from DNA studies. In Ch. 4 he presents a content analysis of some nonverbal and verbal IQ tests which show that the solution to both kinds of IQ test 'is dependent on the utilization of propositional meanings of considerable capacity' (59).

Several empirical studies of language tests conducted since the 1970s that deal with the validity question make up the rest of the book. Studies of competencies of monolinguals at the secondary level (Ch. 5), English proficiency of adult ESL students (Ch. 6), and nonverbal intelligence and English proficiency of adult ESL students (Ch. 7) provide some evidence that there is usually an underlying general factor or general linguistic ability that is responsible for a proportion of the variance. Chs. 8–12 present studies of test performance of Crow, Hopi, Navajo, Choctaw, and Spanish bilinguals and ESL learners, from kindergarten through Grade 9, on ESL and verbal and nonverbal IQ tests. Using principal factor analysis (instead of principal components analysis, which tends to inflate the 'g' factor), O attempts to show that 'deep language or semiotic capacities ... figure largely in all of the tests' (123). Though statistically there is evidence to support this hypothesis, there is no way of knowing conclusively whether this is an artifact of exploratory factor analysis, whether the same findings would be borne out in structural equation modeling (or confirmatory factor analysis) or with different samples (such as bilinguals from other countries) and different tests, or whether this is in fact the reality.

Overall, though O makes a strong theoretical case drawing on research from biology, education, linguistics, philosophy, and psychology, the results of the studies are not interpreted to clearly support his claims. Instead, the somewhat weak interpretations of factor-analysis results in most of the studies diminish the value of the findings. Another weakness is a too-brief and ill-advised section on statistical concepts in Ch. 5; it would have been better to expand this section and place it in an appendix. To conclude, though O is not able to show empirically that intelligence is a kind of semiotic or representational capacity, he has nevertheless made an admirable start on a monumental task. [ANTHONY JOHN KUNNAN, *California State University, Los Angeles*.]