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In this Issue

- Articles in this issue of the TESOL Quarterly examine the implications of classroom practices and policies. The lead article questions the “English-only” policy in many of our classrooms, while the article that follows explores the actual language processes (sometimes trilingual) reported by students when required to produce speech acts. The third article explores the negative implications of traditional writing activities for deaf students. In contrast, the fourth reports giving second language students authentic writing activities addressed to real audiences. The last paper addresses issues of syllabus design.

- Elsa Auerbach questions the “English-only” policy in many of our classrooms. In her words, “Although the exclusive use of English in teaching ESL has come to be seen as a natural and commonsense practice which can be justified on pedagogical grounds, this article argues that it is rooted in a particular ideological perspective, rests on unexamined assumptions, and serves to reinforce inequities in the broader social order.” Auerbach presents evidence that the use of the first language in classrooms can facilitate second language learning.

- In their exploration of the actual processes used by learners to produce speech acts, Cohen and Olshtain’s article provides a stimulating counterpoint to Auerbach’s. Using retrospective reports of role plays, their study investigates the processes used by nonnative speakers to execute apologies, complaints, and requests. Speakers often thought in two languages (sometimes in three) and used a series of strategies to search for language forms. The authors discuss research and teaching implications; among the latter is the fact that some speaking tasks make far greater demands on learners than do others.
Like Auerbach, John Albertini seeks to uncover assumptions operating in the classroom. His research uses recollections of writing activities by deaf students in the U.S. and Germany. He argues that the reported activities represent “a narrow conception of literacy and inaccurate assumptions about language learning.” His discussion addresses two current educational reform movements: back to basics and social constructivism (which stresses the social context of language teaching and use). The paper argues that the former perpetuates inaccurate assumptions about language learning.

Ann Johns studies the writing practices of successful nonnative-speaking grant writers. In the context of the literature on audience and argumentation, she explores how responding to real audiences can produce successful texts. She describes her efforts as a teacher/researcher to provide her students with authentic writing contexts.

As do other authors in this issue, Rod Ellis focuses on the learner as he “examines the case for a structural syllabus in the light of second language acquisition research.” He argues that such a syllabus cannot serve as a basis for developing implicit knowledge of the language because the manner in which structural properties are taught often does not correspond to the way learners acquire them. Rather, Ellis envisions a role of intake facilitation for the structural syllabus, causing learners to pay attention to specific formal features. A structural syllabus, he argues, can serve to develop learners’ explicit knowledge. The structural syllabus, then, has a significant role but would need to be used with a meaning-based, communicative syllabus.

Also in this issue:


• Book Notices: Learner strategies are the focus of this issue’s Book Notices section, for which Marianne Celce-Murcia has been the guest editor.

• Brief Reports and Summaries: Toni Griego Jones surveys language attitudes and perceptions of personnel in bilingual early childhood centers; her findings have been used to develop recommendations for teacher training and have resulted in a collaboration between the centers and the local university. Gayle Nelson and John Murphy’s study of videotaped peer response writing groups identifies some contexts (e.g., cooperative interaction) in which student writers are more likely to use peer responses in revising.

• The Forum: Cynthia Nelson explores seven common reactions in “Heterosexism in ESL: Examining our Attitudes”; Rosalie Pedalino
Porter reacts to comments on her book, Forked Tongue: The Politics of Bilingual Education; the reviewer and commentator respond. In the subsection Research Issues, Margaret DuFon and Fred Davidson comment on ethics in TESOL research.

Sandra Silberstein
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Despite widespread opposition to the English Only movement, support for bilingual education, and advocacy for language rights, many U.S. ESL educators continue to uphold the notion that English is the only acceptable medium of communication within the confines of the ESL classroom. Although the exclusive use of English in teaching ESL has come to be seen as a natural and commonsense practice which can be justified on pedagogical grounds, this article argues that it is rooted in a particular ideological perspective, rests on unexamined assumptions, and serves to reinforce inequities in the broader social order. Evidence from research and practice is presented which suggests that the rationale used to justify English only in the classroom is neither conclusive nor pedagogically sound. Further, the article details a growing body of evidence indicating that L1 and/or bilingual options are not only effective but necessary for adult ESL students with limited L1 literacy or schooling and that use of students’ linguistic resources can be beneficial at all levels of ESL. Accounts from a number of projects, including two with which the author has been involved, document a range of uses for the native language in both initial literacy and ESL instruction for adults. Finally, because the issue of language choice is so intimately linked with issues of power, the article calls for reconceptualizing the notion of expertise to legitimate the knowledge and experience of nontraditional experts from the communities of the learners.

To me, the whole Rodney King case and the rioting proved that there is no American dream of opportunity for people of color,” said Jesus Vargas, 17, a high school dropout enrolled in a job training program in East Los Angeles.

We are treated like garbage. I kept getting suspended because when I spoke Spanish with my home boys, the teachers thought I was disrespecting them. They kept telling me to speak in English because I was in America. I wasn’t going to take that. . . . So I left and never went back. Some of those teachers don’t want us. That hurts, that really hurts. (Ribadeneira, 1992, p. 7)
As a field, we face an unwitting yet pervasive schizophrenia. On the one hand, we like to see ourselves above or beyond the kind of practices described by Vargas in the epigraph, taken from the Boston Globe. Although some ESL educators support and have organizational ties to the English Only movement, many others advocate language rights and bilingual education, decry linguistic repression, and oppose the political agenda of U.S. English (see, e.g., Judd, 1987). The TESOL organization itself has passed a language rights resolution (TESOL, 1987) supporting “measures which protect the right of all individuals to preserve and foster their linguistic and cultural origins . . . [and opposing] all measures declaring English the official language of the United States of America . . . .” More recently, it has issued a statement opposing discrimination in hiring based on language of origin (TESOL, 1992).

On the other hand, within the confines of the ESL classroom, many of those who may oppose the English Only movement on a policy level insist that their students use English as the sole medium of communication; teachers devise elaborate games, signals, and penalty systems to ensure that students do not use their L1 and justify these practices with the claim that use of the L1 will impede progress in the acquisition of English. Even official TESOL publications lend support to this view with the publication of articles like a recent one (Weinberg, 1990) extolling the virtues of fining students for using their L1. The author humorously tells her students, “This is an English-only classroom. If you speak Spanish or Cantonese or Mandarin or Vietnamese or Russian or Farsi, you pay me 25 cents. I can be rich” (p. 5). The axiom underlying these practices, assumed to be self-evident, seems to be that English and English only should be used in the ESL classroom.

To the extent that this axiom is widely accepted among ESL educators, it needs to be reexamined. Whereas the political agenda of the English Only movement may seem obvious on a macrolevel, the ways in which our own practices reinforce this agenda on a microlevel are less visible, and yet, as Vargas says, what happens inside and outside the classroom are two sides of the same coin. Whether or not we support the use of learners’ L1s is not just a pedagogical matter: It is a political one, and the way that we address it in ESL instruction is both a mirror of and a rehearsal for relations of power in the broader society.

SITUATING COMMONSENSE PRACTICES IN AN IDEOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Power, according to Fairclough (1989), is exercised by the dominant groups in two main ways: through coercion (the use of force) or
through consent (willing acquiescence). Consent, however, is not always the result of conscious choice; rather, it comes about through the unconscious acceptance of institutional practices:

Institutional practices which people draw upon without thinking often embody assumptions which directly or indirectly legitimize existing power relations. Practices can often be shown to originate in the dominant class or the dominant bloc, and to have become naturalized. (p. 33)

In other words, practices which are unconsciously accepted as the natural and inevitable way of doing things may in fact be inherently political, serving to maintain the relative position of participants with respect to each other—they help to perpetuate existing power relations. These everyday, taken-for-granted practices constitute what Fairclough calls ideological power, one of the central mechanisms of ensuring control by consent. He argues that language has a particularly important role in exercising this control: Authority and power are manifested by institutional practices around language use.

Several recent analyses document the ways that language policies in general, and policies around the imposition of English in particular, function as tools of domination and subordination on a global level. Tollefson (1991) argues that language policies are a central mechanism in ensuring that vast numbers of people will be unable to acquire the kinds of language competence required by modern social and economic systems. As he says, “Language is one criterion for determining which people will complete different levels of education. In this way, language is a means for rationing access to jobs with high salaries” (pp. 8–9), thus creating unequal social and economic relationships. Skutnabb-Kangas (1988) calls this type of control linguicism and defines it as “ideologies and structures which are used to legitimate, effectuate, and reproduce an unequal division of power and resources (both material and nonmaterial) between groups which are defined on the basis of language” (p. 13). Phillipson (1988, 1992) situates linguicism within a broader theory of linguistic imperialism, arguing that English linguistic imperialism (in which “the dominance of English is asserted and maintained by the establishment and continuous reconstitution of structural and cultural inequalities between English and other languages” (1992, p. 47)) has come to be a primary tool of postcolonial strategy: “Whereas once Britannia ruled the waves, now it is English which rules them” (1992, p. 1).

Whereas the mechanisms of ideological control exercised through language policy have been examined extensively on a global level, they have been less fully explored on the level of day-to-day interactions between teachers and learners. What I want to show in this paper is that the insistence on using only English in the classroom represents
precisely the kind of taken-for-granted and naturalized everyday practice which Fairclough discusses: Although it has come to be justified in pedagogical terms, it rests on unexamined assumptions, originates in the political agenda of the dominant groups, and serves to reinforce existing relations of power. Precisely because its mechanisms are hidden, it is a prime example of Fairclough's notion of covert ideological control. This paper, thus, is meant not as an attack on those who advocate the monolingual use of English, but rather as an invitation to reexamine these practices in light of their often invisible ideological roots, their pedagogical effectiveness, and their implications for the ESL profession as a whole.

HISTORICAL ROOTS OF ENGLISH-ONLY INSTRUCTION

Historical accounts of language education in the U.S. show that monolingual approaches to the teaching of English have by no means always been the norm (Baron, 1990; Crawford, 1991; Daniels, 1990); rather, there have been cyclical fluctuations in policy often determined by political rather than pedagogical factors. In the 19th century, for example, the decentralized and locally controlled nature of public schooling allowed for bilingual education in accordance with the political power of particular ethnic groups. It was the resurgence of nativism and antiforeign political sentiment in the late 19th century that signaled the decline of bilingual education. The advent of World War I, the increase in immigration from Southern and Eastern Europe, and the growing role of immigrants in the labor movement contributed to an increasingly xenophobia atmosphere in the early 20th century; “foreign influence” was blamed for the nation’s political and economic problems and the Americanization movement was promoted as a means of countering this influence. ESL instruction became a vehicle to enhance loyalty both to the company and the country, with companies like the Ford Motor Company requiring employees to attend Americanization classes (Crawford, 1991, p. 22). English was associated with patriotism—speaking “good” English was equated with being a “good” American (Baron, 1990, p. 155). Children were encouraged to profess language loyalty through oaths such as one that began as follows:

I love the United States of America. I love my country’s flag. I love my country’s language. I promise:
1. That I will not dishonor my country’s speech by leaving off the last syllables of words.
2. That I will say a good American “yes” and “no” in place of an Indian grunt “um-hum” and “nup-um” or a foreign “ya” or “yeh and “nope.”
(Robbins, 1918, p. 175, cited in Baron, 1990, p. 155)

According to Baron, the spread of ESL instruction in the first quarter of the 20th century was a direct outcome of the Americanization movement; it was at this time that direct methods stressing oral English gained favor over methods which allowed the use of the students’ native language, and English only became the norm in ESL classes. In the early 1920s, Henry Goldberger developed an approach to adult ESL instruction which focused on teaching practical English including lessons on opening bank accounts, visiting the doctor, making purchases, asking directions, and showing gratitude. He recommended that English be the sole medium of instruction, and, in grouping students, “warned teachers to prevent the formation of ‘national cliques’ which would delay the work of Americanization” (Baron, 1990, p. 160).

Hand in hand with instructional approaches designed to promote U.S. values were formalized gate-keeping practices designed to exclude foreigners from the ranks of the teaching profession: Speech tests were instituted, and those who failed the pronunciation sections were denied licenses. Many states passed laws requiring teachers to be citizens. According to Baron (1990), country of origin and native language were more important for teaching ESL than training: “As a result of these efforts to homogenize the language of the teaching corps, schoolteachers remained by and large monolingual English speakers untrained in any methodology to teach English to non-anglophones and unable to empathize with the non-anglophone student” (p. 162).

Although this is not the place to proceed with a detailed account of the subsequent development of ESL methodologies, I present this slice of history to show that practices we take for granted as being pedagogically grounded have antecedents in overtly ideological tendencies. Much of the discourse from the Americanization period is mirrored in the discourse of present-day “innovative” approaches which focus on survival English in an English-only classroom, with the notable difference that, at that time, the political agenda was more explicit.

Phillipson argues that more recent global roots of commonly held assumptions about English language teaching (ELT) can be traced to British neocolonial policies. He claims that the development of ELT as a profession was itself a direct response to a political imperative. English was seen to be a key component of the infrastructure required for the spread of British neocolonial control and, as such, there was a vast infusion of funding to support the development of ELT in the late 1950s and early 1960s. A conference held at Makere University in
Uganda in 1961 articulated this relationship of dominance and dependence between the developed and developing countries through the ways ELT expertise was to be shared and disseminated. Five basic tenets emerged from this conference which, according to Phillipson (1992), became an unofficial and yet unchallenged doctrine underlying much ELT work. These tenets are:

- English is best taught monolingually.
- The ideal teacher of English is a native speaker.
- The earlier English is taught, the better the results.
- The more English is taught, the better the results.
- If other languages are used too much, standards of English will drop. (p. 185)

Phillipson argues that these tenets have become the cornerstones of the hegemony of English worldwide. Thus, although the roots of monolingual approaches to ESL have been largely obscured, and despite the fact that they are based on arguments which have been challenged by research, they have come to be seen as natural and commonsense.

**COMMONSENSE ASSUMPTIONS AND TAKEN-FOR-GRAANTED PRACTICES**

To investigate the extent to which these same tenets underlie current attitudes among ESL educators in the U.S., I recently passed out a brief survey at a statewide TESOL conference asking, Do you believe that ESL students should be allowed to use their L1 in the ESL classroom? Only 20% of the respondents gave an unqualified yes to the question; 30% gave an unqualified no, (with comments such as, “It’s a school policy” and “No . . . but it’s hard”); the remaining 50% said sometimes (with comments such as: “Usually not, but if I have tried several times to explain something in English and a student still doesn’t understand, then I allow another student who speaks the same language to explain in that language”; “They’re going to do it anyway”; “As a last resort”). The essence of these comments is captured by the following response: “In general ESL students should be encouraged to use English as much as possible, but in reality this doesn’t always work.” Thus, despite the fact that 80% of the teachers allowed the use of the L1 at times, the English-only axiom is so strong that they didn’t trust their own practice: They assigned a negative value to “lapses” into the L1, seeing them as failures or aberrations, a cause for guilt.

The rationale for this view is often framed in pedagogical terms: The more students are exposed to English, the more quickly they will learn; as they hear and use English, they will internalize it and begin
to think in English; the only way they will learn it is if they are forced to use it. There seems to be an all-or-nothing view: Because the grammar-translation method has been widely discredited and concurrent translation (immediate translation of what is said in the target language into the L1) shown to be ineffective (Legaretta 1979), no alternative except the complete exclusion of the L1 in the ESL classroom is seen as valid.

**EVIDENCE AGAINST ENGLISH ONLY IN THE CLASSROOM**

Evidence from both research and practice, however, suggests that the rationale used to justify English only in the classroom is neither conclusive nor pedagogically sound. Although there is extensive and widely accepted research supporting bilingual education for children (e.g., Ramirez, Pasta, Yuen, Billings, & Ramey, 1991; Snow, 1990), the relevance of these findings for either ESL instruction or the language education of adults is rarely examined. Bilingual education and ESL are seen to be separate beasts with different underlying assumptions. Even those who fully support bilingual education often justify their own practices within the confines of the ESL classroom with reference (either implicit or explicit) to studies of children who have become bilingual through immersion programs. Yet, as Irujo (1991) shows, claims for the relevance of the immersion model for ESL must be qualified. First, many of the immersion programs used to justify monolingual ESL instruction are in fact bilingual to the extent that students are initially allowed to use their L1 to communicate with each other and the teacher; the teacher understands the learners’ language even if s/he doesn’t produce it. A recent study of effective instructional practices for linguistically and culturally diverse students (Garcia, 1991) found that precisely this practice characterized the classrooms of academically successful learners: “In classes with Spanish speakers, lower grade teachers used both Spanish and English, whereas upper grade teachers utilized mostly English. However, students were allowed to use either language” (p. 4). Allowing the use of the L1 in early ESL acquisition was critical to later success; use of both languages facilitated the transition to English.

Further evidence suggests that strong initial literacy is a key factor in successful second language acquisition and academic success (Cummins, 1981). Whereas research indicates that immersion programs can be effective in the development of language and literacy for learners from dominant language groups, whose L1 is valued and supported both at home and in the broader society, bilingual instruction seems to be more effective for language minority students, whose language has
less social status (Tucker, 1980). This finding clearly indicates that relations of power and their affective consequences are integral to language acquisition. Acquiring a second language is to some extent contingent on the societally determined value attributed to the L1, which can be either reinforced or challenged inside the classroom. As Phillipson (1992) says, “The ethos of monolingualism implies the rejection of the experiences of other languages, meaning the exclusion of the child’s most intense existential experience” (p. 189). Prohibiting the native language within the context of ESL instruction may impede language acquisition precisely because it mirrors disempowering relations.

Rivera (1988, 1990) argues that the underlying rationale for bilingual education for children applies equally to language minority adults. Yet implications of these findings for adult education have, until quite recently, been virtually ignored. Despite the fact that a growing percentage of students in adult ESL classes come from precisely the groups shown to benefit most from a bilingual approach—subordinated minority language groups and those with limited L1 literacy backgrounds—relatively few programs nationwide provide native language literacy or bilingual adult ESL instruction for adults. A survey of programs offering literacy instruction to linguistic minority adults and out-of-school youth conducted by the National Clearinghouse for Literacy Education (NCLE) indicated that only 68 of the almost 600 programs who returned the questionnaire offer classes in learners’ native languages; of these, all but 10 have been started since 1980 (Gillespie, 1991).

Although research on adult biliteracy has increased in the past decade (see, e.g., Spener, in press), much of it focuses on ethnographic descriptions of literacy practices in the home, community, and workplace rather than on issues of acquisition and their educational implications. The NCLE survey was able to identify only two research studies (Robson’s 1982 study of Hmong refugees in Thailand and Burtoff’s 1985 study of Haitian Creole speakers in New York City) investigating the effectiveness of initial native-language literacy for adult students. Although both of these studies point toward “the beneficial effect of initial literacy in the native language on subsequent oral and written English language proficiency (Gillespie, 1991, p. 2),” there has been little research to follow up on these preliminary findings. Thus, until further research is undertaken, we need to look to accounts from practice and to related (but perhaps less direct) research to ascertain the effectiveness of native language and bilingual approaches to adult ESL.

In the remainder of this article, I will supplement research data with published and unpublished accounts from both practitioners and
learners, including evidence emerging from my own work at the University of Massachusetts/Boston in two adult literacy training projects. The first of these, the Student Literacy Corps project, trained undergraduate ESL students as tutors and placed them in community-based adult literacy programs where they worked with learners from their own language groups. The second, the Bilingual Community Literacy Training Project, a collaboration between the University of Massachusetts and three community-based adult literacy centers (the Jackson-Mann Community School, East Boston Harborside Community Center, and the Haitian Multi-Service Center), trained people from the communities of the learners to teach ESL, Spanish, and Haitian Creole literacy, respectively.

Perhaps the strongest evidence against monolingual adult ESL comes from examining what actually happens when this approach is enforced in the ESL classroom. Very often, English and literacy skills are not differentiated in intake assessment and placement. Literacy is equated with English literacy, and English proficiency is equated with oral English proficiency (Wiley, 1990–91). The result is that students with little L1 literacy background are grouped with those who are literate in their L1 but have beginning oral ESL proficiency. For those with little L1 literacy background and schooling, the effect is often to completely preclude participation and progress, causing the “revolving door syndrome” in which students start a course, fail, start again, and eventually give up (Strei, 1992). Community-based programs like Casa Azatlan in Chicago report that the majority of students who drop out of ESL classes are precisely those who are unable to read and write in their L1 (1985 survey reported in Gillespie & Ballering, 1992). In one of the University of Massachusetts projects, students with minimal L1 literacy in monolingual ESL classes often told their bilingual tutors that they had no idea what was going on in class: “I am always lost. I waste my time.” Similarly, Klassen’s (1991) ethnographic study in Toronto’s Spanish-speaking community found that monolingual ESL classes were virtually inaccessible to the beginning-literate Spanish speakers. Despite their lack of Spanish literacy, the people he interviewed were able to manage in virtually every domain of their lives except in the ESL classroom; there, they reported becoming completely silenced, making virtually no progress, or dropping out:

Angela . . . said that she had never gone back to an ESL class she once started because the teacher embarrassed her by asking her about things she had never learned before. Maria and Doña Lucia described spending their time in class “drawing” letters and words they could not understand while everyone else read the words and learned. Maria said she left class knowing no more than when she first came. . . . Pedro and Rebecca both said that, because they did not “know Spanish” (meaning that they did not know
Moreover, the people Klassen interviewed reported a strong sense of exclusion in their English classes. Two of them “experienced the classroom as a place where teachers isolated them from other students” (p. 53), a response perhaps based on teachers’ own sense of frustration at being unable to communicate or being forced to reduce lesson content to the most elementary, childlike uses of language. The students’ sense of exclusion within the class was compounded by the fact that it led to exclusion in the outside world as well: The lack of Spanish literacy was an obstacle to participating in the higher level ESL courses required for entry into job training programs, which, in turn, limited their employment possibilities.

Thus, the result of monolingual ESL instruction for students with minimal L1 literacy and schooling is often that, whether or not they drop out, they suffer severe consequences in terms of self-esteem; their sense of powerlessness is reinforced either because they are de facto excluded from the classroom or because their life experiences and language resources are excluded. This, in turn, has consequences for their lives outside the classroom, limiting job possibilities and perpetuating their marginalization. Given the fact that monolingual ESL classes virtually assure that minimally literate language minority adults will be excluded from access to English and all but the most menial employment, one has to wonder why federal and state funding for bilingual and native language models is so limited; perhaps, as Fairclough would suggest, this lack of funding exemplifies how the dominant groups maintain their status through institutional practices.

EVIDENCE SUPPORTING USE OF THE NATIVE LANGUAGE

On the flip side, when the native language is used, practitioners, researchers, and learners consistently report positive results. Rivera (1990) outlines various models for incorporating the L1 into instruction, including initial literacy in the L1 (with or without simultaneous but separate ESL classes) and bilingual instruction (where both languages are utilized within one class). The first benefit of such programs at the beginning levels is that they attract previously unserved students—students who had been unable to participate in ESL classes because of limited L1 literacy and schooling. For example, because Creole literacy is now being offered, Boston’s Haitian Multi-Service Center reports that former students who had dropped out are re-
turning. Teachers at Centro Presente, a bilingual program for Central Americans in Cambridge, Massachusetts, report that current students often say they dropped out of monolingual ESL classes in the past because they felt intimidated. The data from this community-based native language literacy program were gathered through interviews with teachers and administrators unless otherwise indicated.

A second benefit of using the L1 is that it reduces affective barriers to English acquisition and allows for more rapid progress to or in ESL. Hemmendinger (1987) likewise found that a bilingual approach to initial ESL for nonliterate and nonschooled Hmong refugees was more effective than monolingual approaches had been; although students made almost no progress in 2 to 3 years of monolingual survival ESL classes, once a bilingual, problem-posing approach was introduced, progress was rapid. She attributes this in part to the fact that the bilingual approach allowed for language and culture shock to be alleviated. Similarly, in a study designed to investigate the effectiveness of using “pedagogically unsophisticated” bilingual tutors to teach nonliterate Cambodians, D’Annunzio (1991) reports that the students made rapid gains in ESL. Despite a relatively short total instructional time, highly significant results were attained in speaking, reading, and vocabulary as indicated by pre- and posttest scores on a number of standardized tests, portfolio analysis, and ongoing informal assessment. Strei (1992) reports that a pilot native-language literacy program for Haitians in Palm Beach County resulted in the dramatic increase of their retention rate once they enrolled in ESL classes. The drop-out rate decreased from 85% prior to the program to only 10% after it was started.

Further, contrary to the claim that use of the L1 will slow the transition to and impede the development of thinking in English, numerous accounts suggest that it may actually facilitate this process. Shamash (1990), for example, describes an approach to teaching ESL used at the Invergarry Learning Center near Vancouver which might be considered heretical by some: Students start by writing about their lives in their L1 or a mixture of their L1 and English; this text is then translated into English with the help of bilingual tutors or learners and, as such, provides “a natural bridge for overcoming problems of vocabulary, sentence structure and language confidence” (p. 72). At a certain point in the learning process, according to Shamash, the learner is willing to experiment and take risks with English. Thus, starting with the L1 provides a sense of security and validates the learners’ lived experiences, allowing them to express themselves “while at the same time providing meaningful written material to work with” (p. 75).

Similarly, teachers at Centro Presente report that use of the L1 naturally gives way to increasing use of English. Their students often say, “I can’t say this in English, but I really want to say it”; once they
have expressed their ideas in Spanish, the group helps them express them in English. Centro Presente teachers argue that since students don’t start by thinking in the second language, allowing for the exploration of ideas in the L1 supports a gradual, developmental process in which use of the L1 drops off naturally as it becomes less necessary. Likewise, Strohmeyer and McGrail (1988) found that allowing for the exploration of ideas in the L1 served to enhance students’ ESL writing. When students were given the choice of writing first in Spanish, they went on to write pieces in English that were considerably more developed than their usual ESL writing. These findings from practice are supported by García’s (1991) more formal research on effective instructional practices which found that (a) academically successful students made the transition from Spanish to English without any pressure from teachers; and (b) they were able to progress systematically from writing in the native language in initial literacy to writing in English later.

These findings concerning use of the L1 are congruent with current theories of second language acquisition. They show that its use reduces anxiety and enhances the affective environment for learning, takes into account sociocultural factors, facilitates incorporation of learners’ life experiences, and allows for learner-centered curriculum development. Most importantly, it allows for language to be used as a meaning-making tool and for language learning to become a means of communicating ideas rather than an end in itself. As such, according to Piasecka (1986),

... teaching bilingually does not mean a return to the Grammar Translation method, but rather a standpoint which accepts that the thinking, feeling, and artistic life of a person is very much rooted in their mother tongue. If the communicative approach is to live up to its name, then there are many occasions in which the original impulse to speak can only be found in the mother tongue. At the initial stages of learning a new language, the students’ repertoire is limited to those few utterances already learnt and they must constantly think before speaking. When having a conversation, we often become fully aware of what we actually mean only after speaking. We need to speak in order to sort out our ideas, and when learning a new language this is often best done through the mother tongue. (p. 97)

USES OF THE L1 BEYOND BEGINNING LEVELS

Even those who acknowledge the usefulness of a bilingual approach to beginning ESL acquisition often find it counterproductive beyond the very beginning stages, arguing that overreliance on the L1 will interfere with ESL acquisition. However, evidence from both research
and practice again suggests that the L1 may be a potential resource rather than an obstacle. On the research side, for example, a recent study by Osburne and Harss-Covaleski (1991) suggests that the widely frowned upon practice of writing first in the L1 and then translating into the L2 is not detrimental to the quality of the written product. They cite the conventional wisdom that students should be discouraged from translating as this will “cause them to make more errors, result in rhetorically inappropriate texts, and distract them from thinking in English—and that all these factors would negatively affect the quality of their writing” (p. 5). To investigate the validity of this claim, they compared ESL compositions written directly in English with others written first in the L1 and then translated into English; their results indicated no significant difference in the quality or quantity of the written products. They conclude, “It seems then that there is no need for teachers to become overly anxious if students choose to employ translation as a composing strategy at times” (p. 15). Friedlander (1990) cites numerous other studies reporting the beneficial effects of using the L1 for L2 composing; his own study provides further support for L1 use in planning ESL writing when knowledge of the topic has been acquired in the L1.

Although practitioners rarely advocate the nondiscriminate use of the L1, they do report finding the selective and targeted integration of the L1 useful; accounts from practice identify a multiplicity of clearly delineated functions for such use. Piasecka (1988), for example includes the following in her list of “possible occasions for using mother tongue” (pp. 98-99): negotiation of the syllabus and the lesson; record-keeping; classroom management; scene setting; language analysis; presentation of rules governing grammar, phonology, morphology, and spelling; discussion of cross-cultural issues; instructions or prompts; explanations of errors; and assessment of comprehension. Collingham (1988) concurs with many of these uses, adding the following: to develop ideas as a precursor to expressing them in the L2; to reduce inhibitions or affective blocks to L2 production; to elicit language and discourse strategies for particular situations; to provide explanations of grammar and language functions; and to teach vocabulary. G. Dove (personal communication, 1992) sees L1 use as a way to value cultural diversity as students teach each other vocabulary or expressions in their own languages.

Osburne (1986) describes an instructional strategy in which students are invited to reflect on their own L1 writing attitudes and practices; compare these with those of other ESL writers; write a composition in the L1; analyze their L1 writing processes, strategies, and strengths based on this composition; and discuss implications for writing in English. In this case, the L1 is utilized to develop metacognitive aware-
ness of the writing process; as students identify similarities between themselves as writers in their native languages and in English, they approach composing in English with more confidence. Brucker (1992) describes using the L1 as a tool for initial assessment, to identify student needs and goals. She writes:

I encouraged the students to answer this evaluation in Spanish. Although I don’t read Spanish well, I can always find a staff person or another teacher to translate for me. This extra step is worth my time because students can give me “true,” that is to say, more accurate and more complete answers, using their first language. They feel freer to express themselves and let me know what they want. It also gives me a sense of the students’ native language competency. This is important in order for me to understand where students are starting. (p. 37)

There are two revealing aspects of the studies and programs described here which reinforce the notion that the question of language choice is, in essence, a question of ideology. The first is the fact that many of those who advocate native language or bilingual approaches to adult ESL do so because they see language acquisition as intimately connected with addressing the problems learners face in their lives outside the classroom. Hemmendinger (1987), for example, identified use of the L1 as critical in implementing an empowering approach to ESL in her classes because it allowed students to discuss vital issues in their lives which they were then able to address in English. As she says, “The class members thus still learned new language they needed, but more important, they used that language to attempt to solve problems, such as in [a work-related] incident where they were cheated” (p. 20).

Many of these programs support Paulo Freire’s approach to adult education in which curriculum content is drawn from participants’ experiences and invites reflection on these experiences. Goals are framed in terms of challenging and changing oppressive conditions in learners’ lives. As Rivera (1988) says, “The role of education in this approach is to empower learners to use their native language actively in order to generate their own curriculum, and, therefore, their own knowledge” (p. 2). Thus, a monolingual approach to ESL is rejected not just because it may slow the acquisition of English but because it denies learners the right to draw on their language resources and strengths; by forcing a focus on childlike uses of language and excluding the possibility of critical reflection, it may ultimately feed into the replication of relations of inequality outside the classroom, reproducing a stratum of people who can only do the least skilled and least language/literacy-dependent jobs. As Collingham (1988) says,

To treat adult learners as if they know nothing of language is to accept the imbalance of power and so ultimately to collude with institutional racism;
to adopt a bilingual approach and to value the knowledge that learners already have is to begin to challenge that unequal power relationship and, one hopes, thereby enable learners to acquire the skills and confidence they need to claim back more power for themselves in the world beyond the classroom. (p. 85)

The second revealing fact is that many of the advocates for L1 usage cited here come from outside the U.S.—from Canada, Australia, and England, countries where multiculturalism rather than English only is stressed in the wider political and policy context. ESL teachers with whom I spoke on a recent trip to Australia expressed surprise that using the L1 in ESL classes might be considered controversial in the U.S.; they told me that they encourage students to use their L1 since teacher evaluation is based in part on the extent to which the students’ cultures and languages are valued in the classroom. Although I certainly cannot generalize from these comments, I mention this to show that monolingual ESL instruction is by no means the taken-for-granted norm everywhere in the world. The fact that so many of the studies exploring the use of the L1 are published outside the U.S. (see, e.g., references in Hopkins, 1989, and Nicholls & Hoadley-Maidment, 1988) again suggests that monolingual approaches to ESL may be ideologically rooted.

CLASSROOM REALITIES: LANGUAGE CHOICE IN MULTILINGUAL CLASSES

However appealing the notion of a bilingual approach to ESL may sound in theory, the prospect of implementing it in the classroom is often met by resistance; teachers respond with understandable concerns: “How can I incorporate my students’ first languages when half of them want me to enforce English only, they come from 20 different language backgrounds, and I don’t speak their languages?”

However, each of these concerns, I think, has ideological implications relating to how issues of power are embedded in classroom relations. The issue of language choice is really part of the broader question of teacher-student roles—who gets to decide what should happen in the classroom. Traditionally, the teacher determines what is best for the students based on his/her status and knowledge of the field. But, as Freire (1970) argues, central to acquiring the skills and confidence for claiming more power outside the classroom is a shift of power inside the classroom. For example, very often the issue of L1 use is a source of classroom tension, with some students feeling that it wastes time or creates bad feelings and others seeing it as a necessary support. Whereas beginning-level students often say they prefer a bilingual
approach (e.g., Hopkins, 1989; C. Howell, personal communication, 1991), more advanced students may feel use of the L1 slows English acquisition. In cases like these, then, rather than the teacher making the decision for the students (either for or against L1 use), the question can be posed to students for reflection and dialogue. As such, the issue itself can become content for language and literacy work. Students can discuss when it is and isn’t helpful to use the L1 in English acquisition. After considering the advantages and disadvantages of L1 versus L2 use and the functions of each in different contexts, students can establish their own rules for the classroom. Certainly, teachers can contribute their own knowledge and opinions in this exchange, but what is important is a shift toward shared authority. The teacher moves from being a problem solver or arbiter of tensions to a problem poser or facilitator of critical reflection.

Teachers I worked within the Bilingual Community Literacy Training Project (BCLTP) who used this approach with several beginning ESL classes reported that each of the classes arrived at different conclusions; in some, students decided to use the L1 as little as possible; in others, they enumerated specific functions/times when it was and wasn’t helpful. Significantly, however, each class stuck to its decision regardless of the particular content of the decision. The teachers reported that they no longer had to mediate disagreements or act as the enforcer of language choice decisions. Similarly, Chang (1992) reports that when students are invited to regulate language use themselves, they consciously use the target language more, and the teacher’s role as ESL enforcer or corrector diminishes. Of course, for beginning ESL classes, this kind of discussion can best take place in the L1; yet even reflecting on the ways that both languages are used to conduct this discussion can yield insights into the use of each language for various functions in other contexts.

The concern about L1 use in multilingual classes can also be addressed through a dialogical process, with students exploring the particular functions and consequences of using the L1 when several language groups are present. The pedagogical bonus is that students develop metacognitive awareness of language learning strategies; the classroom management bonus is that it takes the teacher off the hot seat; students develop empathy for each others’ perspectives, and tensions are relieved. Most importantly, students gain a greater sense of control over their own learning. Ultimately, the process of decision making is even more important than the outcome of the decision, not because it is an effective mechanism for classroom management, but because it models a way of addressing problems and shifting power that can be extended more broadly. The tools that students develop for thinking critically, exploring alternatives, and making choices prepare
them for addressing problems outside the classroom. The same process can be applied with other issues of classroom dynamics. If there are attendance problems, or problems with uneven participation, involving students in analyzing the underlying issues fosters a sense of control over their own learning and, in turn, becomes a kind of rehearsal for dealing with outside issues.

**WHO'S THE EXPERT HERE ANYWAY?**

The question of the teacher not knowing the students' L1 and thus being unable to use it as a resource in the classroom is also really the tip of a much larger ideological iceberg, namely, the question of who should teach and what counts as qualifications for teaching non-Anglophones. The taken-for-granted assumption in the field is that ESL teachers don't need to know students' languages to teach ESL. When we're at a party and someone says, Oh, you're an ESL teacher, what languages do you speak?" the automatic response is "You don't need to know the learners' languages to teach them English." The assumption here is that native English speakers with TESOL degrees have the requisite qualifications by virtue of their linguistic background and advanced study. What counts is knowledge of English and second language theories, research, approaches, and methods.

Yet, as Phillipson (1992) suggests, the tenet that the ideal teacher of English is a native speaker is a twin of the tenet that English is best taught monolingually. Both are aspects of the same underlying ideological orientation which privileges the interests of the dominant groups and reinforces inequalities. In the case of British neocolonialism, structural dependence is perpetuated “as the presence of native speakers and books from [Great Britain], and all that they signify, is necessary to implement the native speaker tenet” (p. 199). Even the term native speaker itself is an ideological construct to the extent that it implies a single, idealized native English although there are in fact many native Englishes, some of which are valued more than others for sociopolitical reasons (Phillipson, 1992); the term has de facto been used to refer to white Britons from the dominant groups. Because these native speakers are seen to be the model speakers of English, British norms of usage and language teaching have become the universal standard. This, in turn, has diverted attention away from the development of local solutions to pedagogical problems and impeded the process of building on local strengths, resulting in the creation of ideological dependence. In the case of the U. S., as we have seen, the origins of the native-speaker fallacy can be found in the Americanization movement, where language instruction was seen as a vehicle for the imposition
of U.S. cultural values and native English speakers seen as the only appropriate conveyers of these values. That this tenet is alive and well in the U.S. today is demonstrated by the fact that many states still require teachers to be native speakers. For example, at the time of this writing, there was a move to oust a first-grade teacher in Westfield, Massachusetts, because of his nonnative accent.

Although the pedagogical rationale for privileging native speakers is that their knowledge of the target language is better, examination of current theory suggests that being a model English speaker is not a sufficient qualification for teaching ESL and, in some cases, not a necessary one. Of course, it is widely agreed within the profession that it is wrong to assume that just because one speaks English, one can teach it; specialized training is required. Phillipson (1992) claims that many of those qualities which are seen to make native speakers intrinsically better qualified as English teachers (e.g., their fluency, appropriate usage, and knowledge of cultural connotations of the language) can be acquired or instilled through training. Moreover, he argues, nonnative speakers possess certain qualifications which native speakers may not: They have gone through “the laborious process of acquiring English as a second language and... have insight into the linguistic and cultural needs of their learners” (p. 195).

I would go further in arguing that, in the case of ESL (as opposed to EFL) where English is being taught to immigrants and refugees transplanted to a new country, it is not just experience as a language learner, but the experience of sharing the struggles as a newcomer that is critical. If a central tenet of state-of-the-art second language and literacy theory is the importance of contextualizing instruction around real, meaningful usage centered on content that is significant in learners’ lives, who is better qualified to draw out, understand, and utilize learners’ experiences than those who themselves have had similar experiences? There is something about having actually lived these realities which enables immigrant teachers to make connections that are otherwise not possible. For example, I once, spent many hours struggling to elicit discussion about housing issues from a class of Haitian learners while one of my students, a Central American undergraduate with considerably less “professional knowledge,” was able, with seeming ease, to instantly ignite animated discussion of the same topic just by sharing an anecdote from her own life dealing with an exploitative landlord. Her lived experience was more powerful than my expertise in unlocking the doors to communicative interaction.

Similarly, D’Annunzio (1991) attributes much of the success of his program to “the use of bilingual tutors who shared the students’ experiences” (p. 52). He argues that, with a short training period, “pedagogically unsophisticated” bilingual (who, in the case his program, were
“only high school graduates”) can become effective tutors and trainers of other tutors; this model “may break the chain of reliance on heavy professional intervention” (p. 52). Hornberger and Hardman’s (in press) study of instructional practices in a Cambodian adult ESL class and a Puerto Rican GED (Graduate Equivalency Diploma) class corroborates the importance of shared background between teachers and learners. In the case of the Cambodian class, they found that despite the fact that the teacher (who had finished just 2 years of college and a vocational program) tried to speak English exclusively, the students used Khmer to respond to her questions and help each other; in addition, the teacher and students shared assumptions about the learning paradigm, and classroom activities were intimately connected with learners’ other life activities and cultural practices. Likewise, in the GED class, instructional activities were embedded in a cultural and institutional context that integrated and validated learners’ Puerto Rican identity. Their study suggests that the reinforcement of cultural identity, made possible by the shared cultural background of learners and teachers, is critical not just for L1 literacy acquisition but for ESL acquisition as well.

Both the BCLTP and the University of Massachusetts Student Literacy Corps (SLC) project were based on the notion that, with training, people from the communities of the learners who are usually excluded from teaching positions by virtue of a lack of formal credentialing can become effective language and literacy instructors. A comprehensive account of the rationale, process, and outcomes of these projects will be presented at a later date; however, some mention of their results is relevant here. In both cases, through a multidimensional participatory training process, trainees who were or had been ESL students themselves became tutors or teachers. In the SLC project, tutors not only contributed their energy, life experiences, and native language resources but were able to introduce innovative state-of-the-art approaches to literacy instruction to the classrooms of experienced teachers. The following quote, taken from a teacher’s evaluation, indicates the power of this model:

J. is a model tutor because he has a genuine understanding of our students based on his own experience and his ability to listen to them, and because he is able to follow his gut feelings. His initiative is extremely valuable. I wish I knew how to bring out that kind of leadership ability in other tutors.

In the BCLTP, interns came from a range of backgrounds, including some who had themselves been beginning ESL students a few years earlier and others who were getting their GEDs or were undergraduate students. Despite the fact that they may have higher education in their home country, several were working in jobs such as housecleaning,
factory work, and so on, because of lack of credentials and/or English proficiency. They were trained to become native language literacy or beginning ESL instructors through workshops, mentoring, and teacher sharing processes. As a result of their work, adult students in the native language literacy classes who had been unable to write their names at intake were writing dialogue journals, letters, and articles for site magazines after about 6 months of instruction. At the Haitian Multi-Service Center, interns developed a Creole proverb book for initial literacy; students in ESL classes wrote language experience stories about the coup in Haiti and its effects on their lives, studied the history of Haiti, and read and discussed news stories. All of this was possible largely because the teachers were integrally part of the learners' communities, sharing both language and life experiences.

Even in mixed ESL sites, like the Jackson-Mann Community School, where students come from over 25 language groups, the fact that the interns were themselves from the communities of the learners was an asset. In developing lessons, interns drew on their own experiences as language learners and members of the community. The adult learners, seeing their peers in the role of teacher, assumed more responsibility for the learning of others. In one case, for example, a student who had never spoken in class began to participate actively after being paired with a more advanced student; the advanced student then asked to remain in the class (even though he was ready for a higher level), because, as he said, "I can help here. You need me."

These projects demonstrate that the benefits of hiring teachers from the communities of the learners can at least balance the benefits of hiring native English speakers. Whereas nonnative speakers of English with nontraditional educational backgrounds can be trained in literacy/ESL pedagogy, it is not clear that the reverse is true—that the understandings that come through shared life experience and cultural background can be imparted through training. These are qualifications which may be truly intrinsic to nonnative speakers (although these characteristics too are certainly not sufficient in themselves to assure good teaching).

**IMPLICATIONS FOR THE PROFESSION**

The implications of the arguments presented in this article are neither that traditionally credentialed native-English-speaking teachers should commit professional suicide nor that ESL instruction should be totally abandoned in favor of L1 literacy instruction. Rather, what I want to suggest is that we need, on the one hand, to rethink and expand
the roles of native-English-speaking ESL teachers and, on the other hand, to expand the range of options and uses for the native language in initial literacy and ESL instruction. I hope to have shown that unveiling the mechanisms of ideological control can ultimately strengthen the field as a whole. By letting go of some of our unexamined and taken-for-granted assumptions about how ESL/literacy students should be taught and who is qualified to teach, we can open the doors to rich resources for addressing the language and literacy needs of immigrants and refugees.

The first step in this process is recognition of the fact that commonly accepted everyday classroom practices, far from being neutral and natural, have ideological origins and consequences for relations of power both inside and outside the classroom. As the evidence presented here indicates, monolingual ESL instruction in the U.S. has as much to do with politics as with pedagogy. Its roots can be traced to the political and economic interests of dominant groups in the same way that the English Only movement has been; the rationale and research used to justify it are questionable; and there is increasing evidence that L1 and/or bilingual options are not only effective but necessary for adult ESL students with limited L1 and schooling backgrounds. Clearly the accumulated body of research and practice points toward the need to expend much greater resources in exploring L1 literacy or bilingual ESL program models for these learners.

Further, the evidence suggests that current definitions of teaching qualifications must be reconsidered in order to implement this goal. As with language use, the question of who is qualified to teach is more than purely a pedagogical matter. Insistence on the irrelevance of teachers’ knowing the learners’ languages may be de facto a justification for maintaining the status of native English speakers. Alternatively, by expanding the conception of what counts as expertise to include other kinds of knowledge beyond those traditionally developed and validated through institutions of higher education, ties between the classroom and communities of the learners can be strengthened. Evidence from a range of programs suggests a new way of thinking about community-classroom relations in which community people are seen not just as aides or cultural resources but as experts in their own right and as partners in collaborative relationships. Promoting the development of this community-based expertise does not by any means imply eliminating the role of traditionally credentialed ESL teachers; these two kinds of expertise aren’t oppositional or mutually exclusive. Rather, credentialed ESL/bilingual educators and community-based bilingual educators can work together through a process of mutual training to share their knowledge, establish partnerships, and learn from each others’
This may mean expanding the role of native English speakers in the areas of teacher training and classroom-based collaborations with nonnative English speakers.

Thus, returning to the opening epigraph, as Vargas suggested in discussing the reactions to the Rodney King verdict, we need to recognize that respect for learners’ languages has powerful social implications. The extent to which ESL educators value participants’ linguistic resources in teaching is a measure of our willingness to address basic inequities in the broader society. As we let go of the need to enforce English only in the classroom and open our ranks to community expertise, students will gain greater control of their own learning. Each of these changes represents limited steps that we can take as a profession to contribute to struggles for greater equity outside the classroom.
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Descriptions are now available of the speech act realizations of native speakers in given situations and of expected deviations from these patterns in the speech of nonnative speakers. Still largely lacking is a description of the processes involved in the production of these speech act utterances. This paper reports a study describing ways in which nonnative speakers assess, plan, and execute such utterances. The subjects, 15 advanced English foreign language learners, were given six speech act situations (two apologies, two complaints, and two requests) in which they were to role play along with a native speaker. Retrospective verbal report protocols were analyzed with regard to processing strategies in speech act formulation. The study found that in executing speech act behavior, half of the time respondents conducted only a general assessment of the utterances called for in the situation without planning specific vocabulary and grammatical structures, often thought in two languages and sometimes in three when planning and executing speech act utterances, utilized a series of different strategies in searching for language forms, and did not attend much to grammar or pronunciation. In an effort to characterize the speech production of the respondents in the study, three different styles seemed to appear: metacognizers, avoiders, and pragmatists.

During the last decade, the literature on communication strategies has been growing (Bialystok, 1990; Faerch & Kasper, 1983) and along with it, an extensive literature on speech act strategies as performed by native and nonnative speakers alike. The first speech act study that the current researchers undertook was actually motivated by a desire to determine how feasible it was to construct a rigorous test of speech act performance as a departure from the more impressionistic measures that were then available (Cohen & Olshtain, 1981). At
present, the research literature provides relatively detailed descriptions of realization strategies for perhaps eight speech acts in a variety of situations (i.e., apologies, requests, complaints, disapproval, refusals, disagreement, gratitude, compliments; see, e.g., Blum-Kulka, House-Edmondson, & Kasper 1989; Cohen & Olshtain, 1985; Cohen, Olshtain, & Rosenstein 1986; Hatch, 1992; Olshtain & Cohen, 1983, 1989, 1990; Wolfson, 1989).

There is also some information concerning the extent to which non-native speakers at varying proficiency levels will approximate native norms for some of these speech acts. What is still lacking are detailed descriptions of the processes involved in the production of these speech act utterances by nonnative speakers. Because the complexity of speech act sets like those of apologies and complaints makes special demands of the speaker, they are of interest in language learning. The apology speech act set, for example, is potentially complex because it can comprise a series of speech acts, such as expressing apology (I'm sorry), acknowledging responsibility (That was dumb of me), offering repair (Here, let me pick them up), and giving an explanation or excuse. In addition, there are various possible modifications for intensifying the sincerity (I'm really sorry), mitigating the apology (Yeah, but you were in my way!), and so forth. What adds to the complexity of selecting appropriate strategies is that this and other speech acts are conditioned by a host of social, cultural, situational, and personal factors.

The empirical investigation of processes involved in the production of utterances by nonnative speakers has focused primarily on “compensatory” strategies—that is, strategies used to compensate or remediate for a lack in some language area—and largely on lexical retrieval strategies (Faerch & Kasper, 1983; Kellerman, 1991; Paribakht, 1985; Poulisse, 1989; Tarone, 1983). Building on the work of Faerch and Kasper (1983) and others, Bachman (1990) broadened strategic competence beyond compensatory strategies to include three components: an assessment component whereby the speaker sets communicative goals, a planning component whereby the speaker retrieves the relevant items from language competence and plans their use, and an execution component whereby the speaker implements the plan.

If we apply this model to the study of speech act processes, we might expect there to be learners who only do a minimal assessment of a situation before starting to speak, which could in turn result in violations of certain sociocultural conventions. Likewise, there are learners who prefer to plan their foreign language utterances carefully in terms of vocabulary and structures before producing them. Seliger (1980) classified nonnative speakers according to one of two general patterns—the planners and the correctors; the former plan out their utterances before delivering them, whereas the latter start talking and make...
midcourse corrections. Crookes (1989) found that when intermediate- and advanced-level ESL students were specifically instructed to plan for 10 min before performing descriptive tasks, they showed more variety of lexis (e.g., more explicit adjectives) and more complexity of language (e.g., more subordinate clauses) than a control group not given time to plan.

One of the first studies of speech act production strategies using verbal reports was conducted in Brazil by Motti (1987). In that study, 10 intermediate-level EFL university students were requested to produce spoken apologies and then to provide retrospective verbal report data. In their verbal reports, the respondents indicated that they had many things on their minds while responding. For example, they reported analyzing the situational variables such as the interlocutor’s age and status. They also reported thinking the utterance through quickly in Portuguese, their native language, before producing it in English, the foreign language. Subjects also expressed concern as to whether they were producing their utterances correctly in terms of vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation.

In a more recent study of speech act production using verbal reports, Robinson (1991) had 12 female Japanese ESL students complete a discourse questionnaire with six refusal situations to which they were to respond in writing. The respondents were also requested to provide taped think-aloud data as they completed the situations. The investigator then interviewed the respondents regarding the content of their utterances from the think-aloud session. The findings dealt with cultural and personality issues. For example, respondents sometimes accepted the request rather than refusing it as they were instructed to do because their cultural background taught young women in Japan to say yes, or at least not to say no. There were also specific instances in which the respondents indicated in the retrospective interview that they had not had experience with the given situation (Robinson, 1991).

The current study set out to investigate more fully the processes whereby nonnative speakers produce speech acts in an elicited role-play situation. The study was designed to arrive at a description of the ways in which nonnative speakers assess, plan, and execute such utterances (cf. Bachman, 1990). The decision to investigate thought processes during complex speech acts was based on the above-mentioned assumption that such sociolinguistic tasks would be potentially demanding speaking tasks and thus a rich source of data.

A second interest was in exploring the sources for positive and negative transfer of forms from native to target language by attempting to describe precisely when the thinking was taking place in one or the other language. Whereas the literature on language transfer pays a good deal of attention to the transfer of structures (e.g., Dechert &
little attention has been paid to the shift in language of thought between and among languages (in the case of trilingual) during the process of assessing, planning, or executing a given utterance.

Another purpose of the study was to examine ways that verbal reports could be used as a research methodology for collecting thought processes during oral elicitation situations. As noted in the literature, verbal reports have their limitations, just as do other research techniques (Cohen, 1987, 1991), but their careful use can provide one more source of data, often data unobtainable in any other way (Ericsson & Simon, 1984). With regard to reliability, respondents have been found to provide more reliable retrospective reports on their cognitive processes if the reporting takes place shortly after the mental events themselves (Ericsson & Simon, 1987).

Because verbal report techniques are intrusive, it would be unreasonable to ask speakers to provide such data while they are engaged in oral interaction. For this reason, in the study described below, subjects were videotaped interacting in two role-play situations at a time. They then immediately viewed the videotapes (one or more times) as a means of helping them recall their thought processes during the interactions.

The following are the research questions that were asked:

1. To what extent do respondents assess and plan their utterances, and what is the nature of this assessment and planning?
2. What is the language of thought used in assessing, planning, and executing utterances?
3. What are the processes involved in the search, retrieval, and selection of language forms?
4. What is the extent of attention to grammar and pronunciation in the production of speech act utterances?

METHOD

The subjects for this small-scale, exploratory study were 15 advanced EFL learners, 11 native speakers of Hebrew (Jackie, Sharon, Shalom, Zohara, Hagar, Nogah, Yaakov, Shlomit, Hava, Galit, and Ricki) and 4 near-native speakers of Hebrew, who were native speakers of French (Michel), Portuguese (Lillian), Spanish (Lily), and Arabic (Wassim), respectively. Ten were females, 5 males, and their average age was 24 years. They were undergraduates in the humanities or social sciences and were all taking a course in reading English for academic purposes at the time of the study.
The subjects were asked to fill out a short background questionnaire (see Appendix A) and then were given six speech act situations (two apologies, two complaints, and two requests) in which they were to role play along with a native speaker (see Appendix B). These situations were written out for the respondents on cards and the native-English-speaking interlocutor, Debbie, also read the instructions out loud just before each situation was role played. The interactions were videotaped, and after each set of two situations of the same type, the tape was played back and the respondents were asked in Hebrew by a native-Hebrew-speaking investigator both fixed and probing questions regarding the factors contributing to the production of their response to that situation (see Appendix C).

These retrospective verbal report protocols were analyzed with regard to the following aspects: the extent to which utterances were assessed and planned, the selection of language of thought (i.e., L1, L2, L3) for planning and executing the utterances, the search/retrieval/selection of language forms, the extent to which grammar and pronunciation were attended to, and the sources for language used in the production of the utterances (see Appendix B for the transcript of the interactions between one respondent, Nogah, and the interlocutor). Excerpts from the verbal report data are presented here in translation.

RESULTS

The following are the findings, including descriptive statistics, for the research questions enumerated above.

The Assessment and Planning of Utterances

It was found that in 49% of the speech act situations, respondents reported that they made an assessment of the general direction that the utterance would follow (e.g., expressing an apology and choosing an excuse such as that of the bus being late) but did not plan the specific utterances that they would use (e.g., preselecting the vocabulary and structures that they would use). In 30% of the cases they actually planned out a portion of the utterances, perhaps just several words. In the remaining 21% of the situations, they did not plan at all (see Table 1). As can be seen in Table 1, the situation of asking for a lift prompted by far the most specific planning. Respondents reported perceiving that because they were asking a higher status person for a ride, they needed to think about it more first.
The Language of Thought

For the purposes of this research question alone, assessment (i.e., choosing goals) was subsumed under the category of planning (i.e., identifying and retrieving language forms) in the analysis of the verbal report data. It was found that the language of thought for planning and for executing the utterance turned out to be a complex matter. The three most common patterns were planning in English and responding in English (21 instances across 9 speakers), planning in Hebrew and translating from Hebrew to English in the response (17 instances across 7 speakers), and planning in Hebrew with the response in English (16 instances across 8 speakers). On theoretical grounds, we might expect that planning and executing utterances exclusively in English would produce the least amount of transfer from the native language, that planning utterances in Hebrew and executing them in English would produce more transfer, and that planning in Hebrew with execution consisting of translation of Hebrew to English would produce the most transfer. The other 16 combinations of thought patterns had far fewer instances. Whereas the French, Portuguese, and Arabic speakers tended to think in Hebrew—the language they used for daily communication—rather than in their native languages, they thought in their native languages in one or two situations: the French speaker (Michel) for planning and producing his utterance in the Lift situation, the Portuguese speaker (Lillian) for planning in the Book and Notes situations, and the Arabic speaker (Wassim) for planning in the Notes situation. In the case of the Spanish speaker, Lily, whose English was weak, the patterns were most complex, involving both planning in Hebrew and then back to Spanish and translating from Spanish to English in producing the utterance for the Meeting situation; planning in Spanish and then in Hebrew, with the response translated from Hebrew to English in the Book situation; and planning

---

**TABLE 1**
Planning of Speech Act Production

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situations</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>No assessment or planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lift</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Token</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44 (49%)</td>
<td>27 (30%)</td>
<td>19 (21%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
in both Hebrew and Spanish simultaneously, with the response translated both from Hebrew and Spanish to English in the Music situation.

Only 1 speaker (Jackie) used the same thought pattern throughout—a native Hebrew speaker, he planned his utterances in Hebrew and responded by translating from Hebrew to English. Furthermore, in only one situation did a particular thought pattern prevail across different respondents: in the Music situation, 6 speakers out of the 15 reported planning their utterance and responding in English. It would appear that this sort of complaint situation encouraged processing of the language directly in English, at least according to the retrospective verbal reports. This finding might have importance for researchers in their selection of situations for role playing.

The Search, Retrieval, and Selection of Language Forms

In this section we will look at the communication strategies and concerns that one or more speakers reported in searching for, retrieving, or selecting language forms to use in their speech act utterances. These examples represent all the instances that were identified in the analysis of the verbal protocols for these 15 speakers except for instances that are not included in a given category or ones that the respondents did not recount in their verbal report even though they had been aware of it. Eight of the categories reflect areas that have been much discussed in the communication strategy literature: din in the head, monitor, use of formulaic speech, message omission or abandonment, lexical avoidance or simplification, and approximation. The other four categories reflect insights gained from the use of verbal report protocols: self-debate, afterthoughts, partial delivery of a thought, and delivery of a different thought.

Retrieval Process—Din in the Head

Ricki noted after completing the first two situations that she had difficulty in speaking English because of a long period of non-use: “When I start speaking English after not speaking it for a long time, my vocabulary is weak and it is hard to retrieve words from memory.” Krashen (1985, pp. 40–41) has called attention to the “din-in-the-head” phenomenon whereby the din, or sense of having the language available for use, may take anywhere from 1 to 2 hours of good input and may wear off after a few days. In certain oral elicitation tasks, there may be a warm-up period, but often this period is not long enough to activate the din in the head.
Self-Debate Before Selection

In the Lift situation, Hava debated between to get a ride and to give a lift, and finally asked whether she could get a lift. Shalom debated among drive, come, and go, and ended up with, Can I come with you? Galit wanted to make a polite request and was uncertain as to whether she could ask, Do you have any room in the car? As she put it:

It has a lot of meanings and I wasn’t sure that it was correct, so I changed my tactic, and decided she would understand better if I said, I want to drive with you. I thought of lift, but didn’t know how to use it in a sentence so I left it out.

In the same situation, Lily debated among three expressions—in the same neighborhood, your same neighborhood, or in your neighborhood. She was translating from Spanish and felt that the result was not good. Also with regard to the Lift situation, Yaakov debated how to address Debbie—Debbie, Teacher, Gveret [lady], or Gveret Teacher. He decided to address her the way he would in a high school class in Israel, Debbie.

Afterthoughts

In the Meeting situation, Ricki used very as the intensifier in her expression of apology, very sorry, but reported thinking to herself afterwards that she could have said, terribly sorry. She also used stopped in that situation (I’m very sorry, but I—I met some friends and they stopped me and I couldn’t go on) and, as she put it, “I knew it wasn’t the correct word, but I was already in the middle of things.” Sometimes the afterthoughts respondents have during a given speaking task can, in fact, cause later communicative failure in that their mind is still engaged in some previous language form while they are being called upon to perform a new task.

Awareness of Using the Monitor

Four of the respondents referred to their use or non-use of monitoring. With regard to the Meeting situation, Lily commented,

I always think about grammar, and so my pace is so slow. I think about how to structure the sentence correctly, verb tenses and other aspects. For example, I haven’t sleep good, I didn’t sleep good. I thought the first form wasn’t correct.

In the Music situation, Lily erroneously said, you have listened to the music very loud last night and noted,
With this confusion, I wondered whether to continue with the mistake or correct myself. I decided that it was important to correct myself because if I am aware of an error and it is possible to correct it, I want to do it.

Ricki could also be viewed as a consistent monitor user. With respect to the Music situation, she commented, “I am always thinking about grammar ... When I have problems like not, don’t, I correct them. I was yesterday awake—just came out that way and I noted that it was not correct.”

Hagar on the other hand would be viewed as an underuser of the monitor. With regard to the same situation, she remarked,

I don’t put effort into grammar. I am aware that it is bad. I focus on the idea, the message. Grammar gets me stuck. I prefer not to know how grammatical I sound. I depend on the listeners to see if they understand me, using facial expressions and letting them complete my sentences for me.

Wassim only thought about grammar extensively in the Notes situation in which it was not spontaneous in that he was translating from Arabic. In the Meeting and the Book situations, he reported: “When I first read the situations, I thought that it would be good to think about my grammar, but I then forgot about it because it was more important for me that Debbie understand me.”

Use of Formulaic Speech

In the Lift situation, Nogah used I would love to in requesting a ride, which sounded peculiar for the requesting party to use (see Appendix B, Situation 5). Nogah noted that she had heard this expression a lot and that is why she spontaneously used it. Although this was the only reported instance of an unanalyzed phrase appearing in the respondent’s data, it is likely that such formulaic speech occurs with some regularity in the output of nonnative speakers (Ellis, 1985).

Omission, Avoidance, or Simplification

There were also examples of respondents not saying what was intended for lack of the appropriate forms or lack of certainty about them.

Omission. Two cases of omission of an utterance occurred in the data. In the Meeting situation, Lily thought of saying that she was late because of a problem at home but decided that it would be too difficult for her to say it in English. Instead she chose to say that she usually comes late. She also indicated that in general she chooses the easiest
utterance—the one for which she knows the verbs and the sentence structure and can say it directly “without having to express it in a round-about way.” In the Lift situation, Shlomit debated whether she should address her teacher by name and then chose instead to say, Excuse me, are you going home? because, as she put it, “it was a bit more formal—in general, when I address a lecturer in Hebrew, I do it this way.”

Abandoning a word or expression. Five instances of breakdown were identified in the data. In the Meeting situation, Galit said, I really don't have any exc- and stopped there. She said she got stuck because of the x sound, In the Book situation, Shalom asked, Anything I can do to comp-something? He said that he sort of knew the word compensate receptively. In the Music situation, Hagar started the utterance, Can't you just, and stopped. She felt that what she was starting to say was inappropriate and did not know how to convey the correct message in English. In the same situation, Lily produced, I want you to—that, and in explanation noted, “I wanted to say that I didn't want that to happen again but stopped in the middle because it was too complicated for me.” In the Notes situation, Nogah wanted to indicate that she always (tamid in Hebrew) gave her friend class notes if she wanted them but did not know how to say it: “I debated between often and always and I couldn't remember it, so I let it go. ” She simply said, When you need things I al—I give you and made no further attempt to supply the adverb.

Partial delivery of a thought. Two instances of partial delivery of an utterance were identified. In the Notes situation, Hagar was not sure whether she should just continue requesting the notes or whether she should simply say that she did not need any favors from her friend and thank her anyway. She chose to be angry but commented that “anger doesn't come out well in English.” As she put it, “I started and got stuck because of my English, and so I chose a compromise.” Her compromise was to be sarcastic: Well, you're very kind to me. I mean I gave you in the past things and it's—uhm—allright, no thank you. In the same situation, Nogah wanted to use strong language but did not know how to say it in English in a way that would not sound too exaggerated, so instead of saying the English equivalent of tov lada'at [it's good to know] or ani ezkor et ze [I'll remember this], she simply said, I need them too.

Delivery of a different thought. There were two examples of a different thought being delivered than was originally intended. In the Meeting situation, Hava wanted to indicate that the bus did not come, but she reported that she did not find the words in English, so instead she said,
I missed the bus. Galit, in looking for a reason that she needed a ride, said, My bus is very late, which she saw right away to be incorrect. As she explained it, “I meant that it wouldn’t be leaving until later in the evening, but grammatically the sentence was OK so I left it. I let it go because it wasn’t so bad—she would understand what I meant.”

**Lexical avoidance or simplification.** There was one identifiable instance of lexical avoidance and one of simplification in the data. In the Music situation, Shlomit wanted to say that her neighbor’s music was too loud but avoided the equivalent English forms by saying, Your music is—uhm—and I can’t sleep with your music. In the Notes situation, Yaakov simplified his utterance, saying I really don’t like—this. He explained as follows: I searched for something else like, the way you act/your behavior, but it didn’t come to mind when I was answering. I used the easiest way out at the moment.”

**Approximation.** In five instances the word search ended in an approximation as the speaker felt or knew the word was incorrect but could not come up with an alternative. In the Book situation, Jackie was looking for a word to indicate repair but did not find it. He said, I’m shocked, I’m sorry, but he was looking for lefasot [to compensate] and, in his words, “had a blackout.” Also in the Book situation, Galit wanted to say the English equivalent of xomer [material] and could not find a word like notebook, so she said stuff: I didn’t find the—stuff. In the Music situation, she asked the neighbor to reduce the volume. Her retrospective comment was as follows: “I had my doubts about the word reduce; it seemed like a literary word to me.” When it was noted that the interlocutor (Debbie) had in fact supplied the phrase when she said, I would have turned it down, Galit replied, “I was more into my own words than into listening to Debbie’s.” In the same situation, Jackie wanted to ask that the neighbor turn it down, and instead he got stuck with put it lower. Finally, in the Token situation, Ricki said she used listen as an opener “because I didn’t have anything else to use.”

**Attention to Grammar and Pronunciation.**

Regarding the issue of attention to grammar, respondents indicated that they were thinking about grammar in 41% of the situations. One example was a correction in choice of verb tenses: I haven’t sleep good, I didn’t sleep good. As can be seen from Table 2, the Lift situation was slightly more likely than the others to prompt attention to grammar. In contrast, the Token situation was far less likely to prompt attention to grammar. In 22% of the situations, the subjects did not indicate whether they were paying attention to grammar.
TABLE 2
Attention to Grammar in Speech Act Production

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situations</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lift</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Token</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding attention to pronunciation, in far fewer situations (than the 41% for grammar), only 22%, did respondents indicate thinking about pronunciation in the production of their utterances. In 66% of the situations, respondents reported that they did not consider pronunciation (and in 12% of the cases, they did not report on the issue at all). (See Table 3.)

TABLE 3
Attention to Pronunciation in Speech Act Production

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situations</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lift</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Token</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whereas for the most part the respondents paid no attention to pronunciation, there were exceptions. For example, in the Book situation, Sharon noted that she was aware of confusing the sound z with th. She was also aware in the Music situation that ask came out as athk, and Shalom was aware of his Israeli-accented r. In the Lift situation, Lillian, the native Portuguese speaker, reported that her owl sound in the utterance, I’ll be waiting made her uncomfortable because it did not sound natural to her. Hagar said that she tried to pronounce properly because of the higher status of the interlocutor, She added, “When I find the appropriate thing to say, my pronunciation is better.”

In the Token situation, Shlomit said that she used excuse me because it was easier to pronounce than sorry as an opener to get the attention of her friend. Hava reported that she felt more confident with this
situations than with the preceding one, the Lift. As she put it, “Because I was more confident here, so I was more fluent. When I am fluent, it goes smoothly. When not, I get stuck on vowels and consonants and start to worry about how to pronounce them.” In the Token situation, however, she had the feeling of having what she termed over-higui [over-pronunciation]—too much attention to pronouncing the word token; the friend had responded, What? the first time she asked, so she asked more decidedly a second time. (In both the Lift and the Token situations, the interlocutor purposely pretended not to hear the request the first time around in order to prompt a second and perhaps more careful request.)

Emergent Speech Production Styles

One style, that of the metacognizer, was characteristic of those individuals who seemed to have a highly developed metacognitive awareness and who used this awareness to the fullest. The thoughts of these individuals included a voice in the back of the head which kept informing them of their general deficiencies, kept them monitoring their language output to some extent, and continued to remind them of their possible or actual production errors from prior utterances. Whereas she was aware that she was purposely not monitoring her grammar, Hagar did report monitoring her pronunciation in order to speak properly to her higher status professor in the Lift situation. When unsure of how to say something, she would use the strategy of partial delivery of a thought, such as in the Notes situation, where she wanted to express full anger but settled for sarcasm instead.

Ricki alluded to her difficulties in trying to retrieve English vocabulary after not speaking it for a long time. Having these problems is not in itself noteworthy, but her calling attention to them brings up the issue of the din-in-the-head phenomenon mentioned above. Ricki was one of those who has spent time in English-speaking environments where the din in the head was intensified (a month in England 4 years prior to the study and 3 months in the U.S. 1 year prior to the study). Perhaps a voice in the back of her head was reminding her that she was not rehearsed enough in her English to have the words appear effortlessly. Ricki was also a frequent monitor user (“I am always thinking about grammar... When I have problems like not/ don’t I correct them.”), which would be consistent with the metacognizer style.

In addition, Ricki indicated various afterthoughts that she had after producing utterances. One such afterthought was about having said very sorry in the Meeting situation but then thinking to herself that she could have said terribly sorry. Another such afterthought was when she realized that stopped was not the correct word in the Meeting situation.
(I met some friends and they stopped me and I couldn’t go on) and that she should not change it because she “was already in the middle of things.” Such lingering thoughts about prior speech production could possibly interfere with the execution of the utterance at hand.

A second speech production style was that of the avoider. For example, in the Lift situation, Shlomit did not know whether it was appropriate to call her teacher by name, so she left it out. In the Music situation, she was not sure how to say that her neighbor’s music was too loud, she avoided the adjective altogether by saying, I can’t sleep with your music. Perhaps the behavior most indicative of a systematic avoidance strategy was her conscious avoidance of words that were difficult for her to pronounce. So, for example, in the Token situation, she reported saying excuse me because it was easier for her to pronounce than sorry.

A third style to emerge could perhaps be termed that of the pragmatist, individuals who exhibited this style got by in oral production more by means of on-the-spot speech adjustment than through metacognitive planning. Rather than simply avoiding material altogether, this pattern involves finding alternative solutions that approximate what is called for. Galit would be a good example of such a subject. Not only did she switch to I want to drive with you when she was not sure if she could say room in the car, but she also refrained from mentioning a lift because she was not sure how to use it in a sentence. She was also the subject who, in looking for a reason why she needed a ride, let her utterance, My bus is very late, stand although she knew right away that it was not what she meant to say. She left the utterance as it was because it was grammatically acceptable and comprehensible. She also was willing to settle for various approximations instead of struggling to find the most appropriate word. So, in the Book situation she settled for stuff when she wanted to say material. Then, in the Music situation, she asked the neighbor to reduce the volume when she meant him to turn it down. She did not notice that the expression appeared in the prompt itself (“I was more into my own words than into listening to Debbie’s.”).

**DISCUSSION**

The study found that in executing speech acts, the respondents only planned out the specific vocabulary and grammatical structures for their utterances in approximately a third of the situations, often thought in two languages and sometimes in three languages when planning and executing speech act utterances, used a series of different strategies in searching for language forms, and did not attend much to grammar or to pronunciation. The study also found that there were
subjects whose speech production styles seemed to characterize them as metacognizers, avoiders, and pragmatists.

**Issues of Research Methodology**

It could be argued that the elicitation of any oral language production would have served the purposes of this study—that there was no need to elicit speech act behavior. Whereas this may be true, as noted at the outset, the current study chose to investigate thought processes during complex speech behavior because such language behavior was considered perhaps more demanding sociolinguistically than other language behavior and thus a richer source of data. Several things made the situations even more demanding.

The use of a semioral, role-play interview (i.e., written situation and then role play) as a simulation of actual behavior could have made special demands on the respondents. In other words, is such an event really semiethnographic, as suggested in Olshtain and Blum-Kulka (1985)? What is the effect of having respondents take on a role they would not assume in real life? In some instances, respondents remarked that a given situation happened to them all the time. In several cases, the respondents commented that they had performed a particular speech act in real life as, for example, requesting a neighbor to turn down loud music late at night. In other cases, respondents made it clear that the situation had never happened to them.

In instances where the respondent had never had to react in such a situation (e.g., apologizing for keeping a classmate’s book 2 weeks beyond the agreed date), it could be argued that the instrument was forcing unnatural behavior and that if the respondent were not a good actor, the results might be problematic. The issue would be to distinguish respondents’ language proficiency from their situational adeptness. In the research study under discussion, the respondents were not given the choice to opt out of the speech act. If they deflected the stimulus, the interlocutor pursued the issue. This is not necessarily the case in the real world, where a person may opt not to apologize, complain, or request something (Bonikowska, 1988).

Furthermore, it was not specified for the respondents what stance they were to take in a given situation. In the Notes situation, for example, Hagar decided that she would get angry and take the stance of not needing any favors from her friend.

It should also be noted that the order of the different speech acts may have had an effect on the response since respondents indicated that the apologies, which came first, were the most difficult because the respondent had caused the infraction. The more perfunctory
speech acts, the requests, came at the end when the respondents may have been somewhat fatigued by the research procedures.

The lack of specificity concerning the behavior the prompt called for raises the issue of just how specific the prompt should be. Just how much context should be provided for the respondents? For example, should the prompt give culturally relevant information if the situation is culturally specific? Should it tell them what stance to take (e.g., recalcitrant or conciliatory, assertive or reticent), what emotion to express (e.g., anger, frustration, sadness, sarcasm)?

The fact that the prompts described the situation in the target language gave the respondents the opportunity to use the vocabulary of the prompt even when they did not have mastery over these forms in their productive knowledge. This marks a departure from, for example, the semidirect format (e.g., the Center for Applied Linguistics’ simulated oral proficiency interview [SOPI]), in which the instructions are presented in the language of the respondents, and the response is to be in the target language. Thus, if the respondents do not know the vocabulary item in the target language (e.g., the word for house slippers in Portuguese on the Portuguese Semi-Direct Test; see Stansfield et al., 1990), they are at a disadvantage.

From time to time respondents did take language forms directly from the text which described the situation—language forms that were only partially or not at all in their productive knowledge. For example, in the Lift situation, Hava noted that she had taken my bus has just left directly from the text. Also, whereas she would typically say token, she requested a phone token in the Token situation because that was written in the text. Wassim also indicated taking the expression phone token from the text. In that same situation, Yaakov said he had used the word urgent because the word appeared in the description of the situation, that he would not have used it otherwise. Likewise, Shlomit said she also used urgent because it was included in the situation. Finally, there was an instance of the respondent’s combining his own material with that contained in the text. So, in the Lift situation, Yaakov described how he arrived at asking Debbie, Can I come by your car?:

First I thought with your car, with you and that I would not mention the car because I didn’t know how to indicate hamixonit shelax [your car]. I worried that she would think I wanted to go for a ride with her. To get a ride with you would be an expression I wouldn’t know how to use. Can I come are words that I know how to use. After I heard Debbie read by car, I said by your car.

Notwithstanding the above cases, there were many more instances in which respondents did not make use of the cues provided in the prompt. In fact, some respondents were oblivious, being caught up too
much in their own words to use the vocabulary of the interlocutor or of the prompt as an aid to production.

These speech act situations also created a form of time pressure not so prevalent in other forms of elicitation, such as with verbal reports of reading and writing processes. The interlocutor purposely pursued each issue until some resolution of the situation took place. This procedure meant that in each interaction there was invariably an unplanned portion where the respondent had to react immediately. Such was not the case, for example, in the Robinson (1991) study, where there was no rejoinder.

The finding that certain situations may be more likely to cause the respondents both to plan an utterance and to produce it directly in the target language may be of interest to language acquisition researchers. They may wish to choose their situations so as to encourage this form of cognitive behavior. Until now, investigations of speech behavior have not given much attention to the language-of-thought issue with respect to planning of utterances. As a result, elicitation procedures may have unknowingly called for complex language decisions on the part of the respondents, such as in the Lift situation in this study.

The findings reported in this study are based on a relatively new form of data with regard to role-playing situations; they are by and large process and not product data. The research method of having respondents role play two situations and then view the videotape seemed to produce richer linguistic information than did the method used in the Robinson (1991) study. There were probably several reasons for this. One was that the interactions were more naturalistic: They were oral and not written. Second, the retrospective verbal reports were conducted in the respondents’ native or near-native language. Third, videotape was used to refresh the respondents’ memory as to the choices made in selecting material for their utterances.

It could be noted that asking subjects after speech act situations whether they were aware of their pronunciation or grammar would have reactive effects on the subsequent speech act situations. Although the situation that prompted the most attention to grammar (8 respondents) as well as the highest level of attention to pronunciation (5 respondents) came in the third set of speech acts, it was also a situation involving style shifting (requesting a lift from a higher status teacher). Thus, it is difficult to say whether the results reflect incrementally more attention to grammar and pronunciation or are an artifact of the situation.

Fortunately, as more work is done in the elicitation of speech act behavior, more attention is also being given to describing possible research methods and to enumerating their strengths and weaknesses.
(Cohen & Olshtain, in press; Kasper & Dahl, 1991). Unquestionably, this is an area in which further development of research methods is called for.

**Pedagogical Implications**

There are several pedagogical implications that can be drawn from this study. First, learners may have a more difficult time in producing complex speech forms than teachers believe, whether they be speech acts or other language forms of comparable complexity. The end product—the learner’s utterance—may have been the result of extensive thought processes in two or more languages and repeated internal debate as to which lexical word or phrase to choose. To merely assess the product may be doing the learner a disservice. Teachers may wish to devise a means for finding out more about the processes involved in producing the resulting utterances. Just as teachers might ask learners about the strategies they used to arrive at answers to a reading comprehension test, they may wish to ask them how students produced utterances in a speaking exercise, using an audio- or videotape to assist the students in remembering what they said.

Second, some learners may not be adequately aware of what is involved in complex speech behavior. These learners may benefit from a discussion of what compensatory strategies are so that they can better understand the strategies that they use and be more systematic in their use of such strategies. (Note that there is a somewhat pejorative ring to the term compensatory, suggesting something remedial. A more positive term might be that of complementary strategies, which suggests strategies that are meant to complement other existing means of communication.) For example, there are students who are stopped in their production of utterances each time they cannot come up with the word or phrase they want. Such students may turn to a dictionary, with sometimes dubious results. Lexical avoidance, simplification, or approximation strategies do not necessarily come naturally to such learners, so formal discussions could be beneficial.

Finally, teachers need to be aware that not all speaking tasks are created equal—that there are tasks which make far greater demands on learners than do others. In this study, the seemingly simple task of requesting a lift home from the teacher was the most demanding in terms of thought patterns, monitoring for grammar, and pronunciation. Teachers may wish to consider the language processing demands which are likely to be made by a given classroom exercise or test task because the level of demands may help to explain the learner’s success at completing the task. Especially with demanding tasks, the teacher may want to promote some nonspontaneous, planned language as a
means of promoting second language development in the classroom (Crookes, 1989). Whereas the use of spontaneous, unplanned language is a common characteristic of communicative language teaching, there is evidence that acquisition of nativelike production by nonnative speakers may take many years (Olshtain & Blum-Kulka, 1983) and that formal instruction can be of some benefit in speeding up the process (Olshtain & Cohen, 1990).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The research reported in this study was funded by the Zalman Aranne Fund. We would like to acknowledge Yafa Schuster and Debbie Pulver for their assistance in collecting the data.

THE AUTHORS

Andrew D. Cohen teaches in the Department of ESL, Institute for Languages and Literatures at the University of Minnesota. He has published numerous research articles on language teaching and learning as well as books on bilingual education, language testing, and most recently on language learning strategies (Language Learning, Newbury House/Heinle & Heinle, 1990).

Elite Olshtain teaches in the Schools of Education at both the Hebrew University of Jerusalem and Tel-Aviv University. She has taught, conducted research, and published widely in the areas of second language acquisition, discourse analysis, ESL materials development, curriculum design, and teacher training.

REFERENCES


APPENDIX A

Background Questionnaire

1. Field of study and level

2. Birthplace and date of birth

3. Native language Father's native language Mother's native language

4. Self-evaluation of proficiency in English as compared to natives:
speaking: excellent very good fair poor
listening: excellent very good fair poor
reading: excellent very good fair poor
writing: excellent very good fair poor

5. Period of time in an English-speaking country:
Name of country/countries mos years

6. Use of English in the past and currently:
a. use for speaking English with English speakers.
b. reading in English: magazines, literature, academic texts.
c. watching films in English without translation.
In the past: frequently sometimes rarely
Currently: frequently sometimes rarely
Comments:

THE PRODUCTION OF SPEECH ACTS
APPENDIX B

Responses in English to Different Role-Play Situations

Instructions
You are asked to participate in six role-play situations. The situations will be presented to you two at a time. Try to respond as you would in a real situation. The situations will be explained to you in English by Debbie and call for role playing with her. Before you respond to each situation, you will be given a minute to think out your response. Pay attention to all aspects of each situation.

It is important that you understand the situation fully. If there is something in it you do not understand, ask us and we will explain it to you in English or in Hebrew.

The response to each situation will be videotaped. Then you will be shown the videotape and will be asked a series of questions by Yafa regarding your response to the situation in order to understand how you arrived at your response in the given situation.

Thank you for agreeing to participate in our study!

Situations
(Note. This is the initial stimulus and then the situations are played out to completion.)

1. You arranged to meet a friend in order to study together for an exam. You arrive half an hour late for the meeting.
   Friend (annoyed): I've been waiting at least half an hour for you!
   Neighbor: Yeah.
   You:

2. You promised to return a textbook to your classmate within a day or two, after xeroxing a chapter. You held onto it for almost two weeks.
   Classmate: I'm really upset about the book because I needed it to prepare for last week's class.
   You:

3. This is not the first time that your neighbor has played loud music late at night, and you have to get up early the next morning. You phone her to complain:
   Neighbor: Hello.
   You:

4. A friend who studies with you at the university refuses to share important notes she got hold of before the final exam. You are quite upset because you've often helped her in the past.
   Friend: No, I can't give you these notes. I need them!
   You:

5. An evening class has just ended. Your bus has just left, and the next one will not be along for another hour. Your teacher lives in the same neighborhood and has come by car. You'd like to get a ride with her, so you approach her after the class.
   You:

6. You have to make an urgent phone call. You ask your friend for a phone token.
   You:

Transcript of Interactions between a Respondent, Nogah, and the Interlocutor

Situation 1: Meeting
Friend: I've been waiting at least half an hour for you!
Nogah: So what! It's only an—a meeting for—to study.
Friend: Well, I mean—I was standing here waiting. I could've been sitting in the library studying.
Situation 2: Book
Classmate: I'm really upset about the book, because I needed it to prepare for last week's class.
Nogah: I really feel sorry. It's too bad that you haven't told me before. I forgot. I don't know what's to—what—I don't have what to say—you're right in whatever you—you say.
Classmate: Well, you know—I'll have to really think about it next time if I lend you a book again because—you know, I needed it and—
Nogah: You're right. You're totally right.
Classmate: OK.

Situation 3: Music
Neighbor: Hello.
Nogah: This is your neighbor from the—top floor.
Neighbor: Yeah.
Nogah: I'm sorry to talk with you in this hour of the night but—I really want to go to sleep and I can't because of the music.
Neighbor: Oh, my music. Is it too loud?
Nogah: Yeah.
Neighbor: Oh, sorry.
Nogah: Usually it doesn't disturb me but—I really have to wake up early.
Neighbor: Oh, fine. I didn't realize that it—bothered you.
Nogah: I'll turn it down. Sorry, bye.
Classmate: Thank you.

Situation 4: Notes
Friend: No, I can't give you these notes, I need them!
Nogah: I need them too. When you need things I al—I give you.
Friend: Yeah, I know, but I—this is different. This is really urgent and I have to go home and study right now, and I—I can't—give them to you. Sorry.
Nogah: I only want to xerox them but it's if it is such—such a disturb for you—so—OK, I will manage without it.
Friend: OK, sorry. I mean—Look, normally I would, but I just can't this time. Sorry.
Nogah: OK.

Situation 5: Lift
Nogah: Excuse me, are you going to Baka?
Teacher: Yes, I am.
Nogah: Really? Can I have a ride with you?
Teacher: Yeah. Sure. Um-listen, I have to meet someone downstairs—um—I'll be leaving in about five minutes. OK?
Nogah: Fine, if it is OK with you. I will—I would love to.
Teacher: Great—OK. I'll see you there.
Nogah: Thank you.
Teacher: You're welcome.

Situation 6: Token
Nogah: Hey, do you have a—a token?
Friend: Sorry, so—excuse me?
Nogah: Do you have one token for me?
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Friend: A token? What—what token?
Nogah: For—to make a telephone call.
Friend: Oh, yeah. Here you are,
Nogah: Oh, thank you.
Friend: That's OK.
Nogah: I really need it.
Friend: Good, OK, no problem.

APPENDIX C

Retrospective Verbal Report Interview
(These questions are asked three times—after each set of two situations. The interviewer
uses these questions as a starter and then adds probes according to the rules-play data on
videotape and according to the responses of the informants.)

Now let us look at your response together.
Why did you choose those elements in your response?
1. The source for vocabulary and phrases
   a. Material learned in courses—which? _____________________________
   b. Material acquired, as from reading literature or newspapers, from conversations, from
      classroom exercises, etc _____________________________
2. Did you have a number of alternatives? Why did you choose that response? _______
How did you choose your response?
1. Content
   a. How did you select the vocabulary? (Interviewer: note intensifiers in the responses, for
      example) _____________________________
   b. Did you think out your response in Hebrew or in English? (partially or fully) In your
      opinion, did you try to respond as an English speaker or as a Hebrew speaker? Please
      explain: _____________________________
   c. Were you thinking about grammar while you were producing your response? _______
   d. Did you think about pronunciation while you were responding? __________________
2. Did you think out your entire response before offering it, or did you start responding
   and think out the rest of your response as you went along? ____________________________
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In response to reports of widespread adult illiteracy in the U. S., two positions on educational reform have emerged: a back to the basics movement that stresses enduring truths, and a social constructivist position that highlights the social context of language teaching and use. Each holds different and competing assumptions about language learning and the teaching of writing. In order to uncover the assumptions operating in classrooms for deaf students, two sets of recollections concerning writing activities were analyzed: the autobiographical essays of 87 U. S. deaf college students and the journal entries of 55 college-aged German deaf students. Students from both countries generally recalled writing for two purposes: to report and to practice grammar and mechanics. It is argued here (a) that these activities represent a narrow conception of literacy and inaccurate assumptions about language learning and (b) that the back to the basics movement perpetuates such assumptions, whereas a social constructivist approach does not. Finally, educational, social, and political implications of using whole language approaches, among others, in the teaching of writing to deaf students are considered.

When I asked a group of teachers to recall early writing experiences, they wrote about forming large letters on blank paper, of an argument with a teacher over the spelling of a new word, of an important essay that received praise, and of writing cowboy stories secretly in class to be shared with friends at recess. From an educator’s point of view, these experiences reflect a variety of skills and a range of knowledge, purpose, and function, all of which have something to do with writing and literacy. From an ethnographer’s point of view, these experiences reflect the social character of the learning process. Literacy consists of more than basic encoding and decoding skills;
literacy is a socially constructed phenomena” (Cook-Gumperz, 1986, p. 2). Furthermore, whereas the term functional literacy is usually defined as “the ability to read somewhere between the fourth- and eighth-grade levels on standardized reading tests” (McLaren, 1988, p. 213) and implies a focus on linguistic and psychological processes, ethnographers argue that inextricably connected to the teaching of reading and writing is a process of social transmission, a teaching of the dominant culture.

Given that the teaching of culture means the transmission of specific knowledge and sets of assumptions and that the teaching of reading and writing involves the teaching of culture, it would be wise for teachers of writing to examine cultural and pedagogical assumptions operating in their classrooms. An examination of assumptions is especially important for teachers of students from nondominant cultures—that is students from non-Eurocentric, non-English, or nonhearing backgrounds—because their school achievement typically falls below that of dominant culture students. As in the hearing population in the U.S., the proportion of minority students within the deaf population is increasing rapidly. It is estimated that by the year 2000, 39% of all 18- to 21-year-old deaf students will be from underrepresented populations (Nash, 1990). In other words, the number of students counting themselves as members of two underrepresented groups (e.g., those who consider themselves members of a U.S. deaf community and a Spanish language community) is likely to increase dramatically. My contention is simply that, as teachers of literacy to students from nondominant cultures, we must be critical of traditional assumptions and practices.

One way to approach pedagogical assumptions in the teaching of writing is to examine the writing activities recalled by students and their attitudes towards writing. According to Gumperz (1986), “almost all members of modern societies have assumptions which find expression in their immediate activities and in their attitudes toward schooling and literacy” (p. 52). In considering the school writing experiences and opinions of young adult U.S. and German deaf students, I will illustrate how the experiences recalled by these students reveal patterns of educational practice and similarities in the experiences of deaf language learners.

EDUCATIONAL REFORM AND NOTIONS OF LITERACY

Considerable attention has been focused recently on rates of adult illiteracy in the U.S. Based on a decline in verbal Scholastic Aptitude
Test scores, E.D. Hirsch, Jr. (1987) concludes that we have failed to teach mature literacy to all students. Jonathan Kozol (1985) estimates that the number of functionally and marginally illiterate people in the U.S. now exceeds 60 million. The Commission on Education of the Deaf (established by the Education of the Deaf Act, 1986) concludes that some 175 years of research on the teaching of English literacy to deaf children have been "remarkably unproductive: deaf students still are graduated from high schools coast to coast with third- or fourth-grade reading achievement scores" (Bowe, 1991, p. 13). Among several prominent suggestions for reform, two very different and competing approaches to literacy have emerged: the back to the basics movement and a social constructivist position.

The back to the basics movement is, simply stated, a return to instructional practices of the past (Resnick & Resnick, 1977). Those who call for such a return in today's schools find ideological support in the works of Bloom (1987) and Hirsch (1987) and their definition of cultural literacy. For them, cultural literacy means "acquiring a knowledge of selected works of literature and historical information necessary for informed participation in the political and cultural life of the nation" (McLaren, 1988, p. 213). Note that McLaren distinguishes between two definitions of cultural literacy: a prescriptive and politically conservative position as represented by Bloom and Hirsch on the one hand and, on the other, a more pluralist and politically liberal position that takes linguistic, ethnic, and economic diversity into account. In this paper, only the former definition will be discussed.

For Allan Bloom (The Closing of the American Mind: How Higher Education Has Failed Democracy and Impoverished the Souls of Today's Students, 1987), the road to educational reform begins with a return to the study of Plato and the "great works" of Western civilization. For E. D. Hirsch, Jr., (Cultural Literacy: What Every American Needs to Know, 1987) cultural knowledge may be defined by a list (a list he, in fact, provides in an appendix to his book); cultural literacy is the possession of this knowledge. It is also the ability to communicate this knowledge in a standard language. A modern industrial nation, he believes, needs a common language:

It's members . . . must be able to communicate by means of written, impersonal, context-free, to-whom-it-may-concern-type messages. Hence these communications must be in the same shared and standardized linguistic medium and script. (Gellner, cited in Hirsch, 1987, p. 74)

For Bloom and Hirsch, learning to write is presumably learning to emulate classical interpretations of experience and forms of expression; foremost among forms of expression is the expository essay.

Critics of a prescriptivist cultural literacy (e.g., see the review of
Bloom’s and Hirsch’s books by Aronowitz and Giroux, 1988), characterize the position as cultural production based on a glorification of the past and indifference to the educational realities of the present. The great works revered by Bloom and the “clothesline of information” (Aronowitz & Giroux, 1988, p. 192) assembled by Hirsch are treated as embodiments of universal truth. Social and ideological contexts of The Iliad, for example, are ignored. Critics see this type of cultural literacy as an attempt to perpetuate (or reinstate) Western European, upper-middle-class values in a society that is increasingly non-European and economically disadvantaged.

A social constructivist perspective stresses the social construction of meaning. In other words, meaning is constructed through interaction and negotiation. A number of current approaches share this perspective, including the whole language movement, the process approach to writing, and the stance of curriculum theorists who argue for a critical literacy.

The whole language movement is a philosophy based on a transactional model of education rather than a transmission model (Weaver, 1990). The teacher’s role is not to transmit knowledge of the classics or their meaning to the students but rather to construct new meaning with the students. The objects of study, or texts, may be the classics, or they may be original texts produced by the students.

Whole language theorists (e.g., Edelsky, Altwerger, & Flores, 1991; Goodman, Smith, Meredith, & Goodman, 1987; Weaver, 1990) and process writing teachers (e.g., Elbow, 1981; Fulwiler, 1991; Graves, 1983; Macrorie, 1985) emphasize the “mining” of a student’s personal experience. Recalling and reflecting on past experience establishes a basis for the student to read critically. Meaning is created by the reader in interacting with a text, by the writer, in retrieving experience and committing a perspective to paper. Whole language theorists see writing as a mode of self-expression and communication but also as an aid to thought and reflection. Like signed or spoken languages, writing (and reading) are used for a variety of functions, and, like language, they are learned primarily through meaningful interaction with other writers and readers (“native speakers”).

Whole language teachers write for, to, and with their students. Precocious preschoolers are well aware of the expressive quality of writing. Their scribble, invented spellings, and storytelling reveal pleasure in the activity (see Bissex, 1980). Writing for one’s students as scribe (where the student dictates and the teacher writes) or as storyteller encourages this mode of self-expression. Writing to one’s students (as in dialogue journals) engages students in an act of written communication that should, among other things, nurture a sense of audience (Braig, 1986). Thirdly, writing with one’s students, recalling experience,
reflecting on learning, and documenting problems demonstrates how writing can support thinking and learning (Weaver, 1990). In other words, the acquisition of literacy, like the acquisition of language, is seen as a transactional process. Similarly, in second language classrooms and with adults, interactive and collaborative activities are thought to promote second language literacy (Rigg, 1991).

Whole language theorists share some views with proponents of a critical literacy. Critical literacy means examining the ideological dimensions of what we read and write in order to identify the selective interests inherent in texts. Such critical reading, it is argued, will help create citizens able to discern the patterns of power in contemporary society. For educators, the ideological dimension of statements such as, “One in five adults in the U.S. are functionally illiterate” is that many of these persons are nonnative speakers of English and more than half are women (McLaren, 1988). In the eyes of critical theorists, a literacy that requires students to emulate works in the “cultural canon,” without a consideration of their social and political contexts, amounts to cultural imposition (Aronowitz & Giroux, 1988). To students from underrepresented groups, then, understanding the canon may appear, on the one hand, unattainable and, on the other, irrelevant and unpalatable. The failure of some to become literate may be due to an outright rejection of the idealized canon and the dominant culture it represents.

For the critical theorist, a role of the reading/writing teacher is to help the student uncover the relationship between knowledge and power in society. Not all proponents of whole language would subscribe to the notion of critical literacy; it is also the case that not all critics of the present social order necessarily subscribe to classroom practices that are supported by whole language theory. One critic of the process writing approach (Delpit, 1988) argues that the “culture of power,” or the rules of the educated Eurocentric majority, can just as easily be ignored in process writing as in skill-based approaches. If used in this manner, process writing is at best a waste of time. Delpit argues that rules and forms of expression used by those in control must be made explicit and taught to students.

THE TEACHING OF WRITING TO DEAF STUDENTS

As in the field of TESOL, two assumptions regarding literacy have predominated until recently in the education of deaf children: speech should be learned before writing, and the teaching of writing should focus on form or grammatical correctness. (See Raimes, 1991, for practice and assumptions in TESOL. For those in the education of deaf
children, see Moores, 1978; Quigley & Kretschmer, 1982; Staton, 1985; and White, 1987. For a clear and concise overview of the language learning situation of deaf students, see Swisher, 1989.) Because the learning of speech is a laborious and time-consuming task for most deaf students, a speech-first emphasis has left little instructional time for writing, and once introduced, writing has often been used as a vehicle for learning English grammar with classroom activity limited to the practice of isolated sentences (Wilbur, 1977). Similarly, research on the teaching of written language to deaf students has focused on morphology and syntax (Akamatsu, 1988; Yoshinaga-Itano & Snyder, 1985). Recent research indicates that deaf children are able to learn writing along with other forms of communication (Conway, 1985) and indeed that deaf children can engage in developmentally progressive language play through writing (Ewoldt, 1990).

In the 1980s, work in other fields caused teachers of deaf students to rethink traditional practices. First, Meath-Lang (1982, 1990), among others, brought a reconceptualist point of view to the teaching of English to deaf students. For reconceptualists, the only meaningful curriculum is one that begins with the student. Student and teacher alike should write from personal experience and approach texts conscious of their own histories (Molnar & Zahorik, 1977; Pinar, 1975). Such an approach to literacy is both reflective and critical. Second, the influence of process writing approaches was evident in special publications and conferences devoted to writing and deaf students (e.g., Copeland & Fletcher, 1987; Kretschmer, 1985). Reports on the use of dialogue journals and other forms of interactive writing with deaf students also attested to this influence (e.g., Bailes, Searls, Slobodian, & Staton, 1986; Cannon & Polio, 1989; Cuneo & Shannon, 1987; Kluwin & Kelly, 1991; Peyton, 1989; Staton, 1985; Walworth, 1990). Third, the influence of whole language theory was apparent in the work of Bensinger, Santomen, and Volpe (1987), Schleper and Paradis (1990), and Livingston (1987), teachers of deaf students at the elementary, secondary, and college levels, respectively.

**WRITING ACTIVITIES IN SCHOOL**

Despite these new developments in the conceptualization of language and literacy, an examination of available reports of classroom writing activities indicates that educational practice reflects the positions of functional and cultural literacy rather than critical literacy. Reports of writing activities in hearing British and U.S. schools are similar in several respects to those recalled by the German and U.S. deaf students who will be considered in this paper. In the early 1970s,
James Britton and colleagues collected more than 2,000 samples of hearing students' writing from 65 high schools in England (Britton, Burgess, Martin, McLeod, & Rosen, 1975), and then categorized the samples by function. Their analysis yielded three main categories. The majority of samples (63.4%) were written to inform, instruct, or persuade a certain narrowly defined audience (usually the teacher). This they called transactional writing. Of the remaining samples, 17.6% were categorized as poetic and 5.5% as expressive. Poetic writing was defined as that which uses language as an art medium, where words are chosen and arranged to create a design or pattern. It is, in a sense, writing that exists for its own sake. The third category consists of writing done to express oneself. Janet Emig's (1971) research indicated that similar emphasis was placed on transactional writing in U.S. schools.

In 1980, Meath-Lang asked 87 U.S. deaf college students at the National Technical Institute for the Deaf (NTID) to write about their experiences learning English. Her goal was to gather a representative sample of students’ pre-NTID experiences learning English and communication skills (e.g., lipreading). The students, most of whom were first-year students enrolled in intermediate-level English language classes, were asked to respond to the following prompt:

Describe your feelings about English. Please include information about your past experiences, especially what you have learned about English/Communication. Explain the way people taught you English language and communication skills. Please write everything that you can remember. Please be very honest. (Meath-Lang et al., 1982, p. 296)

Analysis of the essays, in particular comments related to the process of learning English and those related to perceptions of self-as-communicator “revealed rather traditional and disciplinary approaches” and “a strong sense of the need for improvement in English” (p. 326). For the present report, these essays were reanalyzed for mention of writing in school. In these essays, 25 (29%) of the students mentioned the writing of sentences or some form of connected discourse, whereas others mentioned grammar or vocabulary exercises and spelling practice. The following is an excerpt that represents the kind of writing assignments mentioned.

In the past I learn to write noun & verbs subject, and write composition and have vocabulary word also have term paper. Some time I have trouble on English like forget past tense. Right now I would like to improve my language skill. But right now I improve my reading skill and improve my writing skill also improve my English skill.

For the present analysis, “composition” and “term paper” were taken as types of school writing and categorized as transactional, following
Britton et al. (1975). Out of a total of 45 mentions of a writing function, 28 were transactional; that is, some type of composition, term paper, or report. Poetic writing (e.g., poetry and short stories) and expressive writing (e.g., letters and journals) were mentioned only 4 times. A fourth function that appeared in this data, one not found by Britton et al. or Emig, was writing to improve one’s grammar and mechanics (e.g., writing “good” English sentences, writing rough drafts, and proofreading). This function was mentioned 13 times. In sum, as in Britton et al.’s findings, transactional functions predominated, but for deaf students, another category was added: grammar and mechanics.

In 1987, 55 college-aged German deaf students were asked to write about their experiences learning German (Albertini & Hees, 1990). The purpose of this study, like the Meath-Lang study, was to gather students’ past experiences learning German and communication skills. As in the Meath-Lang study, the students’ participation was voluntary, and the writing was not part of the school curriculum. The focus of the writing in both studies was clearly on the content of the students’ written recollections and not on form. The German students were asked to respond to the following prompt:

Können Sie mir von Ihren Erfahrungen beim Sprachunterricht erzählen? Ich würde mich für das folgende interessieren: Was haben Sie über Deutsch oder Kommunikation (das Miteinander-Sprechen und Schreiben) gelernt? Wie haben die Lehrer Sie unterrichtet? Wie hat Ihnen der Sprachunterricht gefallen? Bitte, schreiben Sie alles, an was Sie sich erinnern. Bitte, seien Sie ganz offen.

Can you describe your experiences in language classes? I would be especially interested in the following: What did you learn about German or communication (speaking or writing with another person)? How did your teachers teach you? How did you like your language classes? Please write everything that you can remember. Please be frank.

The students in both groups were approximately the same age, but the German students were enrolled in preparatory programs for business and technical professions at a secondary school for the deaf in Heidelberg (Staatliche Schule für Gehörlose, Schwerhörige und Sprachbehinderte). Completion of these programs is commonly compared to completion of a junior college (AAS) program in the U.S. Another difference in the two studies is that German students were writing for a visitor to their school and country, whereas the U.S. students wrote for a faculty member from their own college.

The German responses, like the U.S., were analyzed for mentions of writing in school. As in the U.S. sample, two types of writing predominated in the students’ recollections: 13 of the students (24%) men-
tioned writing assignments specifically. The following was the most
detailed listing of those assignments.

In der Hauptschule haben wir nur Diktat, kleine Aufsätze, kleine Geschich-
ten nacherzählen und Fragen beantworten. Das waren die meisten Arbeiten
in Deutsch der Hauptschule. Und in der Wirtschaftschule müssen wir In-
haltssangabe, Interpretation, große Aufsätze Gliederungen, Erörterungen
schreiben. Das fällt mir nicht immer so leicht.

In secondary school, we just had to do dictations, short compositions, retell-
ing short stories and answering questions. Those were mostly the assign-
ments in secondary school. And in the professional school, we have to write
content analyses, interpretations, composition outlines, and arguments. These are not always so easy for me.

Out of a total of 16 mentions of writing functions, 15 concerned
writing either compositions or dictations. Dictations are commonly
used in German schools to practice and test the mechanics of writing. In
schools for the deaf that stress oral communication, they are admin-
istered to deaf students just as they are to hearing students, that is,
without signing. Thus, they become exercises in lipreading as well. For
the congenitally, profoundly deaf child, as Swisher (1989) has pointed
out, such language input via lipreading may be likened to a foreign
learner constrained to learning English (or German) through inter-
active video with the sound turned off. Personal writing was mentioned
once (by a student who kept a vacation journal with his parents) and
poetic, not at all.

A difference between the two groups of responses was the type of
writing experience recalled. In the German experience, an emphasis
on form and mechanics—or on Rechtschreiben (literally, “correct writ-
ing”)—figures more prominently than in the U.S. In mainstream
classes and hearing-impaired classes alike, teachers frequently gave
dictations without signing. Dictations and compositions were always
evaluated for grammatical and mechanical correctness. Interviews with
19 hearing German teachers of the deaf corroborated this emphasis
on form and transactional writing in the German classroom. When
asked what they had written during the 2 weeks prior to the interviews,
journal-keeping and letter writing were mentioned frequently, and, in
general, personal writing seemed highly valued. For school however,
they wrote lesson plans, evaluations, and reports; their students wrote
dictations, reports, and summaries.

The deaf students in both of these samples also expressed opinions
about writing in general and their own writing in particular. Statements
such as, “Some time I have trouble on English like forget past tense”
(from the U.S. sample) and “Those [assignments] are not always so
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easy for me” (from the German sample) were taken as expressions of attitude. The majority of statements in both samples indicated that the students did not like to write. The process was described as “difficult” and the products as “bad” or as “needing improvement.” The U.S. students in particular stated that they needed to learn more about writing. Attitudes toward writing in general and evaluations of one’s own writing were generally negative.

IMPLICATIONS

Analysis of the recollected experience of these German and U.S. deaf students indicates that two types of writing activity predominated: transactional and grammatical/mechanical. The practice of using writing as a form of grammar practice may rest on two assumptions: first, that acquisition of the standard oral language is the single biggest academic barrier for deaf students and therefore requires constant attention (Jussen & Kröhnert, 1982; Moores, 1978) and second, that writing, like language, is learned through imitation and practice. Indeed, some would argue that allowing grammatical errors to go uncorrected in writing constitutes a particular case of negative reinforcement because deaf students rely to a greater extent on the visual modality. Whereas their reliance on the visual modality cannot be disputed, an instructor’s insistence on constant correction can be. First, such practice is based on an assumption that language and writing are learned through behavioristic mechanisms, and second, deaf adults have reported that constant correction negatively affects their motivation to write (e.g., Gustason, 1992).

In German classrooms, teachers are required to administer dictations to their students; in general, they also assign writing topics and formats. Although dictations per se are rarely used by U.S. teachers of deaf students, many still dictate topics and formats and focus on transactional writing. In some classrooms, however, students dictate stories to teachers (Bensinger, et al., 1987) and decide what to read, what to write, and how to write it (Shannon & McMahon, 1989). In other words, in some classrooms, but not those recalled here, students are dictating the curriculum.

Analysis also indicates that the methods used in the two studies successfully elicited rich and detailed data. In the German study the type of writing (dialogue journal) and the cross-cultural context of the writing may have provided added incentive to write. In both cases, it was apparent that the respondents wrote fluently, with authority, and critically about their experiences. If a goal of writing instruction is to produce authoritative writers, then one educational implication of this
study is that the writings of educational recollections might fruitfully be employed to elicit student writing in the classroom. This would mean treating the student as an expert informant and his or her documented experience as course material. In whole language and process writing approaches, form is secondary but not ignored. Vanett and Jurich (1990) have shown that with adult ESL students, personal writing may be used as a bridge to transactional, academic writing.

The results of this investigation also highlight certain social implications of personal writing for deaf students. Socially, writing may be more important to deaf communities than previously recognized by teachers of the deaf. In 1985, when Madeline Maxwell interviewed deaf and hearing parents, teachers, and children of deaf parents, she found that deaf adults used writing daily for conversational, personal, and instrumental purposes. A surprising difference in their recollections of writing at home was that in families where the parents were hearing, no writing for such purposes was recalled; in families where the parents were deaf, on the other hand, writing was used daily for such functions. Deaf adults, who were children of deaf parents, recalled written communication as a regular feature of a busy household. They remembered notes on the refrigerator door, such as: “All family due 6 pm to Johnson. Nice clothes.” Deaf adults of hearing parents, on the other hand, remembered waking up in empty houses, not knowing where their parents were. So pervasive was the reported use of writing for interactive functions that Maxwell suggests writing to be a part of deaf culture in the U.S. From her data, she concludes that adapting writing to personal interaction was crucial to being socialized into the U.S. deaf community. The goal of English instruction has long been to enable deaf students to enter and participate fully in hearing society. What teachers of these students have long overlooked and what Maxwell’s research clearly indicates is the importance of writing within the deaf community.

The content of the U.S. and German responses analyzed here has, finally, political implications. In a U.S. study of the deaf investigating notions of voice in writing, “political voice” emerged as one of three prominent themes. For some, voice in writing meant conveying a political message and as members of a minority, they felt compelled to tell others of their experiences living in a hearing society (Albertini, Meath-Lang, & Harris, 1987). A similar motive might account for the amount of detail provided by the deaf writers in the present study who were schooled in two hearing societies, German and U.S. From a critical literacy point of view, the effect of focusing students’ attention on traditional models and on grammatical form is to ignore their experiences and to leave students without any real control or authority over their writing. A preoccupation with classical interpretations of experi-
ence or with grammar or punctuation defines the student as a receiver of knowledge and writing as a drill-and-practice activity. Going back to the basics then becomes a return to the authority of a dominant group that has been indifferent to the experience of students from underrepresented groups. A critical literacy approach to educational reform would instead argue that as teachers we should encourage students to document their own experience and observations; writing and reading then become tools to shape critical interpretations of this experience. To do this, we may have to reinterpret our own experience and reexamine our own assumptions about writing and literacy.
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Written Argumentation for Real Audiences: Suggestions for Teacher Research and Classroom Practice

ANN M. JOHNS
San Diego State University

Of the various concerns in the teaching of second language writing, issues regarding audience, or readers' expectations, have been the least explored. This article reviews the audience literature in composition studies, focusing on the topic of real audiences as central to understanding how writers produce successful texts in authentic contexts. It discusses the efforts of one teacher/researcher to explore the interaction of audience awareness, writers' purposes, and argumentation in the process of grant-proposal writing undertaken by two bilingual researchers. Finally, it suggests ways in which teachers can give students experiences writing authentic argumentative texts addressed to real audiences.

Writing has been the focus of much discussion in the literature for more than 10 years. In addition to the many articles on second language writing that have appeared in this journal and elsewhere, a number of volumes have been published recently on ESL/EFL writing research (e.g., Connor & Johns, 1990; Kroll, 1990), contrastive rhetoric (e.g., Connor & Kaplan, 1987; Purves, 1988), writing in the disciplines (Swales, 1990a), ESL writing instruction (Johnson & Roen, 1989), and assessment (Hamp-Lyons, 1991). A new journal, Second Language Writing, has been initiated to publish some of the many studies that are conducted throughout the world. In her recent retrospective honoring TESOL's 25th anniversary, Raimes (1991) notes that the discussions of ESL writing research and teaching have focused principally upon three topics: "on the writer and writer's processes, on academic context, and on the reader's expectations" (p. 407). Of the topics mentioned by Raimes, readers' expectations (i.e., audience) have been the least explored in the literature; yet for linguistically and culturally diverse...
students, developing an ability to address a number of audiences is essential to communicative success. Faigley and Hansen (1985), who completed a case study of student writing in academic contexts, comment on the variety of audiences and audience expectations that students confront:

People read texts with varying expectations and their judgments of merit vary as a consequence. (An English instructor will evaluate) according to how well (the student) met the standards of a handbook notion of an essay; (the content instructor) evaluates according to the depth of exposure to new knowledge. (p. 148)

Bridgeman and Carlson (1984) also note a diversity of audience expectations when reporting their study which provided the foundation for the TOEFL Test of Written English (TWE).

Despite these findings, most English and ESL/EFL courses and writing competency examinations often do not take a variety of audiences and their expectations into consideration. There are undoubtedly a number of reasons for this lacuna. It may be that the philosophy a teacher or a writing program espouses concerning the nature of writing and of knowledge inhibits a comprehensive approach. For example, there are many practitioners who believe that writing classes should present students with general principles of writing, principles that are assumed to be transferable to most writing contexts. (See Murray, 1987; Spack, 1988.)

It will be argued here, however, that an understanding of vague or general principles of audience will not suffice; instead, teachers and students need to be sensitive to task-specific and community-specific issues, particularly as they relate to the students' future needs (Colomb, 1988; Smagorinsky & Smith, 1992). If ESL/EFL composition classes are to prepare students for approaching a variety of rhetorical situations, then teachers and researchers must examine critical writing tasks in specific communities, and they must use their insights from these studies to provide students with opportunities to write real texts for a variety of real audiences.

This paper addresses issues of audience variety and expectations in argumentation (Perelman, 1982; Toulmin, 1958; Toulmin, Rieke, & Janik, 1979). Argumentation was chosen because it is common in academic disciplines, the vocations, and the professions; it is sensitive to task, audience, and community, and it is particularly difficult for nonnative speakers (Johnson, 1991). The paper reports my efforts as a composition teacher to understand the interaction of audience expectations and argumentation in a context relevant to my ESL students' future rhetorical challenges. In addition, it reports efforts to provide students opportunities for attempting argumentation for real audi-
ences, to show them that these attempts require some general strategies as well as an appreciation of the task-specific and community-specific demands made upon writers.

ARGUMENTATION AND AUDIENCE IN CONTEXT

The study described here was prompted by my teaching experiences in a large, comprehensive, English-medium university, where undergraduate ESL students are enrolled in academic writing classes charged with the teaching of basic composition, with preparing students for their short-term writing needs (i.e., undergraduate classes in general education and their majors), and with preparing them for long-term writing demands, as well (i.e., for their professional and academic careers). Emig (1971) calls such a class, typical of many ESL/EFL contexts, “a hydra-headed monster” (pp. 97–98): To meet the students’ and institutions’ expectations, teachers are expected to introduce what they believe to be “general knowledge about writing . . . that [might] enable proficiency in all contexts” (Smagorinsky & Smith, 1992, p. 281). However, students and teachers soon discover that general principles are often inadequate when encountering real writing experiences; therefore, preparation for a variety of task- and community-specific demands upon writers is required to encourage transferability and flexibility in student task representation, writing strategies, and processes (see Johns, in press).

The ESL academic writing class discussed here is typical of many: The majority of students plan to major in engineering, one of the two disciplines most heavily enrolled by international and bilingual students both in the U.S. and in EFL contexts (Barber & Morgan, 1988; Institute for International Education, 1990). Most engineering students in English-medium contexts write very little as undergraduates in their disciplines; in EFL engineering student contexts, writing in the first or second language is often delayed until late in a graduate program (see, e.g., Dzau, 1990; Markee, 1986; Zaghoul & Hussein, 1985). Ironically, practicing engineers in many parts of the world are required to write constantly once they receive their degrees (G. Craig, Dean of the College of Engineering, San Diego State University, personal communication, March 1991).

In their other undergraduate classes, these students’ writing experiences are often severely limited as well (see Johns, 1986; Keller-Cohen & Wolfe, 1987). For example, in general education (i.e., “breadth”) classes, they may write the occasional “tell all you know” essay examination response and a few short, annotated bibliographies. Seldom is there a demand for more sophisticated written discourse. Argumenta-
tion, though common in authentic written texts, is a mystery to many undergraduate and graduate students, despite its having been identified as central to many disciplines and professions (Connor, 1990; Dillon, 1991; Fahnestock & Secor, 1982; McCann, 1989).

How, then, can ESL/EFL writing teachers, especially those in “hydra-headed classes,” prepare students for authentic writing experiences, experiences that their students may confront later in their academic and professional lives? To educate themselves to some of their students’ future writing needs and provide credibility, depth, and insight for their classrooms, teachers can conduct research in their own institutions, studies of real writing for real audiences. There are side benefits for composition teacher research within teaching institutions as well: Studies such as the one discussed here indicate to faculty and administrators the importance of the composition teachers’ role in the development of students’ communicative competence (see Swales, 1990a, for benefits of such research to a writing program).

A current productive approach to research in disciplines and professions involves interviewing “expert informants” about specific academic and professional issues in their discourse communities (e.g., Bazerman, 1985; Myers, 1985; Tarone, Dwyer, Gillette, & Icke, 1981). Because the majority of students in my writing class had chosen engineering, I conducted preliminary interviews with faculty and administrators in the university’s engineering college in order to determine the critical elements in engineering disciplines and to identify successful faculty writers who understood argumentation and audience for that genre.

In contrast to many other academic disciplines (Swales, 1987), the journal article was not found to be the most important genre in engineering. Several engineering faculty and administrators indicated that though research articles are a “necessary evil” and are produced frequently, it is the grant proposal, or its equivalent professional genre, the bid, that is vital to the engineers’ employment and security. (See also Myers, 1985, for a discussion of the importance of grant proposals in biology.)

After the initial interviews, I was introduced to the most successful grant writers in the engineering college. I began my interviews with them, discussing the nature of grant writing, the secrets of their successes, and in particular, their understanding of the relationships between audience and argumentation. These successful grant writers were former international students who had completed their advanced degrees in English-medium universities. Thus, they were bilingual, a Japanese/English speaker and a Chinese/English speaker, researchers who work as a team in an electrical engineering laboratory. These researchers were ideal informants, enthusiastic about their work and
delighted that someone outside of their discipline was curious about their interests. During the interviews, the topic of interest was raised, namely, the relationship between audience and argumentation in grant proposals; however, there was no predetermined script, thereby permitting “an openness to categories and modes of thought and behavior which may not have been anticipated” (Saville-Troike, 1982, p. 45).

The informants began by confessing that they had not always been able to obtain grants. For several years, they had submitted proposals, only to have them “thrown into the wastebasket” by the granting agencies. During that period, they had made little effort to assess the audience for their proposals, assuming that their research would speak for itself. However, about 10 years ago, the engineers experienced an important breakthrough: In their discouragement, they began to consult as many of their colleagues as possible about grant writing. As they did, it became increasingly clear that their research would not be funded without its careful positioning within engineering research and among the powerful grant reviewers who served on the boards of the granting agencies. What they had learned was that a potent argument for the funding of their grants derived from the planning for audience that occurs throughout the grant-writing process.

AUDIENCE LITERATURE

Before turning to the details of this study, it is important to review audience literature, a literature that may not be familiar to many ESL/EFL practitioners. In first language composing and rhetoric, there is a long history of audience theory and analysis. Current interest in audience is sufficient to warrant a prestigious collection (Kirsch & Roen, 1990) and many journal articles.

A concise summary of recent audience literature appears in Brandt (1990), who is quoted below at some length:

Rhetoric and composition treat audience more directly from a writer’s viewpoint, but, even so, from a wide range of perspectives: from the literal view of a preexisting, demographic audience (say, the school principal or readers of a certain age, income, educational level, knowledge base and so on) to more sophisticated versions, such as Douglas Park’s (1982), which present audience as a set of interests that can be aroused by the moves that text makes. Other theorists, like Augustine and Winterowd (1986) and Nystrand (1986), describe the author-audience relationship in terms of pragmatic contracts, mega-rules for procedures that are meant to balance conflicting interests or states of knowledge. Empirical descriptions of the generative role of audience have been supplied by Flower and Hayes (1980) and Berkenkotter (1981), among others.
Ede and Lunsford (1984) have complicated the picture by suggesting that a writer's sense of audience shifts throughout composing, that writers address many simultaneous audiences who surge into consideration at different points in the process. In most cases, though, a writer's audience is construed as an abstraction, a hypothetic construct, a creation either of authors or texts or, as some reader-response scholars might say, a construction of the readers themselves. (p. 70)

Though Brandt (1990) indicates that most current composition theory is influenced by reader response theories, the engineers interviewed, like many academics and professionals in other contexts, were obliged to present a cogent argument to a very real, living, audience: in this case, the peer reviewers of their grant proposals. For them, the audience could not be a "hypothetic construct." Thus, for this study, the most applicable of the models mentioned by Brandt is Park's (1986), which states that

a true and known audience... can exist when there is 1) an established social institution, an institutional hierarchy, a social compact. 2) and an evolved and understood function that discourse performs within and for that social relationship. (p. 482)

In the current study, the grant writers and their audiences were operating within the discourse community of electrical engineering (Rafforth, 1990; Swales, 1990a), a community where grants perform a specific function upon which all parties agree. When a "true and known" audience such as the one they address exists, "knowledge of this audience's attitudes, beliefs and expectations is not only possible ... but essential" (Ede & Lunsford, 1984, p. 156).

There is an expanding literature concerning the nature of the audiences for grants in the sciences and engineering, where the audience is that select group of researchers who peer review proposals for the agencies that provide most of the funds, the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and the National Science Foundation (NSF). (See Cole, Cole, & Simon, 1981; Kenward, 1984; Smith, 1983.) Authors of these studies note that the power and influence of the peer review audience upon the technical disciplines cannot be overestimated.

Cognizant of the readers' power, the engineers who were the informants in this study reported their pattern of grant preparation: They began their writing process by attempting to discover whether their proposed research was consistent with the current conversations in their discipline. Their questions were answered through a review of recently accepted grants, including their own, a review of current journals, which through short articles report on work in progress, and phone calls and electronic-mail messages to other researchers and members of granting agencies "in the know." In this way, they estab-
lished the topics and the “angles” for an ideal, generalized audience of peer reviewers within their discourse community.

In the following weeks, the grant writers narrowed their conceptions of audience to the reviewers in a particular granting agency, identifying by name the proposal readers for the year. In order to understand this group of readers’ “set of interests” (Park, 1982, p. 249), the researchers read their recent papers and conference abstracts. In this way, the grant writers could take into consideration the reviewers’ chosen topics and research agendas, and, in some cases, cite them, an acknowledged method of demonstrating shared values between readers and the writers (Fahnestock & Secor, 1982). The grant writers had no intention of directly replicating the reviewers’ research; however, they understood that they must study the reviewers’ work in order not to stray too far from their readers’ interests and values. These grant writers knew that if they disagreed too much with their reviewers or if they offered an argument that was too revolutionary, too odd, or too dated, their work would probably be rejected:

If a few reviewers do not like certain research—and it only takes a few—that research either does not enter the discourse community, or it enters through another (perhaps not so widely read or prestigious) source. (Tomlinson, 1990, p. 92)

One important audience problem for these grant writers was that NSF, the most prestigious of the agencies to which they applied, selects both experts (in their case, electrical engineers) and nonexperts (i.e., engineers and scientists outside of their discipline and immediate research area) to review proposals. Therefore, the argument within the text and the references included need to be sufficiently expert and current to appeal to the insiders, yet sufficiently readable and accessible to those with more general backgrounds. This problem of disparate readership was one that they considered throughout the writing process as they attempted to take into account the expectations of both types of reviewers.

DRAFTING THE TEXT

Following their various efforts at understanding the research and values of the identified peer reviewers, the grant writers were ready to make other decisions, also related to audience, for example, about the task-specific requirements of text structure. For some granting agencies, formatting decisions are simple, because the structure is specified and models are provided. However, NSF does not suggest a model, therefore affording what the informants derisively called an “aura of
freedom.” But in reality, there is no freedom because the evaluators hold to very precise, if implicit, schemata for written proposals. The interviewees noted two of the implicit rules they had discovered over the years: There must be a statement indicating the “obvious gap between what has been done and what is being proposed” (see Swales, 1990b, on indicating the gap), and the paper layout must enable the readers to find the abstract, formulas, tables, illustrations, and references with ease because, as the informants noted, “the readers are busy people and must be able to quickly skim the proposal for the important information.”

Carey, Flower, Hayes, Schriver, and Haas (1989) and Flower (1987) discuss at some length the complexity of the intellectual representation of a difficult writing task such as the NSF grant that these engineers were preparing. These authors note that successful writers take into consideration a complex of variables when planning and executing their texts. As can be seen from the interviews with these engineers, the issues of audience relate to all factors in the representation of their writing task: readers’ values, interests, and biases; topics to be covered; format of the text; and the important mathematical and numerical features, such as formulas and tables. Thus, these engineers had learned to keep many audience considerations in mind as they conceived of their writing task and began composing their grant texts.

The actual drafting and revising of the text came late in their process, “usually too close to the deadline.” And, when final versions of these informants’ successful grants were examined, with the permission of the writers, it could be seen that the engineers had made use of their careful research on the interaction of readers’ expectations and writers’ argumentation throughout the texts.

Toulmin (1958), in his influential discussion of argumentation in the disciplines, notes that presenting a claim is essential in argument structure. In one of the researchers’ successful proposals which we examined together, the claim appears in two forms deemed appropriate for two sections in the text: the abstract and the introduction. The claim in the abstract emphasizes the experimental process:

We propose to measure the rate constant for the H\textsubscript{2}O + O\textsubscript{3} reaction over a temperature range of 200–350K under various pressure [sic] of He, N\textsubscript{2}, O\textsubscript{2}.

The claim appears in a different form in the body of the introduction, however. In this version, the process discussion was abbreviated and the originality of the research design was the focus:

We propose to use this new [sic] developed H\textsubscript{2}O detection method to measure the rate constant for the H\textsubscript{2}O + O\textsubscript{3} reaction.
The engineers had learned from their mistakes and their successes that their audiences expect the claims as they appear in various forms in grant proposals to have the following characteristics. They must be

1. Sufficiently current. The proposed project must be in keeping with one of the “current research angles,” demonstrating the researchers’ involvement in the continuing conversations in the discipline.

2. Written in exact scientific terms. In this way, the project can demonstrate expertise and membership in the discourse community.

3. Significant, yet realizable. The project must make a contribution, yet it must be demonstrated that it can be completed in the stipulated time.

4. Sufficiently original to be worthy of the funds requested. However, the project must not be too radical or contradictory to the work of peer reviewers or others in the discipline.

5. Of appropriate breadth. “If the project is too broad, it will be suspect; if it is too narrow, it will be considered trivial,” said one of the grant writers.

Once the claim statements had been formulated, data consistent with the argument were added to the draft. Again, the audience was a prime consideration, for the “conflicting interests and states of knowledge” (Augustine & Winterowd, 1986, p. 128) of the writers and reviewers must be balanced. Discoveries by these engineers about important features of the data include the following:

1. Most data must appear in the mathematical formulas, often the first features read by the reviewers. One of the informants said that he first drafted a proposal without formulas, and, even though he and his co-writers believed that they did not need formulas to support their claims, they eventually included some in the proposal, “to make it look more scientific.”

2. In addition to formulas, the text must be well supported by “tables, figures and illustrations . . . to mobilize all means of persuasion” (Gross, 1991, p. 937). Illustrations can present particular problems for grant writers. They must be interesting, and yet not appear too commercial or glossy. One of the informants noted that a proposal with a picture of the researchers taking notes while a glamorous subject was peddling a bicycle had a negative effect upon reviewers. (One of the informants said, “A proposal shouldn’t be like an advertisement!”)

3. Data also must include a discussion of the Facilities and assistance available at the proposing institution to carry out the research. The successful proposal whose claims are cited above included a lengthy
section describing the on-site equipment and facilities, supported by line drawings.

4. Myers (1985), discussing grant writing in the sciences, maintains that the “process of writing a proposal is largely a process of presenting—or creating—in a text one's role within a scientific community” (p. 221). Thus, an essential element in the argument is information that validates the researchers as initiated members of their discourse communities and as individuals capable of carrying out the proposed study. This data can include long narratives about the researchers’ previous work, reprints of their published articles, and other evidence of the writers’ backgrounds and qualifications for community membership.

The issues of audience in argumentation discussed here were central to the success of the two bilingual engineers who were interviewed for this study. It is important to note an issue of audience awareness which may be of particular interest to ESL/EFL teachers: Though the informants argued that they must “talk like experienced engineering researchers” in their texts, grammatical perfection was not required by their audiences, the reviewers for NSF grants. The engineers’ successful proposals included an error in almost every sentence, especially morphological errors such as the third-person singular present tense -s and the plural -s morphemes. Swales (1990b), in his study of moves in article introductions by international students, also found that sentence-level errors do not necessarily prevent the acceptance of texts by English-speaking scientists, as long as the texts are appropriate in style and contain community-appropriate contents and argumentation. Among some audiences, then, a “foreign accent” in writing is accepted or ignored. “Maybe we should do something about our English,” the informants said, aware that they were addressing an ESL teacher. “But why? Our proposals are accepted as we write them.”

It can be seen, then, that for the expert writers discussed here, audience was not a hypothetic construct, but real and known, individuals whose power over the scientific and engineering community and the future academic lives of these researchers was complete. Through careful research into the task, the reviewers, and the current values of their community, these researchers were able to write grants that brought in the funds necessary to maintain their work and their professional lives.

TEACHING IMPLICATIONS

This paper advocates research into the production of authentic genres in real contexts to facilitate the understanding of some of the
general, community-specific, and task-specific aspects of audience awareness and argumentation that confront writers. Swales (1990a) indicates that interviews of expert informants, such as the engineers discussed here, can be carried out by graduate students in their own disciplines. However, it is more difficult at the undergraduate level for students to conduct research with experts. Thus, it is their teachers’ responsibility to enter their future worlds and to gain insights into the complexity and variety of writing demands found there. Related to this task is the responsibility of teachers at every level to give students experiences writing authentic argumentative texts to real audiences.

In teaching argumentation for real audiences, there is, first of all, the necessity to establish for students writing tasks in which the audience can be known. In addition, the genre selected should be, in Swales’ words (1990a), “a class of communicative events . . . sharing a set of communicative purposes” (pp. 45–46) recognized by both the writers and readers. Thus, in the case of the bilingual engineers, the audience comprised the peer reviewers for NSF, who represented a larger community in science and technology. The genre was the “class of communicative events,” the grant, which, though it varies somewhat depending upon its audience, shares a set of communicative purposes.

Like these engineers, students in our classes need to develop their understandings of the interaction between their purposes, the interests and values of real audiences, and the genres that are appropriate for specific rhetorical contexts. Acquiring these understandings takes time, and often development of each aspect of the task takes place at a different point in the process. Ede and Lunsford (1984) point out, for example, that though writers’ purposes may be determined quite clearly early on in the writing process, writers may, for a number of reasons, begin their task with a vague or general sense of their audience, a sense that is sharpened as the writing process continues. Thus, the sense of audience can shift and become more precise as writers come to understand their readers and those readers’ expectations.

How can we approach the teaching of argumentation to real audiences? What we do will vary, of course, depending upon the circumstances and location of our composition classes. Discussed below is one of many possible learning experiences, designed for an ESL undergraduate class and inspired by Ede and Lunsford (1984) and Park (1982, 1986).

Recently, the trustees of California State University’s 19-campus system suggested solving some of their budget problems by raising student fees by 40%. Naturally, the ESL students, many of whom were new immigrants struggling to complete their educations, were angry and concerned. Thus, the trustees had established a real purpose for writing in the ESL composition classroom. Immediately after the rise
in fees had been announced, my students discussed the issues involved in the fee increase at some length. I then asked them to write one-sentence arguments against this increase, claims (in the sense used by Toulmin, 1958) that they would later revise as they better understood their audiences. Next, they began to research their potential audiences. Two possibilities for real audiences were suggested, the university trustees and the state legislators. In both cases, the students had to consider the readers’ prior knowledge, their interests, and the particular approach to argumentation that would appeal to these audiences.

Each student selected a specific legislator or trustee to address. In order to better understand the trustees, the students collected annual reports from the trustees’ companies, their past public statements, and information from university administrators about particular trustees’ views. For research on the legislators, they phoned their local offices, interviewed their assistants and asked for information about their political views and voting records, particularly on issues of education.

As the students conducted their research on their “real and known” audiences (Park, 1986, p. 482), they were required to ask themselves these questions:

1. What does my reader value (e.g., free education, access to education for all students, no new taxes, internationalizing the curriculum, effective preparation of students for their professions)?
2. Which values are most important to this audience? Which are least important? How do I know? (i.e., What data have I collected to support a ranking of values?)
3. What are my purposes for writing to this person? (Then, students ranked, in order of importance, their purposes and arguments.)
4. Given my answers to Questions 1–3, how should I revise my claim, which I wrote before conducting the research on the audiences?
5. What data will I use to support my claim, given my purposes and the values and interests of my audience?

The class then moved to the issue of formatting, that is, the structure of the genre, the letter, that would be employed by students in communicating their arguments. Like the engineers who were interviewed about grants, these students were already aware of a general schema for their text. However, they had to spend time in groups designing the appropriate organization of the letter, an organization that would best fit their communicative purposes. This step required more data collection: Students brought in letters to the editors of newspapers in order to more thoroughly understand how they might organize their argument. The teacher provided some additional letters and gave a lecture based upon Belcher’s (1991) study of corporate communication.
After writing their first drafts, students peer evaluated, using Questions 1–5 above as guides to the effectiveness of the texts produced. Second drafts then ensued, followed by third and fourth drafts, each of which was reviewed by peers. When the students were satisfied with their letters, their texts were duplicated and circulated. Working in groups, they then compared the letters for content, argumentation, and audience awareness. Finally, the five letters judged best by the students for audience awareness and argumentation were edited by the entire class very carefully; unlike the case of the NSF grants, these letters would have to be error-free to meet their audiences’ expectations.

There are many ways to teach real writing for real audiences in composition classes. (See, e.g., Mendelsohn, Beyers, McNerney, Tyacke, & Carrier, 1988; Schell, 1982; Schriver, 1992.) Some current approaches are suggested by Brandt (1990), who was cited in some detail in the first part of this paper. What each of the approaches mentioned here has in common is the teaching of audience awareness, especially in crafting arguments. From start to finish, the intended audience and its values and interests are considered to be a factor in the shaping of student texts (Kantz, 1989). At some point in the process, the audience may be a hypothetic construct for the writers. However, if we are to educate our students for a breadth of communicative demands they will confront in English language contexts, we, and they, must understand the necessity of considering an audience as real—living in a community that participates in sharing values and interests. At every educational level, we must provide tasks for our students in which these real audiences can be researched and real tasks and communities can be addressed. As Purves (1991) argues,

the activity of being literate is a deliberate and social activity, one that takes place in the world; it should not be seen as an abstracted mental state or condition. Those who are involved in literacy education should, therefore, be aware of their social responsibility. (Purves, 1991, p. 51)
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The Structural Syllabus and Second Language Acquisition
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This paper examines the case for a structural syllabus in the light of second language acquisition research. It argues that a structural syllabus cannot easily serve as a basis for developing implicit knowledge of a second language because of the learnability problem—learners are often unable to learn the structural properties they are taught because the manner in which they are taught does not correspond to the way learners acquire them. It is possible, however, to envisage a role for a structural syllabus based on a weak interface model of L2 acquisition.

This role consists of intake facilitation (i.e., causing learners to pay attention to specific formal features in the input and to notice the gap between these features and the ones they typically use in their own output). A structural syllabus can also serve as a basis for the construction of problem-solving tasks designed to develop learners’ explicit knowledge of grammatical properties. It is argued that this knowledge may facilitate subsequent intake. The role proposed for a structural syllabus, therefore, is a substantial one. It is recognized, however, that such a syllabus will need to be used alongside some kind of meaning-based syllabus, which is designed to provide learners with opportunities for communicating in the second language.

A structural syllabus consists of a list of grammatical items, usually arranged in the order in which they are to be taught. This kind of syllabus is probably still the most common in language teaching today. Yalden (1983) describes it as “traditional” on the grounds that it is the basis of the grammar translation and audiolingual methods. However, it also serves as a basis for more “modern” methods—Total Physical Response (Asher, 1977) and The Silent Way (Gattegno, 1972), for example. The move towards a communicative approach to language pedagogy in the 1970s and 1980s resulted in alternative syllabuses (in particular, the notional-functional syllabus (Wilkins, 1976), the task-based or procedural syllabus (Prabhu, 1987), and the process
syllabus (Breen, 1984). These syllabuses continue to attract a lot of attention, but they have never totally replaced the structural syllabus. The problems of a structural syllabus, discussed in detail in numerous publications during the 1970s and 1980s (see Krähnke, 1987), have not disappeared, however. The principal problem is that of learnability, the extent to which it is possible for learners to learn the structures they are taught. This problem has always been recognized by language teaching methodologists (see Palmer, 1917), but it has been given additional weight by research which has shown that the acquisition of specific grammatical features is constrained developmentally. Corder (1967) suggested that learners possess a “built-in syllabus,” which regulates when it is possible for them to acquire each grammatical feature. Subsequent studies of naturalistic language learning (see Hatch, 1978a; Meisel, Clarksen, & Pienemann, 1981; Wode, 1980) have given empirical support to this claim. Also, studies designed to investigate whether learners succeed in learning the structures they are taught (e.g., Ellis, 1984, 1989; Felix, 1981; Pienemann, 1984, 1989) suggest that often they are unable to internalize new structural knowledge in a manner that enables them to use it productively in communication unless they are ready to do so. For example, Pienemann (1984) has provided evidence that learners of German as a second language only acquire a feature such as inversion if they have previously acquired word order structures that are easier to process. In other words, in order to acquire Feature D, learners must already have acquired Features A, B, and C. Learnability, therefore, remains a central problem in syllabus design. How can the content of a syllabus be selected and graded in a way that is compatible with the learner’s ability to learn? This is a problem for any syllabus, but it becomes acute when the content is specified in grammatical terms.

The main purpose of this paper is to address this problem and to present a proposal for how it might be overcome. The paper will begin with a brief discussion of the difference between two types of linguistic knowledge—implicit and explicit knowledge. This distinction underlies much of the discussion in the rest of the paper. It will also consider the relationship between these two types of knowledge. There follows a detailed discussion of structural syllabuses in relation to each type of knowledge. The main argument of this paper is that the structural syllabus is a valid device for raising learners’ consciousness about grammar; this role is discussed in the concluding section.

**IMPLICIT AND EXPLICIT KNOWLEDGE OF AN L2**

It has been hypothesized that the learner internalizes two types of knowledge—implicit and explicit knowledge. As Bialystok (1981) has
pointed out, this distinction is common in cognitive psychology. Explicit knowledge refers to knowledge that is analyzed (in the sense that it can be described and classified), abstract (in the sense that it takes the form of some underlying generalization of actual linguistic behavior), and explanatory (in the sense that it can provide a reasonably objective account of how grammar is used in actual communication).

Explicit knowledge is available to the learner as a conscious representation, but it is not the same as “articulated knowledge” (i.e., spoken or written accounts of the knowledge). A learner may have constructed a conscious abstract representation of a grammatical rule (e.g., have formulated an idea that -s on the end of a noun signals more than one) and yet not be able to put this idea into words. Often, however, explicit knowledge is developed together with metalinguistics knowledge (e.g., terms such as plural), and this helps the learner to articulate it.

Two kinds of implicit knowledge can be identified: formulaic knowledge and rule-based knowledge. Formulaic knowledge consists of ready-made chunks of language—whole utterances, such as I don't know or utterance frames with one or more empty slots, such as Can I have a ______? Rule-based knowledge consists of generalized and abstract structures which have been internalized. In both cases, the knowledge is intuitive. Native speakers know a large number of formulas which they have learned as unanalyzed units (see Pawley & Syder, 1983). They also know rules that enable them to understand and produce novel sentences without conscious effort. Implicit knowledge of rules is largely hidden and we know relatively little about how they are represented in the mind. It is doubtful, however, whether the manner of their representation corresponds closely to the way they are represented as explicit knowledge, one of the reasons why published grammars generally do not claim that the rules they describe have psychological validity.

Because implicit knowledge becomes manifest only in actual performance (both comprehension and production), it is, perhaps, not surprising to find that there is disagreement concerning the nature of the mechanisms responsible for its acquisition, particularly where rules are involved. Whereas some researchers (e.g., White, 1987) view rules in both native speaker and learner grammars as primarily linguistic in nature, others (e.g., Clahsen, 1984; McLaughlin, 1978) see them as cognitive (i.e., involving the same general mechanisms that underlie other kinds of learning). Although much of the research into developmental sequences does not specify which type of knowledge is involved, it is clear that it is implicit knowledge that the researchers have in mind. For example, Wode's (1980) account of how German children progress through a series of stages in acquiring English negatives and interroga-
tives assumes that the knowledge they are slowly constructing is implicit rather than explicit.

Another distinction from cognitive psychology that is often referred to in L2 acquisition research is declarative and procedural knowledge. These terms were used initially by Ryle (1949) and subsequently taken up by cognitive psychologists like Anderson (1983) to distinguish knowledge as a set of facts (declarative knowledge) and knowledge about how to do things (procedural knowledge). An example may make this clearer. Knowledge of the rules of the highway code (e.g., Always signal before overtaking) would constitute declarative knowledge while knowledge of how to drive a car in accordance with these rules would be procedural. Anderson characterizes classroom L2 learning as beginning with declarative knowledge of grammatical rules (usually supplied by the teacher), which is gradually proceduralized, resulting in the ability to use the foreign language without thinking.

The explicit/implicit and declarative/procedural distinctions may appear to be very similar, but in fact, they are not, as Figure 1 shows. Whereas the terms explicit/implicit label the type of knowledge learners possess in terms of whether it is conscious or intuitive, the terms declarative/procedural concern the degree of control over L2 knowledge the learner has, distinguishing knowledge that can be used only with effort through controlled processing from knowledge that can be used effortlessly through automatic processing. (Bialystok, 1982, also depicts linguistic knowledge as two intersecting continua, which she labels +/- analyzed and +/- automatic. The former relates to the implicit/\n
FIGURE 1
The Difference Between Explicit/Implicit and Declarative/Procedural Knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Declarative</th>
<th>Procedural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explicit</strong></td>
<td>Type A</td>
<td>Type B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conscious knowledge of L2 items</td>
<td>Conscious knowledge of learning, production, and communication strategies. The learner can use explicit knowledge easily and rapidly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implicit</strong></td>
<td>Type C</td>
<td>Type D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intuitive knowledge of L2 items</td>
<td>Ability to employ learning, production, and communication strategies automatically. The learner can use intuitive knowledge fluently.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
explicit dimension and the latter to the declarative/procedural dimension.) Thus, explicit/implicit refer to a knowledge dimension, whereas declarative/procedural refer to a process dimension. The key point to note is that the two distinctions intersect; we can talk about both explicit and implicit knowledge as existing in declarative and procedural form.

Although the distinction between explicit and implicit knowledge is not itself controversial, the relationship between the two is. The main point of debate is whether explicit L2 knowledge can convert into implicit L2 knowledge. One of the assumptions of traditional language teaching methods based on a structural syllabus is that explicit knowledge can become implicit knowledge through practice. According to this view, learners automatize or proceduralize knowledge that is initially explicit by doing grammar activities. In terms of Figure 1, this is tantamount to claiming that practice enables learners to move from Type A knowledge to Type D, the goal of most language programs. The notion of automatizing or proceduralizing explicit knowledge so that it becomes implicit is a somewhat confused one. It derives from the failure to clearly distinguish explicit/implicit knowledge from declarative/procedural knowledge. Thus, whereas it is legitimate to talk about the proceduralization of declarative knowledge, it is not legitimate to equate this with the conversion of explicit into implicit knowledge.

The key issue—and it is here that we run up against the learnability question—is whether we can manipulate the process by which a learner moves from Type A to Type D knowledge. Two positions can be distinguished—a noninterface and an interface position. According to the former, it is impossible to lead learners from Type A to Type D knowledge through practicing declarative explicit knowledge (as shown in Figure 2a). This position sees Type D knowledge as deriving from proceduralizing Type C knowledge. Practicing explicit knowledge (Type A) may result in greater facility in using this knowledge (Type B) but will still involve accessing conscious L2 knowledge. The interface position comes in a strong and a weak form. According to the strong version, Type A knowledge can be converted into Type D knowledge through practice and there are no constraints on this taking place (see Figure 2b). According to the weak version, Type A knowledge may develop into Type C knowledge providing learners are ready to accommodate the new knowledge into their interlanguage systems. Opportunities for formally practicing the new knowledge or for communicating naturally in contexts that call for its use will be needed before Type D knowledge develops (see Figure 2c).

Krashen (1981) has argued strongly in favor of a noninterface position. He argues that explicit knowledge may assist learners in certain kinds of language performance in the form of monitoring but that it...
does not help them to acquire implicit knowledge. Others (e.g., Gregg, 1984; McLaughlin, 1978; Sharwood Smith, 1981) have opted for a strong interface position, according to which explicit knowledge can change into implicit knowledge as a result of practice.

It is my contention that the evidence available from research into the effects of grammar instruction on L2 learning (see Ellis, 1990, and Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991, for recent reviews of the literature) is
compatible only with a weak interface position. This research suggests
the following conclusions:

1. Grammar instruction results in faster learning and in higher levels
   of L2 grammatical accuracy (see Long, 1983; Pica, 1983).

2. Grammar instruction directed at a grammatical feature that learn-
   ers are not ready to acquire as implicit knowledge does not succeed

3. Grammar instruction directed at a grammatical feature that learn-
   ers are ready to acquire as implicit knowledge is successful (see

The first conclusion cannot be easily explained by a noninterface the-
ory. The second conclusion contradicts a strong interface theory. All
three conclusions are compatible with a weak interface theory.

Figure 3 provides a model of L2 acquisition that incorporates a weak
interface position. The model distinguishes input, intake, and implicit
L2 knowledge. Input refers to the samples of the L2 that the learner is
exposed to as a result of contact with the language in communication
(oral and written). Formal instruction can also provide input (i.e.,
general exposure to the L2), although its raison d'être is to teach

FIGURE 3
A Model of L2 Acquisition Incorporating a Weak Interface Position

\[IL = \text{interlanguage.}\]
specific grammatical items. Intake refers to the linguistic properties in the input that the learner attends to. Not all of these properties will be immediately incorporated into the learner’s interlanguage system; only those features that are finally incorporated become implicit knowledge of the L2.

The model shows that implicit knowledge can be internalized in two ways. The main way is by deriving intake from the input. A secondary way is directly from the explicit knowledge that is learned through formal instruction. This way is considered secondary for two reasons; first, the amount of new grammatical knowledge derived in this way is likely to be limited because only a small portion of the total grammatical properties of a language can be consciously learned (see Krashen, 1982), and second, explicit knowledge can only feed directly into implicit knowledge if learners are developmentally ready to incorporate it (hence the dotted line).

The model posits a number of other uses of explicit knowledge, however:

1. Explicit knowledge is also available for use in monitoring (as proposed by Krashen, 1982). Monitoring can occur before an utterance is produced or after. Monitored output constitutes one source of input. As Terrell (1991) puts it “monitoring can apparently interact with acquisition, resulting in learners acquiring their own output” (p. 61).

2. Explicit knowledge can help learners to notice features in the input and also to notice the meanings that they realize. For example, if learners know that plural nouns have an -s, they are more likely to notice the -s on the ends of nouns they hear or read in input and also more likely to associate the -s morpheme with the meaning more than one. In a sense, then, as Terrell (1991, p. 58) suggests, explicit knowledge can function as a kind of “advance organizer” that helps the learner to comprehend and segment the input and also as a “meaning-form focuser” that enables the learner to establish meaning-form relationships.

3. Explicit knowledge may help learners to incorporate features that have become intake into their developing interlanguage grammars by facilitating the process by which they compare their existing representation of a grammatical feature with that actually observed in the input. For example, if learners know that plural nouns have an -s, they are better equipped to notice the difference between this feature in the input and its omission in their own output.

Monitoring, noticing, and noticing-the-gap are all mental processes and hence are shown inside the “black box” in Figure 3. Because the
availability of relevant explicit knowledge does not guarantee their operation, all three processes are represented by dotted lines.

A key aspect of this model is the role that explicit knowledge is hypothesized to play in noticing and noticing-the-gap. According to Schmidt (1990), the process of noticing is frequently (and perhaps necessarily) a conscious one. He defines it operationally as availability for verbal report. A variety of factors can induce learners to notice features in the input—the demands of a task, the high frequency of an item in the input, the unusual nature of a feature, the inherent salience of a feature, and interaction that highlights a feature. Noticing-the-gap (Schmidt & Frota, 1986) occurs when learners make the effort to establish in what ways a new feature, which they have heeded in the input, is different from their existing interlanguage representation. This entails some form of comparison between what learners typically do in their output and what is present in the input. Learners may notice a feature but not bother to notice the gap. Neither noticing nor noticing-the-gap guarantees that the new feature will be incorporated into the learner's interlanguage system, as in many cases this will be constrained by the learner's stage of development.

This model, then, envisages that explicit knowledge can convert directly into implicit knowledge under certain, fairly stringent conditions related to the learner's stage of development. It also allows for explicit knowledge to have an indirect effect on acquisition by helping to facilitate the processes of noticing and noticing-the-gap. It is hypothesized that learners who know about a grammatical feature because they have learned about it through grammar instruction are in a better position to heed this feature when it subsequently occurs in the input and also are better able to notice the difference between the input and their own production. (Empirical evidence in support of the claim that explicit knowledge facilitates subsequent noticing is provided by Fotos, 1992). Explicit knowledge functions as a kind of “acquisition facilitator” (Seliger, 1979) by providing “hooks” on which to hang subsequent acquisition (Lightbown, 1985).

THE STRUCTURAL SYLLABUS AND L2 ACQUISITION

A structural syllabus employs a synthetic teaching strategy, defined by Wilkins (1976) as “one in which the different parts of the language are taught separately and step-by-step so that acquisition is a process of gradual accumulation of the parts until the whole of the language has been built up” (p. 2). The execution of this teaching strategy involves the course designer in making principled decisions regarding which
parts of the language to teach (i.e., selection) and which order to teach them in (i.e., grading). However, as Wilkins points out, the job of synthesizing the items which have been presented in small pieces is left to the learner.

A structural syllabus can serve as a basis for the development of either implicit or explicit knowledge. In the case of the former, the aim of the syllabus is the development of the kind of intuitive knowledge that is required to communicate in the L2. In the case of the latter, the aim is knowledge about the language—some kind of conscious representation of the “rules” that makeup the language. The structural syllabuses used in the audiolingual and oral-situational methods are directed at implicit knowledge, whereas the grammar-translation method is directed at explicit knowledge.

The Structural Syllabus and Implicit Knowledge

In the case of a structural syllabus for implicit knowledge, the aim is to “teach the language, not about the language” (Moulton, 1961). The term teaching the language can refer to both the comprehension and the production of grammatical items. It is possible to teach a structure only for comprehension, but in most methods that employ a structural syllabus, the aim is to enable the learners to produce the items correctly. As we will see, it is this insistence on production that creates many of the problems. A possible solution to the difficulties of a structural syllabus might be to settle for the lesser but still worthwhile goal of teaching grammar for comprehension.

When production is the goal, another distinction is important. Whereas some structural syllabuses (e.g., those underlying strict audiolingual courses) are based on the idea that each item will be fully mastered before another item is introduced, others (e.g., those underlying more modern approaches to grammar teaching such as that described in Ur, 1988) recognize that mastery occurs only in the long term and that each item will probably only be partially acquired before another is introduced. These two views of structural syllabuses will be referred to as immediate mastery and gradual mastery. The problems of both will now be examined.

STRUCTURAL SYLLABUSES FOR IMMEDIATE MASTERY

Ultimately a structural syllabus directed at immediate mastery will only work if the order in which the grammatical items are taught corresponds to the order in which the learners can learn them. In other
words, the syllabus must satisfy the criterion of learnability. Designers of structural syllabuses have always acknowledged this, and learnability has always figured as one of the criteria of selection and grading. Mackey (1965), for instance, identified five factors that contributed to learnability: similarity (i.e., between the target language and the native language), clarity, brevity, regularity, and learning load. The notion of learnability that underlies these factors is a rational rather than a psycholinguistic (or empirical) one. It reflects an external account of what ought to be learnable.

To what extent does the ordering of items derived from these external criteria conform with the learner’s “built-in syllabus”? One way of answering this question is to compare the order of items in sample Structural syllabuses with the natural order of acquisition reported in studies of L2 acquisition. If it can be shown that the orders do not match, the solution is simple—devise a syllabus where they do. It is doubtful whether such a solution is possible, however. L2 acquisition research has not investigated all the features that the learner will need to be taught, so there is only information relating to the acquisition of a fairly small number of grammatical items currently available. Also, there is uncertainty regarding research that has investigated the “natural order” of acquisition. For example, a number of studies produced evidence that learners of different ages and with different first languages follow the same order of acquisition of a set of English grammatical morphemes (Krashen, 1977), but this research has been challenged on a number of grounds (see Hatch, 1978b). In particular, it is difficult to maintain the view that L2 acquisition involves the systematic mastery of discrete grammatical items, as this research appears to assume.

Another problem is that the grammatical items found in a structural syllabus do not have psycholinguistic validity. Bley-Vroman (1983) has argued convincingly that the categories of a descriptive grammar, from which the items of a structural syllabus are derived, bear no relation to the mental categories which learners construct in the process of learning a language. Learners appear to construct their own rules, many of which are transitional and hence do not correspond to any of the rules found in a reference grammar of the target language. For example, the sequence of acquisition for German word order rules (see Meisel, Clahsen, & Pienemann, 1981) contains a stage where adverb-preposing occurs, as in Example 1.

1. Heute wir gehen ins Kino. (Today we go to the cinema.) Such a rule represents an advance on the previous stage during which adverbs, if used, only occur at the ends of utterances. However, the adverb-preposing rule results in an error because in the target language it obligates the application of a further rule, inversion:
2. Heute gehen wir ins Kino. (Today go we to the cinema.) This is a rule which the learner does not yet know. This example illustrates how acquisition involves the construction of rules not found in the target language (i.e., adverb-preposing without inversion) and shows that progress can actually result in errors not evident at an earlier stage.

A third problem is that structural syllabuses treat each item as discrete and separate. It has been shown, however, that the acquisition of a new form can affect the organization of the learner’s entire mental grammar (see Huebner, 1983). The rules that make up this grammar are interrelated in complex ways, so any change may involve not just an addition of a new form but the restructuring of the whole system (McLaughlin, 1990). This reorganization may not necessarily take place in accordance with the way the target language grammar is constructed. If the implicit knowledge system that a learner builds is viewed as a form-function network (Ellis, 1985; Rutherford, 1987), then the acquisition of a new form leads the learner not just to assign it a certain functional value but also to reassess the functional values assigned to forms previously acquired. It follows that the nature of the form-function system constructed at any one stage of development will be unique until the learner finally arrives at the target language grammar.

In short, it is difficult to see how a structural syllabus directed at the immediate mastery of grammatical items (defined as the ability to use the items accurately in production) can cope with these learnability issues.

**STRUCTURAL SYLLABUSES FOR GRADUAL MASTERY**

A case might still be made for the use of structural syllabuses as a basis for teaching implicit knowledge for use in production if it can be shown they are compatible with a view of acquisition as a process of gradual mastery. The structural syllabuses associated with the oral-situation approach were, in fact, based on this view of L2 acquisition. Palmer (1917), for example, distinguishes conscious and subconscious learning and clearly sees the former as a precursor of the latter, at least where adult learners are concerned. Palmer opposes a purely “natural” method that caters to subconscious learning on the grounds that it is inefficient. He argues for “conscious study of the microcosm” through the graded presentation of linguistic items. He believes it possible to guide the learner through a series of general stages involving (a) receiving knowledge, (b) fixing the knowledge in memory, and (c) developing the ability to use the knowledge as skill. In other words, Palmer adheres to a view of language learning similar to that of proponents of a strong
interface theory. It is probably true to say that views close to those of Palmer underlie the continued use of structural syllabuses for teaching implicit knowledge today (see Ur, 1988).

How can a structural syllabus reflect the process by which learners achieve gradual mastery of linguistic features? Clearly a simple linear syllabus cannot do so. Learners may be able to receive a new feature and perhaps also fix the knowledge in memory, but it is unlikely that a single treatment will result in their developing the ability to use the knowledge as skill. One way around this problem might be to design a spiral syllabus. Howatt (1974) suggests that such a syllabus accords better with the natural process of learning because learners have their attention directed at the same items on several occasions but in different combinations and with different meanings. It is possible, therefore, that a spiral syllabus can cater to implicit knowledge.

The key question, however, is whether it is possible to guide the process by which explicit knowledge becomes implicit knowledge by means of a cyclical re-presentation of grammatical items. According to the model of L2 acquisition shown in Figure 3, this is only possible if the presentation of an item coincides with the learner's readiness to acquire it. A spiral syllabus may increase the likelihood of this occurring, but it is still a hit-or-miss affair. The only way to guarantee the effectiveness of a structural syllabus directed at implicit knowledge is by ensuring it is compatible with the learner's internal syllabus, and this, as we have already seen, is problematic.

STRUCTURAL SYLLABUSES FOR COMPREHENSION

It is possible, however, that the problems of the structural syllabus directed at implicit knowledge can be overcome if the goal of the syllabus is to enable learners to comprehend rather than to produce the items within it. In this case, the teaching materials based on the syllabus would provide activities that enable learners to (a) hear sentences containing the structures listed in the syllabus and (b) identify the specific functions performed by the features (i.e., to establish form-meaning relationships). For example, to help learners comprehend the meaning of plural -s, they might be asked to listen to sentences such as He put the books on the table and He gave his friend the pen and to choose which pictures from a set of pictures correspond to the meanings of the sentences. The pictures for each sentence would include distracters (e.g., one showing a man putting a single book on the table or giving his friend two pens) as well as accurate representations of the sentences actually said. Such activities would be directed at helping the learner to notice new grammatical features in the input and the grammatical
meanings they realize. Like traditional grammar materials, they would be specially contrived to focus the learner’s attention on specific items, but they would differ from them in that they would not require the learner to produce sentences containing the items.

Pienemann’s (1985) distinction between input for comprehension and input for production provides a rationale for such a syllabus. Pienemann argues that the developmental sequence through which learners pass reflects the gradual mastery of a series of processing operations responsible for language production. His own proposal regarding syllabus design is as follows:

1. Do not demand a learning process which is impossible at a given stage (i.e. order of teaching objectives be in line with stages of acquisition).
2. But do not introduce deviant forms.
3. The general input may contain structures which were not introduced for production. (p. 63)

This constitutes a serious attempt to suggest how a structural syllabus can take account of learnability, but it runs up against a number of objections—our knowledge of developmental sequences remains patchy and relates primarily to formal features of the language (i.e., little is known about how learners build form-function networks). It is not clear how teachers are supposed to identify the developmental stages which individual learners have reached or whether this can be practically achieved, and it requires teachers to construct teaching programs tailored to the psycholinguistic needs of individual learners, which, as Lightbown (1985) has pointed out, may be unrealistic in many teaching situations. These objections all arise because Pienemann views the primary goal of a structural syllabus as that of providing input for production. They do not appear to apply if the syllabus is directed at providing input for comprehension. Pienemann suggests that such input can be allowed to arise naturally in the course of communication, but he does not consider the possibility that it might be contrived through formal instruction.

It is possible, however, to envisage an approach where input for comprehension is carefully planned and structured to ensure that the learner is systematically exposed to specific grammatical features. This proposal is a modest one in the sense that the goal is no longer the development of full implicit knowledge of the L2 but only the facilita-

1Currently, Pienemann and his associates are working on various ways in which a learner’s stage of development can be quickly diagnosed. In particular, they have developed sophisticated computer software to facilitate diagnosis. It is not clear to me how practical this will be in many teaching situations, as it necessitates teachers’ obtaining reliable data regarding the structures learners are able to perform at any one stage of development—a painstaking and time-consuming process.
tion of intake. Although this constitutes a substantially reduced goal for structural syllabuses, it is nevertheless still a significant one. Chaudron (1985) has argued that intake “has important status in second language research” (p. 1), and a similar position can be adopted with regard to its importance for language pedagogy. There is a need, as Chaudron emphasizes, for investigating precisely which factors influence intake. One way in which this can be undertaken is through studies of how formal instruction affects learners’ ability to notice and comprehend specific grammatical items (see Van Patten & Cadierno, 1991, for an example of such a study).

**SUMMARY**

We have considered two views of the structural syllabus—one that sees it as a basis for teaching accurate production and the other that sees it as a basis for facilitating intake through the comprehension of specific grammatical items. In the case of the former, the structural syllabus can serve as a device for bringing about the immediate mastery of grammatical items. We have seen that such a view is not compatible with what is known about the way learners acquire an L2. It can also serve as a device for ensuring the gradual mastery of items. We have seen that this view also runs up against the problem of learnability, even if the syllabus recycles the items. In both cases the difficulties arise as a result of treating the structural syllabus as an instrument for teaching learners to produce grammatical items correctly. It has been suggested that these difficulties might be overcome if the goal becomes the comprehension rather than the production of grammatical items. In this case, the goal of the syllabus is intake facilitation rather than the full development of implicit knowledge.

**The Structural Syllabus and Explicit Knowledge**

Another way in which the problem of learnability can be side-stepped is by making the goal of a structural syllabus explicit rather than implicit knowledge. In other words, the syllabus serves as a basis for developing a conscious rather than intuitive understanding of grammatical rules, and there is no expectancy that learners will be able to use the knowledge they have learned in fluent production. This amounts to a reversal of Moulton’s slogan, cited above—we should teach about the language, not the language.

This proposal rests on two principal assumptions:

1. The acquisition of explicit knowledge contributes to the development of L2 proficiency.
2. The acquisition of explicit knowledge can take place as an accumulation of discrete entities.

Assumption 1 derives from and is supported by the weak-interface model discussed earlier. Assumption 2 is justified if it is accepted that explicit knowledge consists of a body of conscious knowledge about isolated grammatical items and rules, a view adopted by many learners, as this quotation from Moore (1989) illustrates:

As a learner I have two major problems to overcome—accumulating a large number of partial entities, whether they be lexical items, grammatical rules, or whatever; secondly, finding opportunities to try out combinations of them, in both structured and unstructured situations. Once I have acquired, say, two thousand partial entities, I am better placed to communicate than if I have acquired only a hundred. (p. 157)

As Moore recognizes, accumulating the “facts of language” is not the whole of acquisition, but it can help to get the learner started.

There are educational as well as psycholinguistic arguments in favor of teaching grammatical facts. Breen (1985) addresses the question of what is authentic for the social situation of the classroom and argues that because the raison d’etre of this situation is language learning, the content of the teaching program should be drawn from the “culture of the classroom.” Breen’s idea is that the communicative and social aspects of learning should serve as content for language work. One source of such content is the linguistic and pragmatic systems of the language. A syllabus that isolates various formal and functional features with a view to making these the topics of learning activities might accord with the expectations of many learners. Grammar constitutes a serious and intellectually challenging content.

What will a syllabus for explicit knowledge consist of? On what basis should the selection and grading of the grammatical content proceed? We will consider somewhat briefly a number of possibilities.

Perhaps the most obvious one is to make use of the criteria which have been traditionally used. Widdowson (1968) identifies two general principles that syllabus designers have drawn on: (a) relative difficulty and (b) usefulness (i.e., the coverage value of an item and the classroom value of the item). However, as Widdowson points out, these two principles are often in conflict as what is useful is often not relatively simple. It is not clear, therefore, to what extent they can be applied in a systematic manner and Halliday, McIntosh, and Strevens (1964) are probably right in claiming that it is “practical teaching experience” that often serves as a basis for selection and grading, although this rather begs the question as to what this actually consists of. Certainly, there is...
considerable agreement regarding both what structures to teach (at least in general courses) and in what order they should be taught (see Yalden, 1983).

One way in which these traditional criteria might be sharpened is by using the insights obtained from the study of linguistic markedness in language learning. This constitutes the second possibility. The notion of markedness is not itself new—adherents of structural grading have long worked with a similar notion to that underlying much current discussion of the concept (see Mackey's, 1965, discussion of “regularity,” for example), but recent studies do give greater precision to the concept. For example, the NP + PP pattern after dative verbs such as give in sentences like Bob gave a gift to Isabel can be considered less marked than the NP + NP pattern after the same verbs in sentences like Bob gave Isabel a gift on a number of grounds. The latter sentence is more transparent, the integrity of the verb and the direct object is maintained, and it is more regular (i.e., just about all dative verbs permit the NP + PP pattern, but only some permit the NP + NP pattern). This kind of information can be used to make decisions regarding which linguistic feature to introduce early and which late. But it is not yet clear how this information should be used. It can be argued that learners generally find it easier to handle unmarked features, so these should be introduced first, but it has also been suggested that learners will be able to project their knowledge of marked features to associated unmarked features (see Eckman, 1985), which constitutes an argument in favor of focusing attention on marked features. Also, unmarked features may be learned by most learners naturally and, therefore, do not require explicit attention. In contrast, marked features are often not acquired (see Bardovi-Harlig & Bofman, 1989; Long, 1988) unless the learners’ conscious attention is directed at them. On balance, the arguments favor the selection of marked rather than unmarked features in a syllabus for explicit knowledge.

A third alternative for organizing the content of a structural syllabus is derived from another old idea—that of remedial teaching. The content of a remedial language program is established through the identification and description of learners’ errors. It rests on the simple idea that formal language teaching will be more efficient if it concen-
trates on what the learner has not learned rather than on teaching the whole grammar. However, as Corder (1981) has noted, there is no reason why remedial teaching should work any better than initial teaching unless the psycholinguistic causes of errors are taken into account. Once again, then, we seem to come up against the learnability problem.

In the case of a structural syllabus designed to teach explicit knowledge, this problem is side-stepped, however, if, as we have argued, it only arises where implicit knowledge is involved. A remedial syllabus might consist of a list of structures which have been shown to be problematic to either learners in general or, better still, to the particular group of learners for whom the syllabus is intended. This constitutes a record of the potential deviations and serves, therefore, as a checklist. Armed with this list, the teacher would need to observe the learners' errors in order to establish whether the potential deviations actually occur in their production and, if so, when. The teacher would then devise activities to draw the learners' attention to errors and help them compare the errors to the correct target language forms.

To sum up, the aim of a structural syllabus for explicit knowledge is to raise learners' consciousness about how the target language grammar works. As Larsen-Freeman (1991) has pointed out, this will involve (a) drawing attention to how grammatical forms are formed, (b) developing an understanding of how particular grammatical forms signal particular grammatical meanings, and (c) helping learners realize what constitutes appropriate use of the forms in context. The rationale for this use of a structural syllabus is that explicit knowledge may help learners to notice features in the input that they might otherwise ignore and also to notice the gap between the input and their own interlanguage productions. The content of such a syllabus might be determined on the basis of traditional criteria for the selection and grading of grammatical structures, by the principled selection of marked linguistic features, or remedially, by identifying gaps in the learners' implicit knowledge through error analysis.

CONCLUSION: CONSCIOUSNESS-RAISING AND THE STRUCTURAL SYLLABUS

This paper has sought to present a new rationale, for the structural syllabus. The need for this has arisen from the recognition that the traditional rationale, which derives from behaviorist learning theory, is inadequate because it cannot provide a satisfactory solution to the learnability problem. The new rationale rests on the claim that grammar teaching should be directed at consciousness-raising rather than practice (see Fotos & Ellis, 1991). Consciousness-raising refers to a delib-
erate attempt on the part of the teacher to make the learners’ aware of specific features of the L2; it entails an attempt to instill an understanding of the formal and functional properties of these features by helping the learners develop a cognitive representation of them. Practice, on the other hand, involves an attempt to supply the learner with plentiful opportunities for producing targeted structures in controlled and free language use in order to develop fully proceduralized implicit knowledge. It is not intended, however, to suggest that practice has no role at all in language teaching. Practice may still be important as a means of helping learners gain control over formulaic knowledge, and it probably also has some place in the teaching of pronunciation. What is being challenged here is the traditional role it has played in the teaching of grammatical items.

In accordance with the preceding discussion, two kinds of consciousness-raising can be identified. In the case of consciousness-raising for comprehension, the aim is to focus the learners’ attention on the meaning(s) performed by specific grammatical properties. It has been suggested that this is tantamount to helping the learner to intake—a necessary (but not sufficient) step for internalization of the feature as implicit knowledge. This type of consciousness-raising will be achieved by means of activities that induce a learner to notice and understand the feature in the input (i.e., activities that require reception rather than production in the L2). In the case of consciousness-raising for explicit knowledge, the aim is to help the learner learn about a particular grammatical feature by developing an explicit representation of how it works in the target language. In many cases, this will involve teaching the learner the metalanguage needed to talk about grammatical rules. It has been hypothesized that explicit knowledge also aids the process of intake formation by facilitating noticing and noticing-the-gap. This type of consciousness-raising can be achieved by means of traditional grammar explanation of the kind found in the grammar-translation method. Another way, however, is to make use of problem-solving tasks that supply the learners with the data they need to discover the rule for themselves. An example of such a task is provided in Fotos and Ellis (1991). If such tasks are carried out in the target language, they serve the double purpose of raising learners consciousness about a specific grammatical item while providing opportunities for communicating in the target language—the learners will be communicating about grammar.

Traditionally, a structural syllabus has been used as the basis for designing a complete language course. This was possible because the goal was procedural implicit knowledge, which underlies the actual ability to use the L2 in communication. However, if the goal of a structural syllabus is the lesser one of consciousness-raising, it can no
longer serve as a complete course, as the ultimate goal of most courses will continue to be the ability to use the L2 in production. It follows that the structural syllabus can only provide part of a course. It will need to be complemented by other kinds of syllabuses that are based on the provision of input of the kind that has been hypothesized to promote implicit knowledge—a functional or a task-based syllabus, for example (see Long & Crookes, 1991). The precise relationship between the structural component and these other components of an overall syllabus remains to be decided. In restating the case for a structural syllabus, therefore, we have also acknowledged its reduced value. The new structural syllabus will serve as a facilitator rather than as a prime mover of L2 acquisition.

Finally, it needs to be acknowledged that many of the claims of both the model of L2 acquisition shown in Figure 3 and the pedagogical arguments based on it have only limited support from existing empirical research. Clearly, there is a need to demonstrate that the various claims that have been made regarding consciousness-raising are valid. However, I am assuming here that it is legitimate to advance pedagogical proposals without waiting for the necessary empirical support to be collected. Indeed, empirical L2 studies provide only one way of validating such proposals. The other, which may well be more important, is the well-established method of trying them out in the classroom and using practical experience as a basis for rejecting, accepting, or refining them. At the moment, the best that can be said is that these claims are compatible with the L2 research that has been carried out to date. The essential points are (a) that it is premature to dismiss the structural syllabus as a basis for L2 acquisition and (b) that considerable modification of the role traditionally given to such a syllabus is likely to be needed.
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The authors’ goal in this volume is to establish a foundation for the application of learning strategies to theory, research, and practice in second language acquisition. They build upon, yet move beyond, the “good language learner” research of the mid- and late 1970s (e.g., Naiman, Fröhlich, Stern, & Todesco, 1978; Rubin, 1975) and the descriptive learner strategy research of the 1980s (e.g., Wenden & Rubin, 1987) by basing their treatment of learning strategies primarily on the cognitive information processing model of Anderson (1983, 1985).

The book contains a preface, eight chapters, a 5-page glossary, a 14-page bibliography, and author and topic indices. Chapter 1 is an introduction to the topic and an overview of the book. Chapter 2 is the authors’ presentation of Anderson’s cognitive theory of learning, which Chapter 3 subsequently applies to second language acquisition. The various descriptive taxonomies and research methods that have been used in carrying out learning strategy research are reviewed in Chapter 4. Several research studies that O’Malley and Chamot have conducted with ESL students at the secondary level and with foreign language students at the university level are presented in Chapter 5. The issues involved in providing instruction in learning strategies and some of the pedagogical recommendations coming out of the research on this topic are covered in Chapter 6, followed by a description in Chapter 7 of models and materials for incorporating strategy training in first, second, and foreign language instruction. The authors give prominence to the strategic teaching model of Jones, Paliscar, Ogle, and Carr (1987) for first language learners and to their own cognitive academic
language learning approach (CALLA) for second and foreign language learners (Chamot & O’Malley, 1986, 1987).

Chapter 8, which purports to be “Summary and Conclusions,” introduces a great deal of new information. This chapter crystallizes many of the problems I experienced with the book. For example, O’Malley and Chamot’s discussion of declarative knowledge and procedural knowledge is confusing; on page 216 they imply that procedural knowledge becomes declarative knowledge (or vice versa), whereas in fact these terms represent two different types of knowledge. It is still an open question among cognitive psychologists whether and to what extent declarative and procedural knowledge interact. Elsewhere O’Malley and Chamot suggest that all metacognition is procedural knowledge, a false assumption no doubt arising from the fact that they fail to distinguish metacognitive knowledge from metacognitive strategies. (The same confusion occurs on page 105.)

Furthermore, cognitive theory, a version of which O’Malley and Chamot present to the exclusion of alternative theories of second language acquisition (SLA), is not without its limitations. Even strong proponents of cognitive theory such as McLaughlin (1987) admit that cognitive theory is only one perspective and that it is not a complete theory of second language acquisition. To be more comprehensive and powerful, McLaughlin argues that cognitive theory must be complemented by and integrated with existing linguistic theories of SLA so that it can explain a range of linguistic facts, such as constraints, that might be accounted for best by markedness theory or language universals. Thus, if Anderson’s cognitive framework is too general to account for all facets of SLA, it is probably also too general to account for all language learning strategies.

O’Malley and Chamot suggest that what the field needs most at this time are large-scale empirical statistical studies to determine which learning strategies and learner training approaches are most effective. I believe that this conclusion is premature, given the state of our knowledge about learning strategies; it presupposes that we have a fully adequate theory of cognition and SLA and that we know exactly what to look for. The authors also imply that quantitative research on learning strategies is theoretically motivated, whereas qualitative research is atheoretical. This is simply not the case. The authors should instead be calling for new and creative ways of appropriately combining quantitative and qualitative research methods. Such multiperspective research is what is needed if applied linguists are to arrive at a better understanding of language learning strategies.

I end, however, on a positive note. I have recently used O’Malley and Chamot’s book as one of the primary texts in an applied linguistics graduate seminar on language learning strategies. Even with some
background in SLA and cognitive theory, my students and I did find the book a bit difficult to read in spots. However, we all felt that reading and discussing the book was very much worth the effort; there is no other volume on the market today that covers the important and timely topic of learning strategies more thoroughly.
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The Role of Strategies in Language Teaching

In the spring of 1992, I taught an applied linguistics seminar on learner strategies in language teaching. As part of the course requirements, each student wrote a book notice. The following eight notices by my students all concern the role of strategies in language teaching.* The first four treat handbooks for language teachers dealing with strategies, and the second four treat ESL/EFL textbooks that incorporate strategy training into their language teaching materials.

MARIANNE CELCE-MURCIA, Guest Editor
University of California, Los Angeles


Language Learning makes a valuable contribution to the emerging research on learning strategies and learner autonomy. The book is designed to enhance the reader’s consciousness about the nature and process of language learning and to suggest effective strategies to improve language learning skills. It is aimed at three different audiences: well-motivated adult learners with previous language learning experience or those currently in the process of learning a language, teachers interested in promoting autonomous learning, and applied linguists. Although the first five chapters are directly addressed to the student, Language Learning may be more useful to teachers because they “may be best able to convey effectively” (p. 2) the content of the book.

The nine-chapter volume begins with an extensive introduction which includes a review of background literature on learning strategies (Chapter 1). The remaining chapters are divided into two parts: Chapters 2–6 present insights about each of the language skills involved in language learning and effective strategies that facilitate the development of these

*Editor’s note, Another book on this topic was the focus of a book notice in a recent issue of the TESOL Quarterly (Volume 26, Number 2): Ellen Bialystok’s Communicative Strategies: A Psychological Analysis of Second-Language Use (Basil Blackwell, 1990).
skills. Most of the insights described in these five chapters derive from Cohen's research, which is detailed in Chapters 7 and 8. Thus, this last part may be of more interest to researchers. Chapter 9 highlights the main issues raised throughout the book.

Whereas some chapters are purely informative, others place more demands on the readers, inviting them to actively participate in individual or group activities. Some strategies are presented inductively, having the readers discover the strategies they already use while performing certain exercises; others are preceded by a theoretical rationale.

Metacognitive strategies (i.e., strategies to regulate language learning) are introduced in the chapter on reading (Chapter 5). This choice, however, raises the question of whether the reader will limit the use of these regulatory strategies to the reading skill alone rather than to language learning in general, which is the usual focus of metacognitive strategies (Wenden, 1991). Chapter 5 also presents some techniques for gathering data on strategies, such as the think-aloud format, and invites readers to experiment with these techniques with a partner. Although such techniques are essential for learner training, I have my doubts as to whether all readers will have the ability and understanding to carry them out without previous experience.

*Language Learning* makes a valuable contribution to the field because it enhances the reader's metacognitive awareness of the tasks and demands involved in language learning and presents some original learning strategies, derived from the author's own research, such as strategies for apologizing (Chapter 4) and strategies for actively attending (Chapter 3).

*Language Learning* is a useful resource book for both teachers and researchers. It provides teachers with insights about how learners go about language learning and includes valuable suggestions to guide or supplement strategic training in the classroom. It links related aspects of second language learning, such as those concerning input/intake theory, individual differences, and foreigner talk, with learning strategy research. Researchers will find numerous issues that need to be further explored as well as many useful references to resources on learning strategies.
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- Learner Strategies for Learner Autonomy is essentially a teacher-oriented, task-based workbook designed to inform the reader about learner auton-
omn (Chapters 1–4), and to help teachers become learning strategists (Chapters 5–8). Chapter 9 introduces six program settings where learner autonomy is central to the curriculum.

Each chapter begins with a focus question and stated outcome. Wenden has elected not to state how to achieve a specific outcome. Rather, the body of each chapter contains tasks requiring the reader to work through student-generated data or short excerpts from research professionals; only then are task guidelines and summaries provided. Teachers who are more deductive learners may feel a certain frustration at this approach and are urged to first read the guidelines and summaries at the end of the chapter. Each chapter concludes with a section titled Valuable Readings, which lists publications relevant to the theme of each chapter.

Chapter 1 argues for the necessity of learner autonomy. Chapter 2 attempts to instill in the reader an understanding of cognitive strategies (comprehending, storing, and retrieving information) and related self-management strategies (planning, monitoring, and evaluating), whereas Chapter 3 discusses metacognitive strategies (personal-knowledge, strategic knowledge, and task knowledge). Finally, Chapter 4 discusses learner attitudes.

Chapters 5–8 focus on plans for teaching strategies. They are challenging and informative, designed to help teachers develop skills to teach specific cognitive and metacognitive strategies (note-taking, self-reporting, inferencing, and changing attitudes and beliefs). However, these chapters are somewhat cumbersome, containing detail-laden lesson plans and task descriptions. Many tasks entail gathering student information needed to sustain the teacher's training process.

The emphasis throughout on learning and teaching learner strategies does not deal with how language teaching fits into the process as much as some might hope. Nonetheless, there is a wealth of information here for teachers that may ultimately be quite beneficial for students.

TRACY CAMARILLO
University of California, Los Angeles


Language Learning Strategies is intended to guide teachers seeking to teach language learning strategies to their students. It combines both research background and practical suggestions for strategy development. It assumes that its intended audience has had little or no prior experience in teaching learner strategies.

The book's seven chapters cover classification of language learning strategies, direct strategies (those that “directly involve the target language,” p. 37), applying direct strategies to the four language skills, indirect strategies (those that “support and manage language learning . . .
without directly involving the target language,” p. 135), applying indirect strategies to the four language skills, language learning strategy assessment and training, and networking at home and abroad. Each chapter begins with a set of preview questions, intended to get the reader to think about the topic; an introductory paragraph outlining the topic; and a more detailed discussion of the topic, with research references supplied where the author considers them necessary. Each chapter concludes with a section titled Activities for Readers, aimed at teaching learning strategies. The author advises teachers to conduct strategy training sessions with their students. She advocates informed training in which information is given about the significance of the strategy rather than blind training in which students are not informed about the significance of the strategy they are using.

Seven appendices take up approximately the final third of the book. They consist of the following: general instructions to administrators of the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL), a document designed to gather information about how language learners go about learning a language; the SILL version for English speakers learning a new language; the SILL for speakers of other languages learning English; sources of quotations (separate from the References) that Oxford uses throughout the book; suggestions to readers on how to find activities; suggestions to teachers on how to find activities to use with their students; and strategy applications listed for various language skills. This last appendix lists the numbers of the pages on which particular strategies are discussed.

The major strengths of this book are its comprehensive overview of language learning strategies, its clear organization, its lists of suggestions for teachers seeking to teach learning strategies, and its extensive research background. Although not really suitable for cover-to-cover reading, most activities deal with actual practices that real language learners might use. This is a useful resource book.

M. P. GRAHAM
University of California, Los Angeles/Universidad de Guadalajara

Learning to Learn English: A Course in Learner Training.

There has been a growing interest in changing the focus of the traditional teacher-centered classroom to a learner-centered one. Oxford, Lavine, & Crookall (1989), O’Malley and Chamot (1990), Rubin (1987), and other researchers have considered the language learning task from the learner’s perspective. If learners learn how to take control of their own learning, then they can become less dependent on the teacher and continue to learn language outside the classroom when the teacher is not there. Learning to Learn English aims to help individuals “become . . . more effective learner[s] and] take on more responsibility for [their] own learning” (p. 1).

Learning to Learn English seems suitable for lower intermediate to interme-
diate students at the university or secondary level. This book takes students on a step-by-step journey toward the self-discovery of their own learning processes. From the very first page, students are made aware of just what kind of learner they are and which strategies would suit them best. At the beginning of the book, there is a self-test in which students can discover whether they are “analytic” language learners or “relaxed” language learners. An analytic learner studies language by concentrating more on form than on communication; whereas a relaxed learner concentrates more on language content than on form. Based on their test results, learners discover their weaknesses and strengths as language learners. After taking the test, a chart is provided to give analytic or relaxed students suggestions on how they can improve their language learning.

The questions asked in each chapter of the book are the same. These questions are meant to awaken the students’ awareness of their own learning processes in each language skill through reflection, discussion, and activity. Students are asked to assess how they feel about learning vocabulary, grammar, listening, speaking, reading, and writing by asking themselves the following questions: (a) How do you feel about a particular skill? (b) What do you know about this skill? (c) How well are you doing? (d) What do you need to do next? (e) How do you prefer to practice it? (f) Do you need to build your confidence? (g) How do you organize your practice? The first two questions are meant to get students thinking about the specific skill and test how much they know about that skill. Question c has students evaluating their knowledge of the skill and their progress. Question d allows students to plan ahead. Questions e-g test the students’ attitudes and personal preferences for learning so that they can draw some conclusions on what learning strategies best suit them.

I have some reservations about this book. Because the book resembles a long questionnaire, composed mainly of questions dealing with the learner’s cognitive style, this book should not be used as the core text of a language course. I would also advise care in using this book with students or teachers who are more accustomed to a teacher-centered classroom. For such students and teachers, the role of the teacher would need to change. Another problem that arises for the teacher is whether to teach strategies or language. Should the curriculum comprise strategies, or should the strategies be integrated with language content? This book does not help teachers do the latter. Despite my reservations, my overall impression of this book is positive, for if a teacher is able to show students how to take charge of their own learning processes, students will benefit in the long run. I recommend that this book be used as a teacher resource with teachers drawing on whichever units they wish to focus on in the class.
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Reading at the University is based on John Munby’s (1979) finding that, “when a person has difficulty comprehending a text, the reason for the errors may be intellectual, linguistic, or a mixture of the two” (p. 146). The text is designed to help ESL students overcome comprehension difficulties by teaching and providing practice with new strategies for meeting the linguistic and intellectual challenges of university reading. Reading at the University is intended for first-year college students or those preparing to enter a university. Because its purpose is to provide students with strategies to use with university-level reading, the emphasis is on process, not product. Munby’s (1979) classification of the most common errors students make is used as the basis for the strategies incorporated into this book. Because Hillman has chosen to focus on strategy use in reading, this review will concentrate on these aspects of her book.

The book is divided into 10 chapters, of which 6 are skill or developmental chapters (as the author refers to them), and 4 are content chapters, in which students are given several authentic readings in psychology, chemistry, cultural anthropology, as well as nonfiction essays. The chapters, which are in order of difficulty, are self-contained, so teachers can easily alter the ordering Hillman suggests for presentation.

The strategies presented are both implicit and explicit. One example of the implicit strategies Hillman incorporates are exercises that require students to answer questions involving background information before students start reading a passage. The explicit strategies provide explanations of why certain strategies are useful in an academic setting and how students can use them to better comprehend and gather information from a text.

For the task of reading part of a textbook, answering questions at the end of the chapter, and preparing for a quiz on the material, the text works on the following: skimming; scanning; predicting a quiz; class discussion questions on the reading; utilizing text information, such as topic headings and italicized or bold-faced words; and becoming an active reader through questioning. After suggesting that students predict and answer questions, the author discusses the types of questions they might find on a test, including literal, interpretive, and application questions.

Reading at the University is engaging and keeps students active at all times. It provides strategies which are valuable for successful university
scholarship, and they are presented in a clear, concise manner. Students who are fortunate enough to work with this book will undoubtedly find their own reading at the university to be more manageable and fruitful.
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On Target, one of numerous integrated skills series now available incorporates a learner-centered approach along with the expectation that students should be active participants in the learning process. These two intermediate-level texts of a six-volume series (that also include two levels each of In Contact and In Charge) are recommended for both EFL and ESL students, 15 years of age and older. Purpura and Pinkley have developed a complete and varied curriculum in On Target, making it well suited for those teachers who would like to use a textbook as the primary medium of instruction as well as those who use a textbook simply as a guide.

Both levels of On Target have 12 integrated skills chapters plus a tape, workbook, and a teacher’s edition—all based on engaging themes ranging from humor and stress to the mysteries of science. Each chapter opens with a warm-up activity, followed by a section which demonstrates the use of newly introduced language, and a minidialogue based on functions. The introduction of new vocabulary includes strategies aimed at enhancing language acquisition. A brief grammatical description of the target language is presented either deductively or inductively. As with each skill section within all the chapters, the listening activity includes before-, during-, and after-listening exercises. Speaking instruction activities cover such topics as word stress patterns, intonation contours, and rhythm. As the textbook progresses, the speaking section also includes instruction on increasingly sophisticated discussion skills. Further extending each chapter’s theme is a short reading followed by various reading comprehension checks. The composing process stages of prewriting, first draft, revision, editing, and awareness of audience are presented in both texts.

The complete syllabus contained in On Target includes a variety of supplemental activities. The Teacher’s Edition includes numerous creative suggestions for preparing the students for each unit through the use of realia, group work, games, surveys, and dictation. Additionally, teachers are given several means to evaluate students or for students to evaluate themselves.
In addition to the creativity demonstrated in the basic textbook design, perhaps the unique aspect of these books is their focus on learning strategies, leading toward learner autonomy. It is evidently the authors’ belief, as well as that of O’Malley and Chamot (1990), Wenden (1991), and other experts in the field, that students must become partners in education, taking responsibility for their own learning and developing the ability to continue the learning process outside the classroom. Through the use of authentic tasks, On Target teaches students to become aware of their personal learning styles and of other learning styles and strategies with which they may be unfamiliar.

On Target begins by developing learner awareness through the use of personal questionnaires, progressing through strategy instruction, such as skimming for the main idea, scanning for specific information, using cognates, organizing information in graphs and charts, classifying, sequencing, inferencing, and drawing conclusions. Due to the variety of strategy instruction, students should learn new strategies and become conscious of those they already know.

On Target, through its inclusion of basic textbook tasks, extensive teacher guidance to further activities, and learner strategy instruction presents a truly integrated course. I highly recommend these two volumes to fellow ESL and EFL teachers.
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The purpose of the books in this series, according to the back cover of Life Science, is “to help junior high and high school students develop content knowledge, skills, and learning strategies that will prepare them for higher levels of academic work.” Although not specifically mentioned, the series seems to be designed for students of limited English proficiency (LEP), evidenced by the simplified sentence structure and format. Listed as one of the series’ features is the incorporation of learning strategies from O’Malley and Chamot’s (1990) cognitive academic language learning

*Editor’s note. For an alternative perspective on this series, see the book notice following this one.
approach (CALLA). Although the CALLA model was followed to some extent in the design of Life Science, the overall result is a text which focuses on vocabulary learning, is weak in other academic skills, and barely touches on the use of learning strategies.

Each of the book's six chapters starts with Critical Thinking Activities, which draw on students' prior knowledge, incorporating vocabulary and pronunciation practice. Following are three to five content readings, each preceded by a prereading section with questions. After each reading is a Self-Evaluation, which has the students review vocabulary and content in consultation. Each chapter ends with a set of Extension Activities and a Glossary.

The CALLA model calls for a content-based curriculum, beginning with science, which allows the kind of "hands-on learning activities" recommended by O'Malley & Chamot (1990) "that provide both contextual support and academic language development" (p. 194). Life Science succeeds in providing contextual support for the content readings through the Extension Activities at the end of each chapter. It is unclear how the activities lead to developing academic language skills: The students are never instructed to write a report or take notes on an authentic scientific article. Simple sentence structure is maintained throughout the text; the students are never exposed, even gradually, to an academic writing style. For example, the authors consistently avoid combining sentences, presenting the students with such text as: "You see with your eyes. Your eyes work like a very good camera" (p. 84).

Another main component of the CALLA model is learning strategies instruction. O'Malley and Chamot (1990) emphasize that teachers need to assess, with the students' active participation, which strategies students already use. Teachers may then select which new strategies need to be taught in the classroom. However, the text fails to evaluate or explain learning strategies, or to instruct students in their use. Instead, a list of one to three strategies is set in a box next to an activity. Without added instruction and activities from the teacher, Life Science cannot explicitly help students develop learning strategies.

Due to its simplified content and style, Life Science would probably be inappropriate for high school students in an ESL context or for students with developed academic skills in their first language. The book would best serve junior high school LEP students who have had little previous instruction in science and might also be used with beginning to intermediate EFL students in a content-based or adjunct program.
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BOOK NOTICES 127
According to the authors, Earth and Physical Science is designed to teach ESL and EFL students to think critically during their language learning activities. This textbook presents very elementary English structures within a specific English for Science and Technology (EST) context which beginners can easily manage. It seems to fit well into the interests and proficiency level of EFL secondary students in the type of courses I am familiar with, for example, in Mexico. These classes consist of approximately 80–90 hours of instruction and assume little or no prior L2 exposure.

The authors' pedagogical philosophy encourages students to acquire and use learning strategies through active reading (i.e., the students are told to perform tasks using appropriate reading strategies for each specific task, such as using background knowledge or imagery). Christison and Bassano base this textbook on O'Malley and Chamot's (1990) cognitive academic language learning approach (CALLA). The authors' implicit goal is to provide practice in learning strategies that good language learners use. It is suggested that these strategies are not restricted to highly capable individuals, but that they can be learned by less effective language learners who have not discovered them on their own (O'Malley & Chamot, 1990).

The book is divided into six sequenced chapters or content units: Meteorology, Topography, Oceanography, Physics and Chemistry, Physics, and Astronomy. However, one drawback of this text is that there is no increase in difficulty level across the units. As a result, the students will not be challenged to develop linguistically in the later chapters.

At first glance, one might think that this textbook is difficult for students of general English because of its subject matter. However, in my view, the textbook is appropriate for ESOL students during their first or second years in an English-speaking academic context. This book can be used by native or nonnative teachers. The authors provide good examples for each of the topics presented, which help both the students and teachers to follow the explanations; at the same time, the texts are reinforced with clear pictures or illustrations, which are undoubtedly one of the strengths of this volume because they promote comprehension through imagery.

The authors provide a series of prereading and postreading activities that help the students comprehend and process the information in the passages. These activities include consulting and sharing ideas with others, making and experimenting with hypotheses, reading and classifying new information, and doing vocabulary building exercises. At the end of each chapter there is a glossary, providing students quick reference to the

*Editor's note. For an alternative perspective on this series, see the book notice before this one.
meanings of previously selected key words. The learning strategies that are activated the most in this textbook are reading selectively (scanning for specific information), working cooperatively (group work), and using prior knowledge or schema activation. These strategies help students process their reading while improving their critical thinking skills.

Earth and Physical Science can make a great contribution to the field of TESOL, specifically to EST in programs such as the reading English for science and technology curriculum that I teach. Because of its relatively simple grammar and the variety of short reading passages, this would be a good textbook to use during the introductory stage of an EST reading program that incorporates learning strategies.
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Lexical Phrases and Language Teaching
James R. Nattinger and Jeanette S. DeCarro
This book presents arguments for a promising new direction in language teaching theory and practice, drawing on recent research issues.

Practical Stylistics
Henry Widdowson
This book takes a particular perspective on the nature of poetry and follows this through to proposals for teaching.

Context and Culture in Language Teaching
Claire Kramsch
This book attempts to redraw the boundaries of foreign language study by focusing attention on cultural knowledge as an educational objective in its own right.

Issues and Options in Language Teaching
H.H. Stern

How Languages are Learned
Patsy Lightbown and Nina Spada
This book is an introduction for teachers to the ways in which second languages are learned.

Cultural Awareness
Barry Tomalin and Susan Stempleski
This book is for language teachers who want to increase cultural awareness and interaction among their students.

Newspapers
Peter Grundy
This book offers practical, creative, and original ideas for making effective use of newspapers in the classroom.
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Are Preschool/Day Care Personnel Ready for Non-English-Speaking Children?

TONI GRIEGO JONES
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

The greatest development in language takes place between birth and 8 years of age. These early childhood years are crucial to all aspects of children's physical, emotional, social, and intellectual development (Bredekamp, 1987; McGee & Richgels, 1990; Perez & Torres-Guzman, 1992; Ziegler & Lang, 1991). An estimated 8 million children in the U.S. spend a part of those years in preschools or day care centers and many of them come from homes where a language other than English is spoken. Although it is difficult to estimate the numbers of non-English-speaking children in preschool/day care settings, the population of non-English-speaking children aged birth to 4 years in the U.S. was estimated to be 2.6 million in 1991 (Diaz Soto, 1991).

For non-English speakers, preschool/day care settings may be the first encounters with an all-English-speaking environment. Children's attitudes toward and perceptions of not only self but schooling and their place in U.S. education begin to be formed by experiences in preschool/day care settings. Activities and climate must be developmentally appropriate for L2 learners in order to maximize their growth in all areas. This means that caregivers in preschool/day care settings must have some understanding of what is developmentally appropriate for L2 learners. Teachers who care for children learning an L2 in the preschool years should have an understanding not only of first language development but of second language acquisition (SLA) as well. Further, an awareness and understanding of the culture surrounding the students' L1 is also crucial to the cognitive, social, and emotional growth of children. What teachers of second language learners should know is well documented (Ada, 1986; U.S. Department of
Education, 1991; Wong Fillmore, 1991). What they actually do know is another question and the topic of the study reported here. Caregivers in preschool/day care centers (in essence, language providers) are particularly important, perhaps the most important element, in quality early childhood programs (Ziegler & Lang, 1991). For L2 learners, day care personnel may be the first adults they develop relationships with who do not speak their home language. These teachers may be the first to introduce English to other language speakers. What do personnel in preschool/day care centers understand about their role and their effect on those children from non-English-speaking backgrounds? How prepared are they to cope with the responsibility of facilitating children's language development at this most crucial time for language growth, when children are trying to integrate two linguistic and cultural systems?

The purpose of this study was to assess the background and perceptions of personnel teaching in two day care centers in Milwaukee. Both centers were designated bilingual day care and preschool centers and the staff (teachers and assistant teachers) included native Spanish speakers who also had some proficiency in English (83% of staff). The staff estimated that at least 50% percent of the children came from homes where a language other than English was spoken. In all but a few cases the L1 was Spanish. Data was collected from 20 members of the staff through surveys designed to determine what teachers know about language development in general and SLA in particular. Questions were designed to elicit information about training, coursework in language development, and experience in working with L2 learners. Other questions focused on perceptions regarding the use of L1 and L2 in instructional settings and at home. Follow-up interviews were conducted with 8 teachers from the two centers to obtain additional information on the use of two languages in school and at home. Seven of the 8 teachers interviewed were bilingual Spanish speakers.

FINDINGS

Results indicated that although teachers felt they were well prepared to teach in preschool positions and had completed minimum certification requirements, they believed that they needed more training in language acquisition and understanding bilingual development. The majority of the staff (79%) believed that it was important to develop a child's native language as well as English. Despite this belief however, teachers estimated that the primary language of "instruction" and interaction for most teachers was English. Even though a significant percentage of teachers (83%) had bilingual capabilities, English was the language most often used in the child care settings even with Spanish-dominant children. Spanish was utilized as a support to clarify and ensure understanding. In the follow-up interviews, teachers described some situational use of each language, utilizing languages for different types of interactions with children and parents. For example, private conversations or emotional, very personal
situations; individual assistance to children; and conversations with parents were associated with Spanish for Spanish-speaking children. The more "academic" school situations such as reading and storytelling, were associated with English for all children.

Beyond preserving the native language, an even higher percentage of the staff (89%) believed it was important to value and promote children's cultural heritage. Cultural traditions and holidays were celebrated and some aspects of the curriculum (songs, field trips to cultural centers, art exhibits) focused on the Spanish-speaking heritage of many of the children. However, day-to-day practice did not seem to incorporate these children's home culture.

When asked how the centers promoted children's home language and culture in the daily routine, answers indicated sporadic, spontaneous, reactive behavior rather than planned, conscious attention that matched what teachers said was important for second language learners.

DISCUSSION

Teachers's behavior did not seem to follow from the perceptions and beliefs expressed, that it is important for children to maintain their native language and culture. For example, the most obvious and most effective way of promoting the Spanish-dominant children's home language would have been to use that home language in the daily routine of the center. Why wasn't it used? The centers described themselves as bilingual. What did bilingual mean to them? Was the orientation toward English as the language of schooling as strong for these teachers, even the bilingual teachers, as it has been found to be for public school teachers and students (Wong Fillmore, 1991).

Advocacy on behalf of young language-minority children has focused on expanding bilingual early childhood education programs. However, advocates need to pay attention to teacher preparation as well. Just as in K–12 public education, we can't assume that because there are bilingual personnel in early childhood settings that there is a coherent understanding of what to do for non-English-speaking children. For example, does a "bilingual" preschool mean that there are teachers who can clarify and explain in Spanish if children don't understand in English? Or does it mean that there is conscious knowledgeable attention to developing the whole child, including the two language systems available to them? The consequences of depriving children of the opportunity to develop their home language are serious. Research suggests that the pattern of language use reported by the teachers in this study results in children losing their home language in a short time (Wong Fillmore, 1990). Children who face the challenge of adopting a second language and culture, then, are cut off from their greatest support system—parents and family (Weinstein-Shr & Quintero, in press). If there is danger to families in shifting children into English at the expense of their native language then it isn't enough to advocate for more bilingual (especially if they are bilingual in name only)
preschools. As a profession, we must begin to assess, inform, -and prepare teachers who are to staff those early childhood environments, whether they are designated bilingual or nonbilingual.

IMPLICATIONS

Information from the study was used to develop recommendations for teacher training and resulted in the beginnings of collaboration between the centers and the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. In response to teachers' perceived need for more training in the area of language development, the Bilingual Education program at the university worked to accommodate that need. A regular university course on language assessment in bilingual/ESL classrooms was offered off campus at one day care center during regular working hours so that all day care personnel could attend. Regular university students, mostly public school teachers, were also enrolled. Besides learning more about first and second language acquisition, students received other unexpected benefits. At the end of the class, the director of the center wrote that child care teachers
typically are not free to attend evening classes without transportation to the University and are generally intimidated by the perceived “snobby” atmosphere, especially if their first language is not English. The group from the center felt universal success with the experience and felt competency equal to that of the degreed public school teachers and are anxious to take another summer school course.

On the other hand, the real-life experience of working with young children (infants through 5-year-olds) gave public school teachers a new appreciation and understanding of child development. The community center which operates the preschool/day care center contributed by paying tuition for personnel who registered for college credit, and the university, for its part, waived prerequisites and focused course content on assessment of language in early years and primary grades.

The survey has been revised and, with the cooperation of the state Department of Public Instruction, will be sent to preschools, day care centers, and Head Start programs throughout the state. Results will have implications for early childhood programs, as Wisconsin is currently experiencing a tremendous increase in the numbers of young non-English speakers.
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Peer Response Groups: Do L2 Writers Use Peer Comments in Revising Their Drafts?

GAYLE L. NELSON and JOHN M. MURPHY
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During the last decade, in response to the impact of collaborative learning theory (Johnson & Johnson, 1987) and a shift in the teaching of composition from an emphasis on product to an emphasis on process (Hairston, 1982), many L2 writing instructors began to use peer response groups in their writing classes. In peer response groups, students share their working drafts with others "as the drafts are developing in order to get guidance and feedback on their writing" (Leki, 1993, p. 22). The essence of peer response is students' providing other students with feedback on their preliminary drafts so that the student writers may acquire a wider sense of audience and work toward improving their compositions.

First language studies (e.g., Nystrand & Brandt, 1989) provide a persuasive argument in favor of writing groups. However, the findings of L1 studies do not necessarily apply to L2 students. With respect to peer response groups, L2 students differ from L1 students in at least two
important ways. First, English is not the native language of L2 students. Because L2 students are in the process of learning English, they may mistrust other learners' responses to their writing and, therefore, may not incorporate peer suggestions while revising. A second issue relates to cultural differences in classroom techniques (e.g., the practice of students' responding to the writings of other students). In China, for example, the teacher is traditionally viewed as an authority figure, the possessor of knowledge, and the one who is responsible for responding to students' work (Hudson-Ross & Dong, 1990). L2 students who view the teacher as “the one who knows” may ignore the responses of other students, not merely because English is the respondents' L2, but because of the perception that fellow students are not knowledgeable enough to make worthwhile comments about their work. If learners do not value other students' comments, they may not take them into consideration when revising.

THE STUDY

These concerns led to the following research question: When revising drafts, do L2 students incorporate suggestions made by their peers in response groups?

The Writing Class

Participants were enrolled in a 10-week intermediate ESL writing course at a large metropolitan university. A primary course objective was to enable students to write a focused and coherent paragraph. The instructor was an experienced teacher of L2 composition who used a process approach to teach writing. Instructional procedures included the use of prewriting heuristics to generate ideas and writing groups in which students responded to each others' drafts. Students were given a set of guiding questions (Leki, 1990), such as What do you think is the writer's focus? Once a week, students brought in copies of their drafts, distributed one copy to each member of their group, and wrote responses on other students' drafts. The instructor also received a copy of each draft, but corrected only grammar, spelling, and punctuation. Students were told not to correct mechanical errors of this kind. During the peer-group discussions, students talked through their responses to the drafts. After the discussions, students went home and revised their paragraphs.

Participants

Four students (two males and two females) were selected from four different countries. Students had been placed at this intermediate level (Level 3 of a five-course sequence) based upon a combination of listening, grammar, vocabulary, reading, and writing scores from a university-developed placement exam. The students were from Chile, Colombia, Peru, and Taiwan.
Procedure

The same four-person peer response group was videotaped once a week for 6 consecutive weeks. These six 45-min sessions were later transcribed verbatim. Data for the study consisted of the videotape transcripts, students’ rough drafts, and students’ final drafts. Two sessions had three students because of absences; therefore, the group discussed 22 (not 24) compositions.

Analysis of Data

Phase 1. Phase 1 of the data analysis consisted of two steps. The purpose of the analysis was to determine if these L2 students altered their drafts according to the suggestions made by their peers in response groups. First, the investigators independently read the rough drafts and corresponding transcripts. While reading the transcripts, they independently listed all suggestions mentioned by the group members, trying to stay as true as possible to the students’ verbal responses. This process is illustrated by the following student comments and subsequent description of how the comments were examined by the researchers. The student is commenting on a peer description of a subway station and train.

1. Maybe you could say more about the station and the train—like the station is small, the train has six windows, or is comfortable, has good chairs . . . . The writing is clear but I think it needs more about the train.

In this instance, one researcher wrote, “give more details about the station and the train,” and the other researcher wrote, “expand on the description of the train and the station.” Interceder agreement was determined by comparing the comments that the researchers had independently written down. In this example, there was complete agreement; for all the transcripts, interceder agreement was 94%.

After the researchers identified the concerns raised by the response group members, they completed the second step of data analysis by independently reading the students’ final drafts to see whether or not students had revised their drafts in light of their peers’ comments. Using a 5-point coding scale, with a score of 1 indicating that students had used none of their peers’ comments in revising their drafts and a score of 5 indicating that students had implemented all or nearly all of the students’ suggestions in revising their drafts, the researchers rated the extent to which students acted upon their peers’ suggestions. For instance, from the comments presented above on the description of the subway station, the student did, in fact, incorporate the suggestions made by her peers.

A section of her initial response group draft included the following;

2. Everyone looks in a hurry. The reason what made me think that was everyone was walking fast and most people was watching the watches.
The train came. I got in and sat down in the last seat. There were people from everywhere.

The parallel section of her revised final draft was as follows:

3. Everyone walks fast and most of them look at their watches. There are seats where the people can sit while they wait for the train. The train has 12 wagons [cars] and three bands of color, blue, yellow, and orange, in each side. The doors of the train open and everybody goes in. It has yellow seats and yellow, rugs. In each wagon, there is a map of the routes of the train. There are people from everywhere.

This student did incorporate suggestions made by her peers. That is, she expanded her description of the station and the train. Her final draft was given a score of 5 by each of the researchers, indicating that the writer had used her peers' comments in revising. Interceder agreement was 86%.

**Phase 2.** In order to explore why students at times incorporated their peers' suggestions into their papers and at other times did not, the transcripts of final drafts coded as 4 or 5 (writers made significant changes based on peer responses) and those coded as 1 or 2 (writers did not make significant changes based on peer responses) were reread and notes were taken. As suggested by Goldstein and Conrad (1990), the investigators looked for recurring patterns suggested by the data. Two major patterns were noted: (a) in some discussions the writers more frequently interacted with the other students, and (b) in the interactive discussions, the writers were sometimes cooperative, listening to and asking for clarification of students' comments and, at other times, the writers tended to be defensive and concerned about justifying their writing.

After identifying these patterns, the investigators independently coded the transcripts as (a) interactive or noninteractive and (b) cooperative or defensive. An interactive discussion was defined as one in which a writer spoke two or more utterances that responded to a suggestion made by a peer. Correspondingly, in a noninteractive discussion, the writer provided fewer than two utterances of this type. Definitions of cooperative and defensive were somewhat less precise. A cooperative environment was one in which the writer tended to be constructively engaged in the discussion, using verbal behaviors such as paraphrasing and clarifying students' comments. In the example below, the student wrote a paper on her plans to become a teacher. In this cooperative interaction, Student A asks the writer what kind of a teacher she wants to be, and the writer clarifies that she wants to teach in a college.

4. Student A: Yes, but do you want to be a teacher in a high school or college... or elementary school? I think you want to teach in college, so maybe you want to describe more.

Writer: I need to describe about college... if I just graduate from a teacher's college, it's no problem [to teach in a high school in Taiwan];
however, if [1] want to be a college teacher [it’s different], that’s why I came here.

In a defensive environment, the writer used more defensive verbal behaviors such as disagreeing or justifying. For example, the writer in the following dialogue, wrote on Chile’s importance in the world. His peers suggested that the topic was too broad.

5. Student A: It’s a big topic this. (reading) “Chile in the world is important with [its] position and natural resources.” Do you understand me?

Writer: No! Look! I say, (reading) “Chile is not well known in this hemisphere; however, it is [a] very interesting and important country.” In this part, I explain... my country. In the second paragraph because it’s large, I say it’s important.

In this instance, the writer seems to be defending his development of the topic.

After defining these two dimensions, the transcripts corresponding to final drafts previously categorized as 1 or 2 (writer did not make changes based on peer responses; n = 8) and those categorized as 4 or 5 (writer made significant changes based on peer responses; n = 11) were rated independently on these dimensions. The transcripts of the drafts previously categorized as 3 (n = 3), were not coded on these dimensions because the degree to which the students incorporated changes was less clear. Therefore, these three drafts were not useful in this stage of the analysis. It is important to note that the interactions examined on these two dimensions were broadly coded as either cooperative or defensive; a discussion might have had components of both, but was coded according to the dominant one. Interceder agreement was 100%.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Phase 1: Did the writers incorporate suggested changes?

The mean score across all six sessions was 3.2, suggesting that students made some changes in their drafts based on responses by their peers. Some students were more receptive to student comments than others. Individual student means are shown in Table 1. Students were not necessarily consistent in the extent to which they used their peers’ responses. For example, one student received a score of 5 one week and a score of 2 the following week. This variation led to Phase 2 of this study.

Phase 2: What factors contributed to students’ using or not using peer suggestions in revising?

Of the 11 instances in which writers used their peers’ comments in their final drafts, 7 of the corresponding transcripts were rated as interactive (6 as interactive/cooperative and 1 as interactive/defensive), and 4 as non-
TABLE 1
Individual and Group Means Representing the Extent to Which Students' Incorporated Peer Comments in Revising Their Compositions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weeks</th>
<th>Individual means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students A</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students B</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students C</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students D</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group means</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1 = students implemented none of their peers' comments in revising their drafts; 5 = students implemented all or nearly all of their peers' comments in revising their drafts.

interactive. Of the 8 instances when writers tended not to act upon their peers' comments, 4 of the corresponding transcripts were coded as interactive/defensive and 4 as noninteractive.

These findings suggest that some conditions are more likely than others to result in student writers using their peers' responses in revising their drafts. When writers interacted with their peers in a cooperative manner, they were more likely to use the peers' suggestions in revising. When writers interacted with their peers in a defensive manner or did not interact at all, the writer was less likely to use the peers' comments. These results are consistent with the findings of Goldstein and Conrad (1990) who found that in teacher-student conferences, students were more likely to incorporate a teacher's suggestions in rewriting their drafts when negotiation had taken place.

Defining a successful peer response group is complex. Success can be measured by a variety of factors such as the tone of the group interactions (e.g., cooperative, competitive), student identification of appropriate strengths and weaknesses in drafts, the incorporation of peer suggestions in drafts, or improved final drafts. We are not suggesting that the success of peer response groups be measured solely by the incorporation of peer comments in the final draft or that the incorporation of peer suggestions necessarily results in improved compositions. In fact, writers may actually weaken their drafts by incorporating peer comments. Two related issues which need to be addressed in subsequent studies may be formulated as follows: (a) Does the quality of L2 student essays actually improve as a result of peer response? and (b) What forms of peer response facilitate improved writing?

IMPLICATIONS FOR THE ESL CLASSROOM

Although results are based on a small sample, they suggest possible strategies for conducting ESL peer response groups. We found that the
degree to which L2 writers incorporate peer suggestions in their revised drafts depends on the nature of the writers’ interactions with the group (e.g., cooperative or defensive). As ESL teachers, we may be able to facilitate greater cooperation among group members. Goldstein and Conrad (1990) suggest that teachers can instruct student writers in the “importance of conversational input and of the negotiation of meaning” (p. 458) to encourage them to interact with their respondents. This form of interaction would also allow writers to maintain ownership of their writing while incorporating peer suggestions. With the principle of negotiated meaning in mind, teachers could ask students to role play peer interactions in which a writer paraphrases a reader’s comments. The teacher may also model appropriate responses, such as paraphrasing and asking for clarification, before asking students to participate in peer response groups. Writing teachers might also provide students with opportunities to examine transcripts or videotapes of peer-group interactions as models for discussion and awareness training. These activities could enhance the potential for productive revisions of student drafts through peer interaction.

This study explored what we perceive to be a basic question of interest to ESL composition teachers: Do ESL students who have participated in a peer response group incorporate their peers’ comments when revising their drafts? The study found that in most cases they do. We feel that the responsibility of the ESL teacher is then to ensure that peer interaction is meaningful and constructive.
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Heterosexism in ESL: 
Examining Our Attitudes

CYNTHIA NELSON
Bellevue Community College

The following is the text of a speech delivered in March 1992 in Vancouver, Canada, at the 26th Annual TESOL Convention. It was part of a colloquium entitled “We Are Your Colleagues: Lesbians and Gays in ESL.” Lisa Carscadden, Jim Ward, and I presented the colloquium, the first official TESOL event to specifically address lesbian and gay issues, to an audience of more than 300 people. The oral character of the presentation has been preserved.

We Are Your Colleagues—that part of the title is easy to say, it’s the next part—Lesbians and Gays in ESL—that hasn’t always rolled easily off my tongue during the past 6 months as I’ve told people about this presentation. But telling people the title has given me many opportunities to talk with my colleagues, who, like me, teach ESL at colleges or universities in the U. S., about things that had never before been broached. I have found that most colleagues want to be supportive. However, I have also found seven attitudes that seem to me to be both prevalent and problematic. It is important to examine these attitudes and others like them if we hope to better support the many lesbians and gays in our profession. As you listen, I’d like to ask you to consider the following questions.

Have you encountered any of the following attitudes among your colleagues in the country, the city, the school where you work? Based on your experiences, what do you think of these attitudes?
ATTITUDE 1

I don't get it. How are gay teachers any different from heterosexual teachers? I mean, we're all teachers. What's the big deal?

We certainly are not a different species. Like straight teachers, gay teachers attend conferences, teach which verbs take infinitives and which gerunds, and are concerned about the future of our planet. What is the big deal?

All of us grew up and still live in societies that uphold heterosexism, the belief that being heterosexual is more "normal" than being gay, lesbian, or bisexual. This belief is reflected in every facet of society. As a result, lesbian and gay people continually experience discrimination. Sometimes this discrimination is blatant, and sometimes it is very subtle, but it exists nonetheless.

According to one lawyer who specializes in gay and lesbian rights for the American Civil Liberties Union,

it is perfectly fine for employers to fire someone for being gay . . . . Our children are still taken away from us. Gay men and lesbians don't have any property rights with their partners, don't have rights to visit each other in a hospital, don't really have family protections whatsoever. And hate crimes are on the rise. More and more of us are getting beaten up on the streets and startlingly little is being done about it” (Quade, 1991–1992, p. 30).

Gay people who happen to teach ESL are not able to walk away from this reality when we enter the office or the classroom. It's not like checking a coat at the door. When we cross that threshold, we shed neither our own life experiences nor our collective history. When we cross that threshold, neither are we handed our civil rights.

We don't leave behind our cultural identities either. I identify as a member of an international community of gay and lesbian people, and I participate locally in creating and preserving cultural expressions of this community through theatre, fiction, humor, analysis, political organizing, and, of course, the ever-present potlucks.

Because of heterosexism, those of us who are involved in gay culture often feel we must hide any expression of that culture. When gay teachers walk into the office or the classroom, most of us feel compelled to hide many of our life experiences.

ATTITUDE 2

Whether or not a teacher is gay simply doesn't—or shouldn't—come up in a classroom. It has nothing to do with teaching English.
Are you married? is probably the most popular question I’m asked by students, other than perhaps, What does this word mean? In fact, I have never had a class where I haven’t been asked whether I’m married, which usually leads to, Do you have a boyfriend? which often leads to, Do you want a boyfriend? which sometimes leads to, Do you want to get married?

Each quarter, with each new batch of students, I field a list of questions like these. I’m beginning to think they suspect I’m gay and are hunting for some validation of that fact. But then I think no, they will just peg me as one of those “career women” who is simply too devoted to her job to complicate it with family demands. Meanwhile, I cope not only with family demands and with teaching but with keeping one a secret from the other.

Many straight and gay teachers alike probably skirt the question, Are you married? and avoid direct answers to, What did you do last weekend? choosing to reveal little about themselves. But how many married heterosexual teachers do you know who have never revealed their marital status, and so, their heterosexuality, to their students? How many have never mentioned to students their husband or wife? Heterosexuals feel free to “come out” as straight every day of the week. Their sexual orientation certainly seems to come up.

For gay and lesbian teachers, classroom conversations sometimes have a surreal quality. In an advanced-level adult education class my students brought up the topic of AIDS. One thing led to another and soon they were discussing whether or not you could tell if women were lesbians just by looking at them. One student said she could tell because they looked like men, citing a famous lesbian from her country, Martina Navratilova. Another said no, they looked like half-men. A third student spoke up to say that she had lesbian friends who were a couple, and they were both quite feminine-looking. “You would never be able to tell just by looking,” she said.

I was sitting there listening, moving my head around from student to student, suddenly wondering exactly what I had chosen to wear that particular day, but hesitant to look down and see. I wanted to say, “Well, could you tell about me?” but I bit my lip and told myself I’ll laugh and cry later. Two more students spoke up, saying that they also had lesbian friends, and one of them went on for quite awhile about how her lesbian friend was “perfect.”

I was quite moved since I’d never before heard a student mention knowing a lesbian at all, and I’d never before heard so many gay-positive sentences in one ESL classroom. Were they trying to tell me something? I felt unusually safe, and at the same time I wondered whether their acceptance would shrivel if they knew there was actually a lesbian among them. I often regret that I cannot openly speak with
knowledge and authority on a subject that is more than a subject—it is my life.

I feel this about specifically gay issues and also when many other types of discrimination come up, which they do all the time in our field. I have facilitated and observed countless class discussions about cultural assimilation, about being a minority, about biculturalism, about prejudice, about passing—these are issues my workplace students, my university preparation students, and my adult education students bring up again and again.

But I do not feel free to spontaneously share the relevant experiential knowledge and personal understanding of such issues that I have developed as a lesbian woman. I choose my words carefully, trying to preserve the gist of what I want to say while removing my anecdotes or observations from real life. In other words, I de-gay things all the time. I remove myself, my friends, my family, my community, my culture from the picture.

ATTITUDE 3

Our students are from countries where there aren't many gay people. I honestly don't think they could handle talking about gays. It would be too controversial.

Many of our students are from countries where there are few, if any, gay rights. In fact, in some countries people are imprisoned and even killed just because they are thought to be gay. Gay people, however, exist everywhere and my guess is that we always have. The International Lesbian and Gay Association, founded in 1978, includes 200 different groups in more than 40 countries (Anderson, 1991). All of our students know that gay people exist.

Quarter after quarter, my students themselves have brought up gay issues. One student chose a gay theme for each essay she wrote all quarter, including a research paper titled “The Gay Rights Movement in Japan.” Students have written in their journals about gay friends they had in high school, their gay host brother, and gay spirituality. They have asked me all kinds of questions about gay people. One beginning-level student brought in a picture of the Los Angeles gay pride march from the newspaper. Students are curious.

One thing I have noticed is that the more comfortable I have become in talking about gay issues in the classroom, the more students seem comfortable. They will discuss gay issues if it feels safe enough to do so.
ATTITUDE 4

There are lots of gay men in ESL. One of them brought his friend to an office party once. There was no problem. Why are you making an issue out of nothing?

It's true: There are a lot of gay men in ESL. It's also true that when I say the word gay to most colleagues or students, I doubt too many of them first picture a woman. Sexism is alive and well.

It's not that we lesbians aren't out there teaching ESL in every corner of the world, but, like most other self-supporting working women, we tend to have concerns about job security. Being out in a relatively competitive field is a tough choice to make. Dealing with sexism in the workplace, or the classroom, isn't easy either.

One result of both sexism and heterosexism is that it's not always easy for lesbians to find each other. During my second quarter of graduate school, I went to the office of one of my professors and said, "As a lesbian teacher I am feeling extremely isolated. I need resources, role models, support. I need to talk to someone who is going through this. Please put me in touch with other lesbians in ESL." My professor said that I was only the second person in 6 years to be out in our program. I started to cry. She said she knew one woman and would ask her if she'd call me. The woman did call me. It turned out she was the only lesbian in ESL I already knew.

I'm sure I am not the only lesbian student or the only lesbian teacher in ESL to have experienced invisibility and isolation. In discussing these issues, we are not "making an issue out of nothing." We are attempting to articulate our experiences and our needs so that we might make our profession, our workplaces, and our classrooms better places for the gay and lesbian people who are already in them.

ATTITUDE 5

I don't care whether or not someone is gay. I never say anything against gays. In fact, I never say anything at all about gays.

Our field is full of wonderful, warm, smart people who genuinely enjoy getting to know all kinds of people—that's one reason we're in ESL or EFL to begin with. The values, politics, and cultural respect reflected by professionals in ESL are surely a far cry from those of blatant bigots. I haven't heard of a teacher not being hired because of being gay; I haven't encountered overt hatred; nobody has reprimanded me yet because I teach the word heterosexism when the words
racism and sexism come up. I'm out to my colleagues and my administra-
tors, and I haven't lost my job.

However, rarely have I heard a straight colleague bring up a gay-
related issue. I have never heard a straight colleague initiate criticism
of the near-complete absence of anything gay in our materials and our
curricula. I have never heard a straight colleague express concern that
our gay students are getting the same opportunities for self-expression
as our straight students.

I have talked privately with individual gay colleagues about these
things many times. However, not until TESOL '92 did I have the
opportunity to discuss issues of particular concern to gays and lesbians
in my field at a professional gathering. This silence, this void, is a
problem. If you don't care whether someone is gay or straight, recog-
nize that many people do. Those of us who are gay don't have the
luxury of ignoring hatred and violence when it is directed against us.

ATTITUDE 6

Gay students? I've never had a student come out to me. Besides, is it really our job
to help them with their social lives?

We need to assume that we have gay students in each of our classes.
We don't need to know which of our students is or might be gay. Our
gay students, as members of more than one minority group, are facing
the daily confines of heterosexism in addition to linguistic and cultural
barriers. As teachers, we need to evaluate the content in our courses
and the methodology we use in terms of their effectiveness with our
gay students. We must ask ourselves questions like these:

1. How safe do gay and lesbian students feel in our classes?
2. In our classroom activities and homework assignments, are our
   students able to choose the level of disclosure that they (not we)
   feel comfortable with?
3. Do we make it clear to our students which information might be
   shared with others and which won't?
4. Do our lesbian and gay students have opportunities to express
   themselves authentically, spontaneously, confidentially?

These are challenging questions, but as professionals we need to face
them. It is our responsibility to give all of our students a good edu-
cation.
ATTITUDE 7

Only gay people can address gay issues. I’m no expert. I wouldn’t know where to begin.

If you’re white, does that mean you never bring up issues that affect people of color? If you’re a man, does that mean you never address issues that affect women? If you’re North American, does that mean you never bring up issues that affect people worldwide? Do you have to be an expert to initiate a discussion, select a video, invite a guest speaker, or find an article in the newspaper?

Those of you who are straight, who enjoy heterosexual privilege, have a kind of authority because you are considered respectable. What you say about gay people can carry a lot of weight, can have a lot of influence. We need allies. Being heterosexual is not the same as being heterosexist.

Those of us who are lesbian, gay, or bisexual are often in very vulnerable positions. For us to raise gay issues, to come out to our colleagues or our students, or even to be out as allies of gay people can be very scary. We don’t know what will happen because it seems it hasn’t been done. Or if it has been done, we don’t know about it because nobody is talking about it, or writing about it, or getting it published. We need to talk about it, about all of it, with each other and with straight people.

I’d like to close with a classroom story from the adult education class I mentioned earlier, the one that discussed whether they could tell a woman was a lesbian. The next day in class, I gave a short speech. This is what I said:

I was pleased to have heard so many positive comments about gay people on Tuesday. I was also somewhat uncomfortable, not with anything any of you said, but because I wasn’t sure whether or not I should say anything during the discussion. You see, I am a lesbian.

I have been afraid to tell you this because many people fear and even hate gay people, but I decided to tell you anyway because I felt uncomfortable not telling you, especially after that discussion. I felt that if I didn’t tell you I would be lying to you, and you all have shared so much about your lives, I just want to be able to be open too.

The other reason I decided to tell you is that many people think gay people work somewhere else, live somewhere else, are just separate from them. Well, I wanted you to know we’re around. So, if you have any questions about me, or about gay people in the U. S., or about gay people in general, please ask me.

Several hands shot up. Someone wanted to know when I had first discovered I was gay; someone else asked me what my relationships
with my parents were like when I was a child; someone else wanted to know how my parents feel about me now; someone wanted to know if it was hard to be gay in the U. S.; someone else asked whether I had ever wanted to be a man; one woman asked me how it could be true both that I seemed very happy and that I face discrimination. I answered all of these questions more honestly than I had ever imagined I could standing in front of a blackboard.

A few students sat quietly, looking like they were absorbing something big and very new. One woman said that back in Indonesia she had lived with eight lesbians. I thought I had heard wrong, but she held eight fingers up, smiling, and told us about getting to know her eight lesbian housemates. She said she knew I was gay on the first day, when she had asked me whether I was married and I had said, “No, never have been.” Several students said proudly that they too had suspected I was gay. A full hour went by, full of stories, full of questions, full of warmth. That hour was one of the best hours of my teaching career.

I look forward to your speeches and your stories. Thank you.
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Comments on Suzanne Irujo’s Review and Keith Baker’s Commentary on Forked Tongue: The Politics of Bilingual Education

The Author Reacts...
sional personal attacks in the Irujo/Baker exchange prompt this clarification.

Truth is the casualty in their exchange in which ideological bias masquerades as critical assessment. That tactic is precisely the subject of my book, *Forked Tongue*—the absence of civil discourse on the education of language minority students and the readiness of bilingual education advocates to employ any weapon to suppress the expression of differences.

My intention here is to set the record straight on a few of the more egregious distortions that appear in the Irujo/Baker exchange and to review Baker’s inconsistencies in reporting on bilingual education research.

Much can be said regarding Baker’s sudden about-face, as he inexplicably reverses his research, publications, and testimony before committees of the U.S. Congress during the past 15 years. Baker read *Forked Tongue* in manuscript before publication and is quoted by the publisher on the book jacket as follows: “This book shows how an entrenched bureaucracy concerned with its own self-preservation lost track of its mission to teach children who do not speak English. . . . A fine view from the trenches.” Baker now describes the book as biased and unscholarly.

A few examples from Baker’s recent writings reveal the enormity of the denial of his own work in the position he now takes. In 1989, in “The Emergence of an Elite in Language Minorities,” with Susan Alexander of U.S. English, Baker wrote: “We will show that bilingual education programs deny students both their civil rights and the key language skills needed for full economic participation” (p. 3). In the same article, reporting on the national survey of parents of Mexican American and Asian children, Baker states, “By a large majority, most parents of language minority students do not want the non-English language used in school if it means less school time in English” (p. 10).

In a paper with Alexander entitled “Hoax or Reality: Bilingual Education Programs and Self-Esteem,” presented at the 1991 meeting of the American Sociological Association, these conclusions were reported:

> The claim that bilingual education programs improve academic achievement by raising students’ self-esteem assumes a causative link from self-esteem to achievement. The literature does not show this link exists . . . . Most of the empirical studies show no statistically significant effect of bilingual education programs on self-esteem. (p. 10)

Until the appearance of his TESOL Quarterly comments concerning *Forked Tongue*, Baker had stood fast on the major conclusion of the Baker and de Kanter (1981) study that there is no empirical evidence
that transitional bilingual education (TBE) is uniquely effective in improving students' performance in English or in nonlanguage subject areas. One must note the stunning irony in the fact that the Baker and de Kanter study has been attacked for the same reasons that Baker now attacks Forked Tongue. Members of the National Association for Bilingual Education (NABE) criticized the work as being “not only biased but ‘malicious’” and that “the study is a political agenda in the guise of rigorous academic research” (cited in Baker & Alexander, 1989, p. 13). Little wonder that educators and researchers maneuver cautiously in the political minefield that bilingual education is known to be, where bitter ad hominem attacks and personal vilification are not the exception. No other area of public education spawns such passions.

Space limitations do not allow me to refute each and every contention by Irujo and Baker but here are a few of the most glaring distortions. Despite Baker’s statement to the contrary, the El Paso Bilingual Immersion Project (BIP), title notwithstanding, is a true English immersion program. All instruction is given in the second language (English) from the very first day of school; reading and writing are taught in English only, in Grades 1 and 2; all subjects are taught in English only; a structured curriculum emphasizing content-based English teaching is used. The only different feature, and I count it a strength of the program, is the enrichment lessons in Spanish for 30–90 min daily in the first 3 years and the introduction of reading in Spanish in Grade 3. For a thorough description and analysis of the outcomes in student achievement comparing BIP and bilingual program students in El Paso, see the 1992 study by Gersten, Woodward, and Schneider.

In another instance, Baker contends that no structured immersion program existed in San Diego in 1969, because he himself invented the term structured immersion in 1981. He ignores the longitudinal study by Gersten and Woodward (1985), assuming evidently that until he named it, structured immersion did not exist!

I am criticized by Baker for citing only one study in support of the superior achievement of the students in the Fairfax County, Virginia, ESL program, the largest ESL program in the U. S., with 5,000 students from 75 different language backgrounds. I chose not to cite the work of Virginia Collier but conducted my own examination of the Fairfax program from 1980 to 1988. I reviewed the entry/exit criteria, testing, instructional curriculum, teacher training and professional standards for staff, student achievement records, and visited the district in 1980, 1981, 1984, and 1987 to observe classrooms and interview staff. I believe my judgment of the Fairfax program, based on this first-hand work, is entirely valid. No author, even so, can escape the predictable critical complaint that she has cited one source and not several others.
Baker’s heaviest barrage is aimed at the claims made for the Newton, Massachusetts, program for limited-English students which I directed for 10 years. There is documentation to support every statement in my book—from student achievement in English acquisition and in subject matter learning, to drop-out rates for bilingual students (less than 1%)—on file in the Newton Public Schools offices and in the Massachusetts State Department of Education, which collected detailed data from Newton for the years 1985–1990 while the program was under state audit. Irujo, in her original review of my book, attests to the quality education provided in Newton for limited-English students based on her own close connections to the Newton program for several years. The fact that no formal study has been done on this program does not invalidate the information reported in my book. The validating documents are available for public review and analysis by interested researchers. The section on Newton in Forked Tongue, incidentally, was originally published in the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science (Porter, 1990), a respected, refereed journal.

Finally, Baker cites the study by Ramirez, Pasta, Yuen, Billings, and Ramey (1991) in his comments as evidence that all-English programs are not better than bilingual programs in teaching English to limited-English students. This particular study, completed after my book was published, is promoted by some as the last word in evidence for the superior effectiveness of bilingual instruction over the English immersion approach. Gersten, Woodward, and Schneider (1992) note these serious flaws in the study: confusion in the definitions of early- and late-exit bilingual programs and inability to compare results of structured English immersion with TBE in the same district. Rossell (cited in Gersten et al., 1992) notes these major flaws: failure to assess achievement levels of early- and late-exit TBE students in Grades 5 and 6, a crucial issue in assessing the lasting effects of instructional programs over time, and the incredible fact that many students in the three samples were not assessed as limited-English proficient even in kindergarten! Ramirez et al. noted no differences in achievement between TBE and English immersion students and stated that the research design did not allow them to make any valid comparisons. The design of the study was fundamentally flawed if it did not even permit that basic comparison. Rossell asserts, finally, that none of the three approaches was shown to be superior.

Since the publication of Forked Tongue, I have received hundreds of letters from scholars, educators, school administrators, and bilingual parents expressing appreciation for the work I have done in giving voice and courage to the many who are unable to speak out on these issues. I stand firm in my basic views—that there is still no valid evidence for the superiority of TBE over alternative approaches either for the
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learning of English or for the learning of school subjects; that given 
the magnificent assortment of languages and cultures represented by 
the population of limited-English students in our schools, there must 
be choice of educational approaches for each community; that there is 
a clear need to improve the special help for limited-English students 
but that the nature of that special help must not be limited to one, 
unproven, linguistically and ethnically segregative model. 
Irujo’s first review, though quite critical of my book, was within the 
bounds of scholarly criticism. No response from me was necessary. The 
Baker/Irujo exchange, however, is an attempt at character assassina-
tion. When Irujo, in relating a comment from a conference in which 
her memory of events differs from mine, declares that “I hoped in this 
way to cast doubt on the veracity of everything Porter claimed,” readers 
can see only too clearly her intention to destroy my credibility. Irujo 
and I have been colleagues for a dozen years. Until now, I believed 
that as professionals we could differ with one another on important 
issues without descending to irresponsible practices. Let the rest of 
us in this challenging field keep to the high ground of responsible 
scholarship and ethical conduct.
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The Reviewer Responds . . .

SUZANNE IRUJO
Boston University

If this were simply a question of Porter’s memory of events differing 
from mine, I would not have included the incident she mentions in my
review of her book (Vol. 25, No. 1). However, I see Porter’s use of the event in question as part of a pattern of twisted memories, misrepresentations, and distortions that is evident throughout the book. I am not alone in this perception; other reviews by scholars who know the research agree with mine. Cummins (1991) finds “logical contradictions, disdain for accuracy and disregard for evidence” (p. 4), and McLaughlin (1991) states that “Porter oversimplifies the issues and selectively reports research findings” (p. 5).

It is difficult to understand Porter’s contradictory reactions to my statements. In my review, which she characterized as being “within the bounds of scholarly criticism,” I stated that I had included the incident Porter refers to only because “it casts doubt on the objectivity of Porter’s account of many other events reported in the book” (pp. 154–155). My response to Keith Baker contained essentially the same statement, but this she sees as “an attempt at character assassination.” I can only hope that TESOL Quarterly readers will critically evaluate Porter’s book, my review of it, other reviews, and the two exchanges that have appeared in The Forum, and make up their own minds about whether or not my statements constitute irresponsible scholarship and unethical conduct, as Porter implies.
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The Commentator Responds . . .

KEITH BAKER
Silver Spring, MD

Space limitations preclude replying to each of Porter’s comments. Regarding my “sudden about face” and “inexplicable reverses,” I disagree. My position is, as always, to see what research tells us. From 1979 until 1991, there was no good evidence that transitional bilingual education (TBE) programs were better than all-English instruction. Recently, two studies (Burkheimer, Conger, Dunteman, Elliott, & Mowbray, 1990; Ramirez, Pasta, Yuen, Billings, & Ramey, 1991) came out that show TBE is superior to all-English instruction in the early stages of learning English. Porter rejects Ramirez et al.’s findings. The U.S. Department of Education paid the National Academy of Sciences
(NAS) $250,000 to critique the Ramirez study and one other large bilingual study. NAS (Meyer & Fienberg, 1992) was highly critical of both studies. However, NAS concluded that the sole believable result in the two studies was Ramirez et al.’s finding that bilingual education programs were superior to all-English instruction in the early years of school.

Porter’s book is two books under one cover. The first is the story of the difficulties she had in battling the educational bureaucracy. Here she brings us a fine view from the trenches of the bureaucratic problems facing local school administrators, although Irujo’s review calls into question aspects of Porter’s telling of this tale. Second, Porter’s personal narrative is mixed in with a research monograph, and this is where the problems are. Her research efforts fall far short of the minimum standards for valid research. Poor research practices pervade her work, and they continue in her comments.

Here are some examples of the poor scholarship in her comments. She miscites the title of the Alexander and Baker (1991), delivered at the American Sociological Association meeting. As she correctly notes, we found no intervening step through self-esteem between bilingual education and learning English, but so what? The important link is direct learning.

Porter continues her incorrect claim that the El Paso Bilingual Immersion Project (BIP) is an all-English program.

Forked Tongue discusses an English immersion program in San Diego, without citation to any source. I pointed out that the only San Diego immersion program in the literature is a bilingual dual immersion program. Now, Porter belatedly cites Gersten and Woodward (1985) for her San Diego program. I have reread Gersten and Woodward. The name San Diego does not appear anywhere in their article. I was the U.S. Department of Education project officer for the Gersten and Woodward study. My recollection is that San Diego was not one of the two sites studied.

I criticized Forked Tongue for claiming that the Newton, Massachusetts, program was better than bilingual education while presenting no data supporting that claim. I agree that the mere absence of data does not invalidate a claim. However, the purpose of data, especially in a research monograph, is to substantiate a claim. Porter does not substantiate her claim in her book nor in her other writings. Now she says, “There is documentation to support every statement in my book,” but evidence supporting Porter’s contentions is again conspicuously absent.

My earlier conclusion is confirmed by Porter’s reply: “Porter’s level of scholarship falls far short of the most minimal standards of acceptable research.”
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Research Issues

The TESOL Quarterly publishes brief comments on aspects of qualitative and quantitative research. For this issue, we asked two researchers to discuss ethics in TESOL research.

Edited by ANNE LAZARATON
The Pennsylvania State University

Ethics in TESOL Research

MARGARET DUFON
University of Hawaii at Manoa

In 1980, TESOL published its “Guidelines for Ethical Research in ESL” in the TESOL Quarterly. Its purpose was to outline procedures to be followed in research on second language learning and teaching that would safeguard the rights of second language learners. The TESOL guidelines advocated following local guidelines set forth by institutions such as universities, school boards, and state funding agencies. However, recognizing that nonnative-speaking subjects are members of a special population because of the power differential and (in many cases) the language barrier between them and the researcher, TESOL felt it necessary to provide additional guidelines. These guidelines addressed six areas of concern. Five of these dealt with the rights of
the research subjects—informed consent, deception, consequences, privacy, and confidentiality and anonymity. The sixth area, applications of research, concerned the students whose learning is affected by the results of the research. The guidelines were not meant as legislation to be enforced; rather, they were designed to provide researchers with principles for conducting and applying research.

This honor system approach has the advantage of reducing the amount of paperwork involved in conducting research. In contrast, it is increasingly common for university institutional review boards (IRBs) to ensure compliance with federal regulations by insisting on preapproval of all faculty and student research projects which involve human subjects, including those using questionnaires, interviews, and even text analysis (A. Lazaraton, personal communication, December 1992). Such an approach requires an enormous amount of paperwork and reduces the efficiency with which research projects can be conducted. An honor system approach, such as taken by TESOL, reduces the paperwork but increases the responsibility of each researcher to be aware of the ethical guidelines and to follow them.

Following their first and final publication in the Quarterly, these guidelines appear to have fallen into obscurity. They have never been updated or reprinted, nor has any article in the Quarterly focused specifically on an ethics question in research. Rather, the research issues discussed have focused on theoretical and methodological approaches, statistics, validity, replication, and so forth. The same has been true for textbooks on research in TESOL such as Hatch & Lazaraton (1991) and Brown (1988). They confine their discussions to the technical aspects of design, analysis, and reporting but, aside from reminding the researcher that selection of appropriate procedures is an ethical decision, do not discuss these larger ethical questions at all. The technical aspects of research are important and require careful consideration. However, a well-executed piece of research is not only technically sound, but ethically grounded as well.

I would imagine that the little attention given to ethics in the TESOL research literature is not due to a lack of need for such discussion but rather to a lack of awareness that we have this need. Perhaps we have been so preoccupied with mastering the technical aspects of conducting research that we have been unable to devote sufficient attention to its ethical aspects. Yet the need for raising, discussing, and reflecting on the ethics of our research is greater today than ever. Advances in technology have facilitated the research process but, at the same time, have created more possibilities for inadvertently violating the rights of research subjects. For example, modern technology has made it inexpensive and easy to copy and share data with other researchers. Data banks are being established so that researchers can conduct inves-
tigations without gathering new data. This facilitates the research process and reduces the number of people who must be imposed upon to be subjects. At the same time, it makes it impossible to fully inform subjects of all the purposes for which their data might be used. Yet, if there is a possibility that the data will be shared and analyzed in other ways, the subject has the right to be informed of that possibility. If ethical issues such as these are not explored, TESOL researchers are less likely to be aware of potential ethical problems resulting from their methods of collecting or reporting data, thereby increasing the risk of causing harm to their subjects. I believe there is a need for researchers to familiarize themselves with the TESOL ethical guidelines and then to plan studies, collect and analyze data, and report results with them in mind.

In addition, I believe there is a need to reexamine the current guidelines and to consider revising and expanding upon them since they are limited both in scope and in specificity. They are limited in scope because they are only concerned with protecting the rights of learner subjects. Yet not all TESOL research subjects of interest are learners; teachers and program administrators are also investigated. Furthermore, researchers are not only ethically responsible to their subjects, but also to other constituencies, such as their colleagues in the field, university students preparing to enter the field, sponsoring organizations, the public, and the governments of the researcher’s home nation and the nation in which research is conducted (American Anthropological Association, 1970).

The TESOL ethics guidelines are also limited by their generality; they do not provide specific information about how to proceed in a given instance. This is not unique to the field of TESOL, and it is not a criticism of the principles themselves, as principles ought to be general statements. What is needed is a way to provide further explication of the general principles without making the principles themselves too specific. One model which might be followed is that of the American Psychological Association (APA; 1982), which published a 76-page document on their 10 ethical principles related to dealing with human subjects. In addition to the statement of these 10 principles, this document provides explications and various interpretations of each principle and discusses ways of handling ethical dilemmas which result from competing values. Concrete guidelines are provided, explaining how to proceed in those cases where there is a lack of consensus regarding the ethics of a particular procedure.

The APA claims to have developed the first ethical guidelines based on both empirical and participatory practices, a procedure which may provide a useful model for TESOL. The general principles and their explications are based on ethical problems provided by the APA mem-
bership. They were then discussed and critiqued both by the membership and by professionals in other fields (e.g., anthropology, philosophy, sociology, law) prior to their revision and adoption.

In summary, then, I would argue that more attention be paid to ethical issues in TESOL research, that TESOL professionals familiarize themselves with the ethical guidelines and reflect on them when planning, executing, and reporting research, and consider expanding their scope and specificity.
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Some Comments on the Social Impact of Research in TESOL

FRED DAVIDSON
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Margaret DuFon has mentioned that the TESOL research guidelines (TESOL, 1980) need to be revisited. I concur heartily and would like to focus my remarks on the sixth area of those guidelines: the impact of research on students in learning situations. As an example of this impact, I will draw heavily on a paper by Virginia Collier from the TESOL Quarterly (Collier, 1987) and on my own experiences while working for the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) several years ago.

Collier’s paper examines the actual time needed for a language minority student to achieve English proficiency comparable to grade
peers, what I shall call time to proficiency. She notes: “These findings show that there is no shortcut to the development of cognitive academic second language proficiency and to academic achievement in the second language. It is a process that takes a long, long time” (p. 638). Some subjects in her study were able to make reasonable progress in as few as 2 years, but the vast majority required a longer period, and what is more, age of arrival was a complex intervening variable. Since time to proficiency is not a simple variable, any simple fixed number of years is ill-considered.

During 1989–1990, I worked for the ISBE as a Program Evaluator, that is, a researcher. That year, time to proficiency was quite a hot topic—as it still is. My main task was to write the 1988-1989 report on ESL and Bilingual Education for Illinois’ schools (ISBE, 1990), and those results reflect time-to-proficiency patterns similar to the complexity that Collier uncovered. The language minority student policy of Illinois is governed by Article 14-C of its School Code (Illinois State Bar Association, 1991; see also Education, 1985). The language of Article 14-C indicates an expectation that a language minority student could progress to proficiency in 3 years. That year, I met and talked with many K–12 educators and heard uniform puzzlement (if not frustration) with the legislative 3-year expectation. Many of my colleagues cited Collier’s work, and I can only hope that my report also helped to dispel that myth.

De facto, ESL and bilingual education professionals in Illinois did all they could to interpret that time limit with flexibility, and careful reading of the statute even indicates some flexibility on the part of the legislators. What actually happens in Illinois is that school districts shift much of the responsibility for removal from services to parents. Notably, after 3 years, the districts must seek permission for each year the child remains in services, but that permission may come through lack of response to the following type of communication to parents: “We recommend that your child remain in ESL/bilingual services. Please contact us if you disagree.” It is a subtle legal interpretation which serves as a loophole and, in fact, allows students to be served much longer than the mandated 3 years.

Nonetheless, when Article 14-C was written in 1979, earlier research must have been interpreted to indicate that 3 years was a reasonable expectation for progress to English proficiency comparable to grade peers. Illinois’ present law reflects that belief, and I suspect the law in Collier’s state did also. The very fact that Collier’s superb study even exists indicates that research operates in a larger domain: social impact. Collier’s work is of the type that sets the record straight on a misconception. Much scholarship also tries to do this; another example is the unitary/divisible competence debate of about a decade ago (see
Bachman & Palmer, 1982; Canale & Swain, 1980), a line of research which is still going on (e.g., Henning, 1992) and is trying to set the record straight on the social impact of large, monolithic, unitary-trait norm-referenced language tests.

Setting the record straight is one major motivation for research since researchers are usually also teachers and frequently see ill-considered real-world decisions being made about students. Researchers can be in a unique position of influence and can live lives of unique frustration. Ethics in research does very deeply involve subjects’ rights, not only within a research project but in the application of research findings. In these comments I have expanded on DuFon’s discussion of the sixth area of the TESOL guidelines. Research has a world view. It can be dishonestly executed to serve the aims of others, although in my heart of hearts I believe that is truly rare. Alternatively, it can be proactive, helping to set odd practices on the right track, as Collier has done. I believe much research is motivated by that spirit.
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powerful, making it useful for writers as well as those working in writing programs.
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THE INPUT HYPOTHESIS
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Introducing the **New Ways** series . . . innovative classroom techniques

*Jack C. Richards, Series Editor*

**New Ways in Teaching Reading**
Richard R. Day, Editor

Become a more effective reading teacher by using these recipes for success. This collection of 130 creative activities and exercises from ESL and EFL reading teachers around the world will help your students

- consolidate what they’ve learned in other lessons
- increase their knowledge of English through exposure to new vocabulary and grammatical structures
- learn about the cultures of other nations
- acquire a life-long skill, one that may well outlast competence and fluency in speaking, listening, and writing.


1993, 300 pp., ISBN 0-939791-45-5, $18.95 (member $15.95)

---

Coming Soon!

**New Ways in Teacher Education**
Donald Freeman with Steve Cornwell, Editors

How do people *learn to teach*? To answer this question, the authors depart from the traditional knowledge-transmission model of teaching by offering 46 activities that lead teachers and teachers-in-training to reflective practices.

All Things to All People

Donald N. Flemming
Lucie C. Germer
Christiane Kelley

Teacher trainers and teachers new to the field of English as a second language will find in this book an illuminating description of what it is like to be responsible for the education of language minority students.

You’ll learn:

• about the roles of an ESL teacher
• up-to-date methods and techniques
• the role of culture in an ESL program
• how relationships form between ESL teachers and language minority children and among these children and their mainstream peers
• why the ESL teacher is so important to the development of language minority students’ language skills
• the nonacademic needs an ESL teacher may have to address
• why ESL teachers must have frequent contact with their students’ parents
• how ESL programs relate to mainstream curricula
• the toughest battles ESL teachers have with administrators
• how to get support from sponsors …

An excellent basis for preservice or in-service training, this book will also be helpful to administrators, guidance counselors, health professionals, secretaries, and mainstream teachers. Each chapter is a window through which you can view the world of ESL.

Some educators see the growing cultural and linguistic diversity within the United States as a liability. But the authors of this collection offer insight into the language uses of diverse student populations so that we—ESOL and Language Arts teachers and teacher educators—can find ways to see diverse learners as resources, not problems.

Part I discusses definitions of literacy and culture and methods for investigating cultural literacy and diversity. Part II explores literacy practices among dominated and recent immigrant groups in the United States. Part III focuses on classrooms to help teachers realize the potential of linguistically and culturally diverse learners.
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*Using, Selecting, and Producing Video for the Classroom*

Susan Stempleski and Paul Arcario, Editors

- Practical advice from experts in the US and Europe on planning and carrying out video-based lessons
- Successful practices for all ages and language levels
- Overview of available EFL/ESL video material and criteria for their selection
- Bibliography on video in language teaching
- Glossary of video acronyms and technical terms
- List of organizational resources


**ESL Curriculum Resource Handbook**
*A Practical Guide for K-12 ESL Programs*

- For classroom teachers, curriculum developers, education faculty, and student teachers
- Basic information on publications, standards, and special materials for K-12 ESL
- Practical advice for assessing student needs and customizing ESL programs

“This excellent volume provides educators with multiple resources and varied strategies to use as they work at developing quality second language education programs for elementary and secondary students.” —Sarah Hudelson, Arizona State University.

1993, 374 pp., Kraus International Publications. ISBN 0-527-20808-6, $19.95
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All prices are subject to change without notice.

**Payment**
All orders must be prepaid unless accompanied by a check or money order made out to TESOL. You may use VISA or MasterCard with a $15.00 U.S. minimum purchase. Please be sure to include card number, expiration date, valid date, telephone number, and cardholder signature.

**Orders from Outside the United States**
International Orders will be shipped foreign book rate. Please allow 3-4 months for delivery. To have orders shipped *airmail* please add 35% to the cost of the book, plus shipping charges.

**Claims**
Claims must be received within 3 months (6 months for claims from outside the U.S.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtotal</th>
<th>Postage &amp; Handling</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Shipping**
Postage and handling must be included in all prepaid orders, and will be added to credit card and invoice orders over $40.00 U.S. Shipping is to be figured using this scale.

**Order Subtotal**
- Under $25.00 U.S.: $2.50 U.S.
- $25.00-$99.00 U.S.: 10% of total
- Over $100.00 U.S.: Declining percentages

Orders within the U.S. are shipped library rate. Please allow 4–6 weeks for delivery.

**Ship to:**
(Name)
(Address)

**Telephone:**
(Country Code) (Area Code) (Local #)

TESOL Member No. 0010000

Nonmember □

☐ Check enclosed ☐ VISA ☐ MasterCard

Card number: ________________
Expiration date: __________ Valid date: __________
Cardholder’s signature: __________
Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Inc.

Membership Application

Membership in TESOL includes a choice of refereed publications. Members may choose subscriptions to TESOL Quarterly (four issues annually) and TESOL Journal (four issues annually). Every member receives 8 issues of TESOL Matters, the bimonthly newspaper. Membership also includes receipt of periodic newsletters from up to 3 of 17 interest sections as well as discounted rates for TESOL Conventions and TESOL books. Membership is required for the TESOL Placement Service.

Name ____________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

Address

City ________________________________________________________________

Province/State ____________________________________________________

Country __________________________________________________________

Postal Code ________________________

Daytime Telephone ________________________

Fax ________________________________

Please check: □ New □ Renewal (ID No. 001-0000- __________)

Areas of Work (At least 50% engaged) (Please check)

☐ Elementary or Preschool ☐ Secondary ☐ Adult Education

☐ Pre-school ☐ College or University ☐ Other

TESOL Interest Sections

Select the interest section in which you wish to become active and vote. Write 1 next to it. Select up to two more sections. Write 2 or 3 next to these sections.

5. Elementary Education 10. Higher Education
6. English as a Foreign Language
7. Intensive English Programs

The number and frequency of the newsletters from these sections vary from section to section, from year to year. TESOL cannot guarantee the specific number or frequency of these newsletters during a membership year.
Membership (Dues include bulk rate delivery) (Please check)

**Individual**
- TESOL Quarterly, TESOL Journal, TESOL Matters ........................................... $ 69.00 □
- TESOL Quarterly, TESOL Matters ................................................................. $ 48.50 □
- TESOL Journal, TESOL Matters ................................................................. $ 45.50 □
- TESOL Matters ............................................................................................... $ 38.00 □

**Student** (at least half-time study)*
- Students receive TESOL Quarterly, TESOL Journal, TESOL Matters ................ $ 45.50 □

**Joint** (two-member household)
- Joint members receive TESOL Quarterly, TESOL Journal, TESOL Matters ........ $ 90.00 □

**Institution** (qualifies if library)
- Library receives TESOL Quarterly, TESOL Journal, TESOL Matters ................ $125.50 □

**Subtotal** ........................................................................................................ $

**Surcharge for Air Mail Delivery** (Optional)
- TESOL Quarterly, TESOL Journal, TESOL Matters ........................................... $ 12.00 □
- TESOL Quarterly, TESOL Matters OR TESOL Journal, TESOL Matters ........ $ 9.00 □
- TESOL Matters ............................................................................................... $ 6.00 □

**Total** ............................................................................................................. $

* Students are required to provide verification of minimum half-time study. Participation is limited to 3 years.

Faculty Signature/Title

________________________________________________________________________

Institution/Address

________________________________________________________________________

Telephone (must be provided)

________________________________________________________________________

Please send check in U.S. funds made payable to TESOL or fill in appropriate credit card information and send to TESOL. TESOL will also accept UNESCO coupons.

□ Check enclosed  □ VISA  □ Mastercard  □ UNESCO coupons

Credit Card no: ____________________________ Exp. ________ Valid Date ________

Signature of cardholder: ______________________

**I wish to receive more information about TESOL:**

□ publications  □ awards and grants  □ placement services

□ conventions  □ summer institutes  □ interest sections

□ group insurance

Send this completed form and payment to:

TESOL, Inc.
1800 Cameron Street, Suite 300
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-2751 U.S.A.
Tel. 703-836-9774 • Fax 703-836-7954
The winning combination in ESL publishing...

✿✿ Addison-Wesley ❄ Longman

To order, call 1-800-322-1377 or Fax 1-800-333-3328

10 Bank Street • White Plains, New York 10606-1951 • 914 993-5000 • FAX 914-997-8115
Use The Power Of Speech®
To Bring Your Students To
A New Level Of ESL Competence.

Free your time by taking advantage of the versatile, innovative, and pedagogically sound software available for ESL Computer-Assisted Language Learning through the American Language Academy.

Your students can move at their own academic pace with a computer. Computers have infinite patience while your students work on their specific problems. Students enjoy interacting with computers while mastering their oral and written communication.

Maximize your teaching effectiveness with ALA's ESL software, incorporate the specific materials you are using in class, and work on the special needs of your students.

Find out how ALA's 20 years of experience in ESL and extensive selection of CALL software can help you in your demanding job. Call 1-800-346-3469 today or write for a free, no obligation resource guide!

C.A.L.L. Department—TS
American Language Academy
1401 Rockville Pike, Suite 550
Rockville, MD 20852
Telephone 800-346-3469 • 301-309-1400
Fax 301-309-0202