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Editor’s Note

Central to the editorial mission of the TESOL Quarterly is the facilitation of critical discussion within English language teaching and allied fields. In the service of this goal, The Forum will appear in this and future issues immediately following the full-length articles. With this change, the Editorial Advisory Board intends to highlight relationships among discussions in both sections.

Continuing recent practice, a special-topic issue has been scheduled for this and upcoming volumes. The Autumn 1993 issue will explore the area of adult literacies. Please note that the current issue includes a call for abstracts for a special-topic treatment of qualitative research in ESOL.

In this Issue

Articles in this issue of the TESOL Quarterly bring the world of the language learner into the classroom. The lead article explores the use of drama by inner city youth organizations, challenging us to bring life through drama into the classroom. The second article shifts the focus of teacher preparation from teaching behaviors to the worldview that sustains these. The third describes a language teaching program that sends students into their EFL community as “investigative researchers.” The fourth article documents remarkable reflective abilities in the evaluation of writing on the part of children who are judged to be unsuccessful in school. The next examines a failure of language teaching in terms of social and political factors external to the classroom, and the last article argues that the everyday commiserating behaviors of native speakers can be used to help nonnative speakers develop sustained L2 interactions.

- Shirley Brice Heath describes a use of drama by inner city youth organizations that allows students to maintain their native language or dialect while practicing standard English. As youngsters play a
range of roles—and as they write, cast, and direct—they become independent language users who can mimic language appropriate to a variety of contexts. Heath challenges us to imagine life through drama in the classroom, to reorient current methods of teaching and testing so that language classrooms may be as successful as the youth organizations she studied.

- Donald Freeman and Jack Richards describe a framework for analyzing second language teaching. Characterizing teaching perspectives in terms of science/research, theory/philosophy, or art/craft conceptions, they note differences in assumptions about “what teaching is, what essential skills it involves, and what teachers must know.” The paper explores implications for language teacher education. The goal is to reorient the discussion of teaching from behavior to the assumptions that underlie external practices.

- Brian Kenny describes an English language program that asks learners to become investigative researchers rather than “pupils.” Learners are provided the opportunity to “pursue their own interests and meanings” with the hope that their research will become a “piece of work” rather than merely an “exercise.” Kenny argues that the change in status from student to investigator “is emancipating and is a way of engaging learner autonomy.”

- Katharine Davies Samway's study of nonnative-speaking children evaluating writing is built upon in-depth interviews conducted after students had rated their own compositions and those of peers. Analysis of the evaluation criteria employed by these “high risk” children revealed “considerable reflective powers.” Although they were highly idiosyncratic in the range of evaluation criteria they employed, the children tended to focus on meaning, regardless of their age or whether the piece of writing was their own or that of an anonymous peer. The children were “critically aware of a story's strengths and weaknesses.”

- Melvyn Resnick argues that the apparent failure of TESL in Puerto Rico, is in fact “a motivated failure—a society's successful resolution of a conflict between government planning for bilingualism and social pressure for monolingualism.” Using fundamental principles of the sociology of language, Resnick explores a “social imperative against learning English” that must be considered by those who seek to implement language instruction in a school system. Resnick's discussion highlights the extent to which the degree of success of ESL instruction can be determined by factors “external to the educational environment.”

- Diana Boxer's study documents differences between native speakers and Japanese learners of English in their use of and responses to indirect complaints (ICs). ICs are defined as “expressions of dissatisfaction with someone/thing that is not present” and thus cannot rem-
edy the situation. Boxer argues that these can serve as positive rapport-building strategies. Missed opportunities for commiseration, then, can lead to missed opportunities for sustained interaction that can aid language acquisition. Implications for pedagogy are discussed.

Also in this issue:


- Brief Reports: George Yule and Paul Hoffman demonstrate that undergraduates can provide judgments that closely match those of ESL professionals with respect to the readiness of an ITA for instructional duties. John Hedgcock and Dwight Atkinson’s comparison of L1 and L2 literacy development highlights the complex nature of the latter.

- Reviews: Thomas Scovel reviews English in China edited by Y. F. Dzau; Bill Johnston reviews Earl Stevick’s Humanism and Language Teaching; Brian Lynch reviews four volumes in the Longman Keys to Language Teaching series; and Elizabeth Feldman reviews Learning in Two Languages: From Conflict to Consensus in the Reorganization of Schools edited by Gary Imhoff.

- Book Notices

Sandra Silberstein
CALL FOR ABSTRACTS

Qualitative Research in ESOL

The TESOL Quarterly announces a call for abstracts for a special-topic issue on qualitative research. We are interested in including in this issue full-length, previously unpublished articles which represent exemplar qualitative studies that inform language policies, curriculum development, and/or teaching practices. Studies may focus on any of a variety of settings (e.g., community, classroom, school) and topics (e.g., oral/social interaction, literacy, equity issues). In addition, we encourage contributions from all geographic and language regions.

Although studies must exhibit a clear understanding of qualitative theory, contributions representing various methodological approaches are encouraged.

In addition to full-length articles, we are interested in short reports of either some aspect of a larger qualitative study or a qualitative theoretical or methodological issue.

At this stage, we are soliciting two-page abstracts for full-length articles and one-page abstracts for short reports. For all submissions, send three copies, a full mailing address, and daytime and evening telephone numbers (along with fax and e-mail information, if available). Abstracts should be received at the address below no later than December 3, 1993.

Kathryn A. Davis
Department of English as a Second Language
University of Hawaii at Manoa
1890 East-West Road
Honolulu, HI 96822
Inner City Life Through Drama: 
Imagining the Language Classroom*

SHIRLEY BRICE HEATH
Stanford University

Both language learning theorists and practitioners of teaching English as a second language or dialect have argued that role playing moves language learners beyond their usual performance in ordinary classroom presentations. This paper tells the story of how inner city youth organizations use dramas that young people write, cast, and direct to enable them to retain their first language or dialect while gaining standard English and preparing for job entry. The story ends with implications for the language classroom.

Much of what I have to say here is about drama. All literature involves the willing suspension of disbelief, and drama is no exception. So I must ask that readers suspend disbelief and conjure up their powers of imagination for the next few pages.

Begin, please, by imagining a theatre of actors milling about on the stage with their manager. The group is about to launch into the production of a drama, and the players scurry about, back and forth, with their written scripts in hand. The manager admonishes them as they attend to their texts and try to get themselves into their roles; he warns against too much reliance on “the empty form of reason without the fullness of instinct, which is blind” (Pirandello, 1950, p. 213).

At this point, six characters—disreputable sorts—enter saying they are in search of an author. The six describe themselves as unused creations of an author’s imagination, and they wish to play their parts. The manager is furious and challenges them, trying to dismiss them as mad. The intruders persist. Their desire is to play their parts not for eternity but “only for a moment.” One of the intruders explains: “The drama is in us, and we are the drama. We are impatient to play it” (p. 219).

* This is a slightly revised version of a plenary address delivered at the 1992 TESOL Convention, Vancouver, Canada, March 1992; many of the oral features of the text have been preserved.
This situation forms the heart of a play written by the Italian playwright Luigi Pirandello in the 1920s. But it also lies at the heart of a series of stories I want to tell of young people in search of an author—or we may substitute here teachers—who will acknowledge their desire in language to do what Pirandello refers to as “to make seem true that which isn’t true.” The actors in search of an author in Pirandello’s play claim that the truth does not lie in prearranged words by an authority “out there,” but in a multitude of possibilities:

Each one of us has within him [or her] a whole world of things, each . . . of us his [or her] own special world. And how can we ever come to an understanding if I put in the words I utter the sense and value of things as I see them; while you who listen to me must inevitably translate them according to the conception of things each one of you has within himself [or herself]. We think we understand each other, but we never really do. (p. 224)

The intruding actors of Pirandello’s play tell the professional actors who experience their lives as directed by words on the page and the rules of the manager that truth is not that which is determined by standard measures or by a display of words alone.

SCENE SHIFT

Now, within your imagination, add another stage to that of Pirandello’s play, and put yourself down inside some of the most distraught and confused inner city neighborhoods of North American cities. Walk these streets and note the empty playgrounds of the housing projects; see the graffiti that marks the territories of neighborhood gangs; and hear the worried talk of older women who gather outside one of the local groceries. As you move down the street, duck into an alcove and climb the stairs to the second floor of a commercial building, where a neighborhood-based youth organization brings young men and women together to practice a play about an origin myth popular back in Puerto Rico. In another room, other youngsters work on a script that will capture the dilemma of a young man leaving behind in Puerto Rico his girlfriend when he decides to go to the United States to make enough money to return for her.

Many of these young people speak Spanish at home; all are from families in which the adults did not complete their formal secondary education. These youngsters go to a secondary school (Grades 9–12) named for a Caribbean hero, and they take ESL classes, where they say and write words, using textbook and teacher modeling as the primary bases of their daily classwork. Once outside the classroom, most
move into Spanish, the dominant peer language. Most feel they are “doing OK” in English in school, but that they cannot show in their classes what they “really” know or can do with the language.

At the neighborhood center—where all the adults are bilingual in English and Spanish—the young people write their plays, rehearse, and perform them in Spanish, often consulting texts written in Spanish to check on “the old stories” or to see how stage directions are written for “real plays.” Once their performance is ready, the neighborhood center holds an afternoon or evening event—sometimes at the local Latino Cultural Center—and parents and friends come to watch. But in this area of shifting gang turfs and unpredictable outbreaks of competition among gangs, some adults fear coming out on the streets at night. Thus the youths perform their plays also for a special videotaped session.

However, for this session, their youth director reminds them they must prepare subtitles in English (to make the videos available to their monolingual friends) along with some written programs that explain certain plays—especially those with a historical base or reference to myths or cuentos (stories) that may not be familiar to all viewers. Working in small groups of 5 to 8, the 30 or so young people take up these tasks, arguing among themselves about whether or not they should also prepare a program to explain the plays they have written that are based not on older known and historical sources, but on their own experiences in their remembered departures from Mexico and Central America or the Caribbean. They talk here about whether they can write about changing sexual norms of their grandparents and even some of their parents: no sex before marriage; or if you promise yourself to someone, that promise should be honored for life. They want to prepare a program that will explain how conscience is not a single thing, but many sided.

They script, practice, discuss, and perform plays that, for the most part, explore the same dilemma that one of Pirandello’s characters explained to the manager of the studio they invaded in search of an author:

So we have this illusion of being one person for all, of having a personality that is unique in all our acts. But it isn’t true. We perceive this when, tragically perhaps, in something we do, we areas it were, suspended, caught up in the air on a kind of hook. Then we perceive that all of us was not in that act, and that it would be an atrocious injustice to judge us by that action alone, as if all our existence were summed up in that one deed. (pp. 231–232)

What are the tensions within this central dilemma?

• Conflicts between the sexual norms of their peers and those of public entertainment heroes, on the one hand, and the rules and regulations their elders and the school lay down for them, on the other
• Conflicts between their own struggling self-image as not part of the city's gang life—so intensely identified by the police and public media along ethnic/linguistic lines, and some new self-image that will somehow bring power, possibility, and promise.

• Finally, the central conflict resting on their fears of getting jobs, of where they will go with the education and the English language that seem to promise so much and to give so little for the friends they have seen finish high school and then search and search—often fruitlessly—for a job that offers some dignity.

By now, you may feel that you are an audience in search of a point. What relevance does all of this talk of drama have for teachers of English as a second language? Is there any theory here to drive practice? Where is the research? Are these simply provocative tales that have no bearing on the many types of programs and circumstances of learning English that the professionals of TESOL represent?

The research here draws from a 5-year study of the life of young people in inner city youth organizations that the youngsters of these neighborhoods judged effective. A team of ethnographers, including 20 junior ethnographers from the neighborhoods, studied the language uses in activities of approximately 60 organizations (ranging from baseball and basketball teams to drama groups and teams of gymnasts) in three major metropolitan areas of the U.S.

Drama in a variety of forms turned out to be a frequently occurring activity of youth groups. Many organizations simply made use from time to time of role playing (e.g., to help resolve disputes, to put youngsters in the role of teachers, police officers, doctors, etc.). Others devoted themselves entirely to drama, dance, and music, incorporating a considerable amount of ethnic history, community life, and contemporary crises in communities and families. In all of these, the youngsters themselves chose the themes and wrote the scripts. Under adult guidance, mentoring, and sometimes through an apprenticeship system, they helped stage, direct, costume, and produce their plays. They also took part in the videotaping of their performances so that they might be able to take their performances into the homes of their friends in the housing projects or neighborhoods where they lived. In some sites, the youngsters took their dramas—covering topics that ranged from teen pregnancy to cult life—into public secondary schools for use as the opening of small-group discussions among students and school personnel.

A striking pattern became clear early in the analysis of the language of practice and performance. Youngsters who had either dropped out of school or did not see themselves as performing better than “OK” in school were speaking and writing at what would usually be judged as
relatively high levels of performance if transferred to the words and tasks of the school classroom. This was true not only for nonnative-English-speaking students learning English as a second language but also for students whose street dialect or vernacular differed markedly from that of standard English.

In other words, once these actors became their own authors, they seemed to tap into performance a deep range of linguistic competence that they otherwise did not display. The power of role shifting, of framing themselves in play, and of using the new voices acquired through becoming actors seemed to loosen a host of abilities undiscovered in the ordinary run of classroom requests for displays of knowledge rather than full performances of knowing.

SCENE SHIFT

Let me call on your imagination once more. Move across town now to a storefront theatre set in the midst of businesses (50% of which have been closed for a year or more) and enter a set of double doors. Here young people aged 8–18 practice dances that will be part of a show they have written about the random shooting of a young boy in the nearby housing projects. The youngsters have written the script to begin with the shooting and to end with the funeral of the boy. In between, they include such characters as the television newscaster broadcasting from the scene of the shooting and talking with local residents; they produce a portion of the evening news broadcast to portray the shooting and other news (statistics related to poverty, teenage pregnancy, and the economy) plus the weather and sports. For the scene of the funeral at a local church, they cast themselves as the mother and younger sisters of the slain, the preacher, choir, and pallbearers. They do not forget an acting corpse in the open casket. Preparation for this show—which, after many weeks of rehearsal, is videotaped for editing—includes numerous sessions for different actors who talk about when street talk goes and when standard English is the norm. The evening weather reporter, sportscaster, and news anchor, as well as the news reporter on the scene, must use standard English, whereas those interviewed in the projects must use the local vernacular. The young people write out their scripts, practice handling and reading from them as their models on the evening news show do, and work to capture the nuances of body movements and gestures that reflect the seriousness of the news and the more jocular tone of sports and the weather. Younger participants, most of whom are in the dance and choir numbers, often sit by and watch rehearsals after they have practiced their dance routines.
hearing—and seeing—their older friends model lessons about language use, power, and institutional roles.

PERFORMANCE THEORY

But where does the theory of such performances lie, and does this research suggest anything about language learning? Let me draw from the language analysis of both the youth leaders and the young people to lay out some findings first and then to suggest theories that help explain what happens here.

These findings can best be set out in a comparative frame with formal classroom learning. But first a caveat: I lay out here features of what may be called traditional classrooms that are instructor- and textbook-centered, though I know full well that many ESL classrooms do not operate exclusively with the features noted here as those of formal classrooms. However, I set the findings off comparatively for the sake of provoking some imagination about ways in which we as teachers might begin to build some bridges between the two seemingly opposing worlds of school and community organizations for youth.

The comparative analysis of language uses in classrooms and in neighborhood-based organizations can be summarized as follows.

Unit of Focus

In the classroom, the primary unit of focus is the individual learner, while in community youth organizations, the primary learning unit is the group engaged in the accomplishment of a group goal.

Medium for Display of Knowledge

In classrooms—even language classrooms—the primary medium for the display of knowledge tends to be written; some ESL classes feel forced to center students' attention on the need to learn to write English because the majority of judgments of their academic ability will depend on their performance in writing. In community youth organizations, writing comes as a natural and necessary part of a rich communication array—including spoken, gestural, spatial, and written means.

The Value of Practice

In classrooms, teachers often feel the need to overcome what they perceive as students' resistance to skills (and drills). In community
youth organizations, adults assume skills exist within the group and that when the task demands certain skills or bases of knowledge, the group will set about to acquire those—making sure they get the practice they need to meet the necessary performance norms. A special note regarding drill and practice is needed here. There are those in pedagogy who decry “skills and drills”—the repetitive practice of language in classrooms. Yet in community youth organizations, practices go on and on, and scenes are rehearsed again and again. The raw footage, for example, of the single day of taping of the funeral mentioned above illustrates the hundreds of times youngsters had to redo shots of the evening newscast—in spite of many months of practice. Here the goal of a good performance, the outcome of which the group would approve, motivated these young people to undergo willingly the drills necessary to master the skills necessary for their roles in the drama.

**Access to Diverse Models**

In classrooms, teachers must struggle to find models of English speakers other than themselves that they can feasibly bring into daily learning activities. In community youth organizations, the diverse ages, histories of migration, and degrees of exposure to English of the participants offer ready models of different types for the youngsters. Moreover, when they use videotapes or recordings as additional models, they do so with the idea of adapting their own language and gestural behaviors to improve their character portrayal in a planned drama. Hence, they move “in character” as they draw on the models available to them in the youth organization.

**The Question of Who Teaches and Who Learns**

In classrooms, teachers see themselves as instructors—transmitting knowledge about the language, words, and standards. Teachers tell, talk, direct, and test. In community youth organizations, youth leaders see themselves more as coaches—as individuals there to help keep a reality check on the tasks the youngsters take up, to direct rehearsals, and to offer support and encouragement. They also evaluate and hold up high standards of expectation and discipline for the group, but they usually do so speaking through and for the potential future audience the group will have to satisfy with their final dramatic performance. Thus all speakers practice and respond not for and to teachers but to their imagined future audience of critics.
Funds of Knowledge

In classrooms, teachers find it tough to draw on the funds of knowledge that youngsters bring to school with them that rarely find their way into the language lessons of the day. In community youth organizations, the funds of knowledge of the young people as a collective create in large part the texts, tasks, and tests of their learning projects. Teen drama organizations depend on the youngsters to know the local church that is most likely to let them videotape part of their show there, the local funeral parlor which will lend a casket, the local cultural center most likely to have the feathers necessary for enactment of an ancient origin myth centering around a giant bird. Perhaps most important, the shared judgments of the youth and their leaders continually grow and develop as they move from performance to performance and set higher standards for themselves.

SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES

What can we make of these differences between classrooms and youth organizations? Are there ways to bridge between them? Let me suggest a few ways to start such a bridging and then move to those theories of learning environments that can undergird any such bridging efforts.

First, as we increasingly see schools moving into some responsibility for the physical and mental health of their students, we need to think about the possibilities of learning what is going on for youth in their neighborhood organizations. The learning environments of such organizations bear many similarities to those of employment: Tasks are complex, direct instruction is minimal, stakes are high, and quality demands relentless. Though inner city youth find many types of youth organizations ineffective from their point of view, others do meet their ideals of good places to be.

As schools create community councils to work with them in school-based reform programs, they need to determine from the youth in their schools whether or not there are local youth organizations they find effective in their neighborhoods. Schools should then invite the leaders of these organizations—adults and young people—into the council and find ways that class credit in language classes (as well as others) can come from certain types of participation beyond the classroom door—in dramas such as those described here, for example.

A second suggestion relates to my earlier call for imagination. The push for year-round schooling increases in many parts of North America; opponents to this idea argue that more of what already
appears not to be working for kids will not do any better. Perhaps what we need to think of—especially for ESL learners—are opportunities for summer drama programs that will bring these youth together to write and perform their stories for use in the multicultural curriculum. Currently, many schools and teachers are scurrying about trying to find appropriate multicultural materials, when excellent funds of knowledge about an array of languages and cultures exist among students. Moreover, because students often put into their dramas, not only distant history and myths, but also the recent history shared by young newcomers to North America, their materials provide a strong link to other students.

Such summer drama programs would bring together youth leaders, teachers, and students around oral and written language and into an array of tasks. Moreover, for students whose first language is not English, summer projects through which they must research, write, and perform in their own language bring them closer to older family members. Such individuals in the community organizations we studied often became resources for youth groups, enhancing parent-teen relationships and enabling youngsters to join together in oral and written activities that required their native language. Funding could be shared between school districts and neighborhood organizations. Many of these organizations already offer summer camps, though usually of shorter duration than the 4–6 weeks it would take to bring a drama to production. Currently, many districts offer funds for mentor teachers who usually work during the year with new teachers; some with appropriate interests could now work instead with youth leaders in summer programs for youngsters. Through these programs, teachers and students should receive credit for learning in new and different kinds of experiences. For example, native speakers of foreign languages offered through the secondary school curriculum could write dramatic scripts for use by their age peers studying such languages as Spanish, Russian, Japanese.

Third, schools would do well to imitate neighborhood organizations and think of the power of drama and of fuller uses of role playing for bringing out performance that reflects the fullest possible range of linguistic competence of students. For those towns with museums, art galleries, historic districts, for example, teachers could arrange to have a team of students act as docents for out-of-town visitors whose L1 is the same as that of the students. Such activities might take place only one weekend a month, or only during the summer, but preparation for these tasks would engage students in authentic learning and testing. But, you may ask, why would using their first language contribute to their English skills? Two ways: First, the materials of museums and many of the explanations of their tasks as docents or guides must come
in English through models that extend beyond their teachers. Second, from many second language acquisition researchers, we have learned that if the academic register or formal uses of language for talking about subjects such as those of the school are acquired in the L1, they come more readily in the second language—in this case, English. Students who may not otherwise use their L1 for formal explanatory—even instructive—purposes, will be called upon to do so in their roles as docents or guides.

One other example: On KQED television (the public television station of San Francisco), announcement times between programs frequently include the voice of a bilingual child announcing the station and the supporters of the next program. The young person is not pictured but speaks over the station logo. He or she first makes the announcement in the L1 and then adds, in English,

Hello, my name is __________, and what I just said was in Hmong [Amoy Chinese, Spanish, etc.], my mother tongue. I am bilingual, and I use __________, my mother tongue, at home, with some of my friends, and I use English at school and also with some of my friends. What I said was. . . .

You are tuned to KQED, Channel 9, a public television broadcasting station.

With a good deal of imagination and cooperation, and riding the wave of current interest in spreading information and understanding of multiculturalism, we can as teachers find new and highly effective ways to bridge between the language learning of the classroom and that of authentic adult mainstream institutional roles. It is, after all, these for which we aspire to prepare our students, and the sooner we can get them into these roles, the better.

Yet another way of enabling students to play roles such as those they will need to assume later in life—that of self-assessor—is to allow students to do their own parent-teacher-student conferences. Several teachers across the country have begun working with their classes to have students think through the kinds of questions they believe their parents would want answered regarding school. These are rehearsed and scripted by each student to characterize his or her accomplishments, weaknesses, and areas of strength. On the occasions of parent-teacher conferences, the teacher begins the three-way conversation by offering an evaluation of the student, and the student then takes over, using a formal register in English (if appropriate) to give his or her individual perspective on learning in the classroom. In this way, students take on new roles: They become the observer and reporter of their own academic performance. They must both represent their own interests and convey their understanding of the professional nature of this interaction around their classroom achievements.
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THEORIES OF LEARNING AND ENVIRONMENTS OF LEARNING

But do these ideas have any basis in theories of learning or theories that try to understand those features of environments that relate to learning? Let me organize these points into three frames, and around these, let me wrap the theories of learning and teaching of a drama and ESL teacher, Gil Sanchez, of the San Francisco Unified School District, who practices these theories daily in his classrooms.

The theories in capsule form are: multiple voices, cognitive apprenticeship, and play. This last—play—enables both multiple voices and cognitive apprenticeship.

Multiple Voices

This idea comes from the theorist Mikhail Bakhtin, as well as L. S. Vygotsky, whose work has alerted us to the dialogic nature of the creation of meaning. Whenever we speak, we actually talk through the words of ourselves and others—words and phrases that we have heard many times and that become our own when we use them to say new things in what are new times and places (Bakhtin, 1986). To the extent that we can strengthen and make obvious and direct in learning environments this speaking through many voices, we can take advantage of the range of models of English language use that are out there in the real world.

When asked to speak as his favorite football player or television character, the shy ESL student can come forward with astonishing capabilities not demonstrated when asked to answer or to read as himself from the textbook in class. When the adult ESL learner has been asked to record and transcribe some English language instructions as they might be given by the boss of her job as a dishwasher, she can take on an aggressive confidence that is otherwise unsuitable to her cultural background and sense of self as wife and daughter in a traditional extended family from the Caribbean.

Cognitive Apprenticeship

This concept, drawn in part from the work on reciprocal learning of Ann Brown and her colleagues (e.g., Brown & Reeve, 1987) as well as from successful on-the-job learning programs, centers on tasks and problems that give students practice in applying key techniques in diverse settings. The apprenticeship moves forward as the expert learner slowly increases the complexity of tasks. Cognitive apprenticeship works to create a culture of expert practice in which students can
participate and to which they can aspire. Cognitive apprenticeship sets the articulation of abstract principles underlying the application of knowledge and skills into the immediate tasks of different contexts. For example, the power relations between standard and nonstandard English speakers, as an abstract concept, comes alive in the practices of the young people cast as television commentator. A focus on particular words causing trouble carries special meaning when the tape is played back and peers reject particular pronunciations as undesirable for this role.

In cognitive apprenticeship, young people actually “play” at taking on the role of expert after seeing experts model for them. For example, in the work of Elspeth Stuckey, Director of South Carolina’s cross-age tutoring program, she has students who are engaged in tutoring younger students write to her and to other tutors across the state about their sense of what they are doing. These correspondents respond in writing, asking more and more sophisticated questions about the context of the tutoring, how the tutee is integrating reading and writing, what kinds of questions the younger students ask, and how certain additional materials and strategies might work with the younger students. This reflection enables the older students not only to respond to their correspondents’ questions but also to ask questions of their own. They thus formulate questions, summarize, clarify, predict, and plan. Their focus on another student’s learning helps them decompose what is involved in learning language—oral and written, and to turn that reflection not only on the other as learner but also on themselves as learner and as model. Heath and Mangiola (1991) report similar programs of cognitive apprenticeship through tutoring with reflection and analysis in ESL classrooms from primary through adult levels. The dramatic ploy in all of these is that of role shift. Youngsters become something other than their usual student selves within the cross-age tutoring frame. They must play new roles as teachers, mentors, evaluators, and planners; they are accountable in new and different ways—to themselves, to their young charges, and to the adults with whom they must communicate about the achievements of their tutees.

Cognitive apprenticeship also derives much from coinvestigation, a term that some cognitive psychologists have used for encouraging students to reflect both on their existing strategies and the new ones they are acquiring (Scardamalia, Bereiter, & Steinbach, 1984). Within the youth dramas, students must constantly reflect on how they are doing, for their progress hinders or enables the show to move forward. Such work enables students to focus on the subactivities that must work together to create a successful role. Hence, students take apart a complex task for themselves (and with each other) and choose as their
focus discrete elements that make up the task and that need special attention.

Play

It is play—that imaginative frame we all put on certain occasions or aspects of our behavior—that enables both multiple voices and cognitive apprenticeship. The anthropologist Gregory Bateson has defined play as the kind of learning about the self that results in a change in the self (1955). He goes on to explain that play is the unit of interaction of learning that really changes us. When we learn the contexts of life, we have to take on behaviors that enable us to fit ourselves to the ongoing pattern of relationships and also to goals of efficacy-accomplishment in tasks that meet group goals. In play that involves full performance—not just verbal display—both sides of the brain are called on. There is, in the words of the neurologists who study such things “high arousal” that enables the development of a number of communicative skills involved with not only codes but also the frames and metaframes of communication. The self is transformed from the vulnerable, inhibited central self that fears making mistakes into the demands of the character. Thus, as Bateson says, we are changed in the frame of play—in being who we are not, we can call upon a full array of skills and features of projection that our nonpaying self would not ordinarily allow. Two or more are certainly, in this case, better than one.

Play is then a frame for action that does not define the actions which are its content and does not obey the ordinary reinforcement rules. Play allows multiple versions of the world.

But theorists can prattle on about such matters of learning and environments of learning. What might a teacher of ESL say? Here I draw from the work of my colleague, Gil Sanchez, who, with his group of ESL learners, presented their work at the 1989 TESOL meetings in San Francisco. There the audience saw his students perform and improvise in a scene, using perfectly understandable English; later the audience addressed questions to the students, who playing themselves now and out of their dramatic roles, faced greater language difficulties.

Sanchez has used drama in his classes for years—as a result of the melding of his theories of learning and his own love of drama. He tells us how he does it. He starts with beginning-level students (no English), asking them to do tableau work—looking, listening, sensing what they are doing in this prelinguistic work. They get their bodies to gesture anger, compassion, mistrust, and gradually they attach language. He combines photos or slides—often of their home country or of settings
or scenes they see in their new environments. They then put two tableaux together through a character moving from one to the other. The next step is to get together to write and “talk” their scripts and to produce two-by-two dramas for the videocamera and then four-by-four dramas for the videocamera, with others helping evaluate.

Sanchez’s strategy is to add comprehensible input to a bed of affect that is achievable and demonstrable most easily through another character and not through the immediate vulnerable self. Beginning with the affective and moving to their own scripts ensures that students have a sense of the causes behind what happens and what is said and that they see not only language but other behaviors as symbols. Furthermore, moving in this way with beginning-level students calls on their collective repertoire of language knowledge. They invest in a stake as a community of learners. Aware of each other at a one-on-one level through their dyadic tableaux, they also learn to be aware of their responses to each other through activities stressing synchrony and rhythm. These become meaningful in a new context as the students shift to verbal communication. A sense of synergy is what the students of Sanchez achieve, knowing that the components with which they work will build to be greater than the whole. Finally, all symbol systems are called into play toward a meaningful end.

But you need not take my word or that of Sanchez. Listen to the voices of his beginning-level students after their experience in his class over the semester. He asked them to write in their journals reflections of what they had learned through drama. 

I learned to work in a group, to coordinate with my fellow students, to have a sense of companionship with them.

I learn how to act and how to dance. . . . I like drama subject because I learn how to speak loud and how to speak English.

I realized that I had learned so much from performances like the history, the stories, the movements, the song, the dances, and we also learned English in that class.

I learned to concentrate better on listening and that I could learn things without being embarrassed.

I learned to be responsible with a group and to integrate and manage the sound equipment. I also learned that in cooperating with the group, I should never be late for practice.

Your imaginary flights have now ended. We have gone to Pirandello’s 1920s scene of six actors in search of an author, to inner city

---

1 Some students wrote in their L1, some in English. Those not written in English by the students are given here in English translation; those written in English are given just as they were written by the students.
youth organizations, and back to classrooms of teachers and students.
I have tried to encourage you to push hard with imagination to consider
what life through drama might say to us about language learning and
how we might reorient our current methods of teaching, testing, and
encasing learning and testing in classrooms.

Let me close now by taking us back where we began to Pirandello's
intruding actors who seek throughout the play to make clear their very
reason for being.

As the actors play out their real stories before the theatre manager,
the latter decides that there may indeed be drama in their reality. He
offers to find an author for them and to have his actors take over their
roles in the subsequent written play. The intruding actors object and
say: "We act that role for which we have been cast, that role which we
are given in life" (p. 235). They return to the notion of truth and contest
the fetters and rigors of encased routines that the actors, author, and
managers see as necessary for drama.

If we listen to the words of these actors, they will remind us as
teachers that often what we see in the classroom is not truth and that
the routines there cannot approach fully those necessary for the drama
of language learning that students must face in real life.

Let us remember then the power of play and the drama of language
learning. When a character is born for a student, that character ac-
tquires at once such an independence, even of teacher or coach, that
the learner can be imagined by everybody in many other situations. I
want to pay tribute to the inner city youth leaders and to teachers such
as Gil Sanchez who have dared use drama to move their students to
and through many situations in their imaginations. I can best pay that
tribute by quoting from Maley and Duffs (1978/1982) Drama Techniques
in Language Learning, written before today's theorists of cognitive psy-
chology, anthropology, and neurology offered explanations for why
drama loosens the tongue and the imagination. Maley and Duff leave
us with a marvelous image of what we can accomplish as language
teachers.

Drama is like the naughty child who climbs the high walls and ignores
the 'No Trespassing' sign. It does not allow us to define our territory so
exclusively: it forces us to take as our starting-point life not language. (p. 15)
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Teaching is variously defined as a science, a technology, a craft, or an art. Each of these characterizations carries with it defined orientations towards what teaching is, what essential skills it involves, and what teachers must know. They also contribute to defining different approaches to the preparation of teachers. Using a framework proposed by Zahorik (1986) which classifies general conceptions of teaching into three main categories—science/research conceptions, theory/philosophy conceptions, and art/craft conceptions—we review the different conceptions of second language instruction prevalent in the field of TESOL and consider their implications for second language teacher education. The aim is to present a framework for analyzing second language teaching which will shift the focus of discussions of teaching from behavior and activity to the thinking and reasoning which organizes and motivates these external practices.
teaching in general, second language teaching can be conceived in
different ways depending on how the nature of the work and the role
of the teacher are framed. Teaching can, for example, be seen as a
science, a technology, a craft, or an art, and each of these characteriza-
tions carries with it defined orientations toward the activity of teaching
and the knowledge base of the teacher. Thus, different views of lan-
guage teaching lead to different views of what the essential skills of
teaching are and to different approaches to the preparation of teachers
(see Freeman, 1991). In this paper, we examine different conceptions
of second language instruction and consider their implications for
second language teacher education. Our aim is to present a framework
for analyzing second language teaching and to show its value for one
critical area of the field.

THE FRAMEWORK

In an important paper on the relationship between theories of teach-
ing and teaching skills, Zahorik (1986) classifies general conceptions
of teaching into three main categories: science/research conceptions,
theory/philosophy conceptions, and art/craft conceptions. Zahorik ar-
gues that, “Beyond a few obvious skills . . . identifying universal
teaching skills is difficult because teaching skills emerge from one’s
conception of good teaching” (1986, p. 21). Any judgments about the
“goodness” or efficacy of particular forms of pedagogy carry with
them often implicit assertions about the nature of teaching itself. Thus,
we would argue the locus of discussions about teaching in our field
needs to shift from considerations of technique and procedure to
examinations of the conceptions of teaching which underlie them. Broadening our discussions to take in these embedded conceptions of
teaching is crucial to the maturation of the field of second language
instruction.

The idea of a conception of teaching is a thorny one, although it has a
history in educational research (e.g., Becker, Geer, Hughes, & Strauss,
1961; Clandinin & Connelly, 1987; Clark, 1986; Marton, 1981). Fishl
and Hoz (1991), in their brief review of that literature, suggest three
commonalities in the definitions used by most educational researchers:

They convey the connotation of comprehensive, organized, and unified bodies
of knowledge about an object, idea, or phenomenon. Some people feel
conceptions affect people’s actions and lead to their performance. (p. 4)

In this paper, it suits our purposes to leave the term intentionally
broad; however, we find Fishl and Hoz’s summary useful in framing
the idea of a conception for our discussions.
Taking Zahorik’s tripartite classification as our starting point, we examine the conceptions of teaching which shape the field of second language instruction. Like any conceptual architecture, Zahorik’s framework focuses on gross similarities among conceptions of teaching, while attending less closely to many of their fine-grained differences. To say, for example, that a conception is scientifically based is not to exclude the values or other attributes which contribute to it, but rather to address what we find as its primary features. Thus, we find the framework, which we develop through examples from the field, extremely useful as is evident in our concluding discussion of how these different conceptions of teaching shape assumptions about—and forms of—second language teacher education.

**Scientifically Based Conceptions of Teaching**

Scientifically based conceptions of second language teaching are derived from research and are supported by experimentation and empirical investigation. Zahorik divides these conceptions into three groups: those which operationalize learning principles, those which follow a tested model, and those which are based on what effective teachers do. In so doing, he draws on a particularly positivistic view of science (House, 1991).

**Teaching Which Operationalizes Learning Principles**

These conceptions depend on teaching principles developed from psychological research on human memory, transfer in learning situations, motivation, and other factors believed to be important in learning. In general education, mastery learning and program learning are two clear examples of scientifically based conceptions of teaching (e.g., Hunter, 1982). In the field of second language instruction, audiolingualism, task-based language teaching, and learner training each represent applications of research in second language learning to the activity of language teaching. It is interesting—and indeed instructive—to see how three such varied examples fall within the same conception of teaching: that is, pedagogy which attempts to operationalize findings of research on language learning.

A clear example, audiolingualism was derived from research on learning associated with behavioral psychology (Brooks, 1964). Laboratory studies had shown that learning could be successfully manipulated if three elements were identified: a stimulus, which serves to elicit behavior; a response, triggered by the stimulus; and reinforcement, which serves to mark the response as being appropriate (or inappropriate) and encourages its repetition (or suppression) in the future. When
translated into instruction, these learning principles led to the audiolin-
gual method (ALM), in which language learning was seen as a process
of habit formation because target language patterns were presented
for memorization and learning through dialogues and drills.

Task-based language teaching, or TBLT, is a more recent example
of using learning research as a basis for teaching. Its proponents assert
that second language acquisition (SLA) research can and should guide
second language instruction. In a recent example, Long and Crookes
(1992) state: “The basic rationale for TBLT derives from [second
language acquisition] research, particularly descriptive and experi-
mental studies comparing tutored and naturalistic learning” (p. 42). In
their formulation of TBLT, Long and Crookes see tasks as the central
unit in the organization and delivery of language instruction. They
argue that tasks improve levels of target language attainment by pro-
viding opportunities for learning through the negotiation of meaning
and a focus on using the target language to accomplish specific goals
and purposes. In this view, teaching is portrayed as a scientifically
based activity, though teachers themselves are peculiarly absent. Long
and Crookes (1992) write:

TBLT is distinguished by its compatibility with research findings on lan-
guage learning, a principled approach to content selection, and an attempt
to incorporate findings from classroom-centered research when making
decisions concerning the design of materials and methodology. (pp. 45-46)

Although audiolingualism did not depend on an extended research
program to elaborate its pedagogy, both task-based teaching and an-
other scientifically based conception, learner training, have been inte-
grally tied to ongoing research on language learning and learners. In
task-based teaching, such research is intended to enable designers to
identify the kinds of tasks which can best facilitate acquisition of specific
target language structures and functions (Loschky & Bley-Vroman,
1990). In curriculum development, Prabhu (1987) initiated a large-
scale application of this type of task-based teaching in schools in India,
developing a syllabus and associated teaching materials around three
major types of tasks: information-gap, opinion-gap, and reasoning-
gap tasks.

Teaching referred to under the rubric of learner training draws on
research on the cognitive styles and learning strategies used by learners
in carrying out different types of classroom tasks (O’Malley & Chamot,
1990). Whereas the pedagogues of audiolingualism and task-based
teaching focus on research-based understandings of the activity of
teaching, this research focuses on learners and may involve observing
them, asking them to introspect about their learning strategies, or
probing their thinking and processes in other ways. The assumption is
that once successful learning strategies are identified, these can be taught to students to make them more effective learners.

In converting findings and principles arrived at through research on learning into classroom practice, each of these forms of teaching asserts that teaching is, in effect, a mirror image of learning. A researcher and proponent of learner training, Willing (1988) makes this argument quite explicitly:

Research shows that an effort to accommodate learning styles by choosing suitable teaching styles, methodologies and course organization can result in improved learner satisfaction and attainment. (p. 1)

There are, however, other types of classroom instruction which fall within the scientifically based conception of teaching but which depend on other forms of rationalization. One is teaching which tries to replicate a tested or researched classroom model; another bases instruction on what effective teachers do in classrooms.

**Teaching Which Follows a Tested Model**

These conceptions develop models of effective classroom practice from results of empirical or experimental research, which are then applied to teaching. In this approach, Zahorik (1986) points out, “a view of good teaching is developed through logical reasoning and previous research; good teaching is defined in terms of specific acts” (p. 21).

Research on teachers' patterns of questioning and wait time provides an example of a group of “specific acts” out of which a conception which follows a tested model has been developed. In this case, a model of effective questioning is derived from research which established the contribution of such behaviors to the quality of interaction in second language classrooms (Long et al., 1984). In applying this research to teaching, proponents developed a simple model in which trainees were taught the distinction between display questions—those questions for which the answers are known in advance—and referential questions—those for which the answers are not known. Trainees were also instructed in the advantages of providing longer wait times after asking questions. The teachers' uses of questions and wait time were measured before and after the training to evaluate the effectiveness of this instructional model of questioning.

As is evident in this example, when teaching is conceived of in this way, it quickly becomes an aggregate of individual teaching skills. If certain teaching behaviors, such as questioning patterns and wait time, are found effective in bringing about classroom language learning, then proponents argue that they should be incorporated as key aspects...
of a model of good teaching. Long et al. (1984) offer such reasoning when they conclude of their work:

The training modules affected teaching behaviors, and the new behaviors affected student participation patterns in ways believed to be significant for these students’ language acquisition. (p. vi)

However such modeled conceptions take a bounded view of teaching, often simplifying, sometimes inadvertently, the complexities of the teaching behavior which they intend to promulgate. In a review of the questioning and wait-time research for instance, Carlsen (1991) comments that

research on questioning has generally failed to recognize that classroom questions are not simply teacher behaviors but mutual constructions of teachers and students. [As such] . . . the meaning of questions is dependent on their context in classroom discourse, the content of questions cannot be ignored, and questions may reflect and sustain status differences in the classroom. (p. 157)

Thus isolating so-called effective behaviors, like questioning in this example, can be more complicated than it first appears. In fact, it may not be a workable approach to developing a notion of “good” or “effective” teaching.

A third group of conceptions, those based on perceptions of what effective teachers do, attempts to circumvent this issue of fragmenting teaching into separate behaviors by turning to teachers themselves as models of effective practice. Thus the behaviors are no longer isolated but instead are placed within the context of the individual, “model” teacher’s actions. Because these behaviors are selected through a view of effective action which is empirically determined, the overall rubric of the scientifically based conception of teaching is maintained.

Teaching Which Follows What Effective Teachers Do

Developing a conception of teaching based on the practices of effective teachers involves identifying those teachers and then studying what they do in classrooms. In this research, effective teachers are typically defined as those whose students perform better on standardized achievement tests. This standard is hardly definitive or comprehensive, however, perhaps because there is not a research-based or

---

1. There is an interesting parallel here with effective schools research of the 1970s in the U.S., which began by measuring schools’ efficacy through standardized measures such as test results. These measures were gradually abandoned as simplistic ways to evaluate effectiveness (Brophy, 1979). It is worth noting, however, that many debates in educational policy—such as America 2000 proposals in the U.S. (U.S. Department of Education, 1991)—continue to frame questions of efficacy in terms of standardized, quantifiable results.
political consensus on what constitutes teacher effectiveness or how best to assess it. In fact, such definitions are subject to much debate, as is evident in the work of the U.S. National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS, 1989; Shulman, 1987).

Advocates of effective teaching research have used their findings as guidelines to train teachers (Rosenshine, 1979). In a summary of this research, Blum (1984) identified a list of characteristics of effective teaching which have been used in structuring teacher education (e.g., Hunter, 1982). In the field of second language instruction, this type of direct research-practice linkage has had less influence, however. In one example, Tikunoff (1985) observed teachers working with limited English proficient students in bilingual programs to find out how they organized instruction, structured teaching activities, and enhanced student performance on tasks. Tikunoff’s analysis identified instructional features as significant in the instruction of LEP students.

Figure 1 compares the features of effective instruction identified by Blum and Tikunoff. While the two studies do not directly correspond and their findings are described somewhat differently, the similarities, which are underlined and grouped by superscript letters, are instructive. The two studies illustrate how, when normatively defined, the practices of effective teachers can be aggregated into a conception of teaching.

Whether they are based on effective teaching research, on following a tested model of teaching, or on attempts to operationalize learning principles derived from research, scientifically based conceptions of teaching share a common shortcoming. They are deeply rooted in a view of teaching as a process which generates learning as its product. In these conceptions, teaching is conceived as appropriate behavior and the role of the teacher is to act on principles and findings articulated by others. This view is workable only if classrooms and learners are seen as more alike than they are different so that they can become settings for implementation of teaching as defined by scientific findings. Such conceptions do not address the idiosyncrasies of particular classrooms or groups of learners nor do they examine individual teachers’ contextual knowledge of their work.

In introducing a comprehensive review of research on second language instruction, Chaudron (1988) voices the hope of scientifically based conceptions of teaching (see also Cazden, 1991). He writes:

This book reviews classroom-based research and attempts to provide confirming or disconfirming evidence for claims about the influence of language instruction and classroom interaction on language learning. . . . Classroom teachers, school administrators, teacher trainers, and second language researchers should all find in [this review] useful implications for language teaching. (p. xv)

CONCEPTIONS OF TEACHING
The statement, and the tradition which it represents, makes an important assumption about the nature of teaching, namely, that it operates most effectively when grounded in research and scientific findings.

There are other conceptions of teaching which do not share this assumption and which are derived from particular views of teaching, teachers, learning, or learners. Because these conceptions spring from theoretical models or general philosophies of teaching and learning instead of empirical investigations, they contrast sharply with scientifically based conceptions. This is not to suggest that they are less rigorous in their formulation, but simply that they have evolved through a different route. However, advocates of scientifically based conceptions may see them as falling short of the standards of “science”; as Chaudron declares, “Theories and claims about language teaching methods have rarely been based on actual research in language classrooms” (p. xv).
THEORY-AND VALUES-BASED CONCEPTIONS OF TEACHING

Of this second group, referred to as theoretically or philosophically based conceptions, Zahorik (1986) writes, “Their truth is not based on a posteriori conditions or on what works. Rather, [it] is based on what ought to work or what is morally right” (p. 22). Conceptions which are derived from “what ought to work” are essentially rationalist in their approach to teaching; these we group together under the rubric of theory based. Those which are derived from beliefs about what is “morally right,” we refer to as values based.

Teaching Based on Theory

The conception of teaching which underlies many theory-based teaching methods and proposals suggests that explanations or justifications for teaching can be arrived at through reason or rational thought. Systematic and principled thinking, rather than empirical investigation, is used to support these forms of classroom practice. Thus, these conceptions of teaching tend not to draw support from classroom results which are empirically measured or compared, such as pre- and posttest gains resulting from the use of a method. Instead they justify themselves through logical argumentation.

In second language instruction, we find examples of such theory-based conceptions in communicative language teaching (CLT) and in the Silent Way, among others. Each of these forms of teaching is based on a set of carefully constructed assumptions which are logically extended from belief into classroom practice. CLT, for example, arose as a reaction to grammar-based teaching realized in the teaching materials, syllabi, and methods prevalent in the 1960s. The proponents of CLT established it as a form of teaching through convincing critiques of the inadequacy of the linguistic and pedagogical theory underlying grammar-based teaching and audiolingualism (Richards & Rodgers, 1986).

Often described as a “principled approach,” CLT seeks to operationalize the theoretical concept of communicative competence throughout second language instruction from program and syllabus design to classroom materials and teaching techniques (Brumfit & Johnson, 1979). While the theory which underlies it draws on work from sociology, anthropology, and functional linguistics (Richards & Rodgers, 1986), the debate which launched and sustained the growth of CLT has been a philosophical rather than an empirical one. Unlike advocates of scientifically based conceptions, by and large proponents of CLT have not felt compelled to seek out research evidence to demonstrate
that learning is more successful when “communicative,” as opposed to
grammar-based, teaching methods and materials are adopted. The
theoretical base of CLT, as derived from classroom discourse, pragmat-
ics, and social interaction research, is considered sufficient in itself to
justify the approach to instruction.

The Silent Way, by way of contrast, is not built on advances in
linguistic theory like CLT, but on a unique view of learning. The
classroom procedures in the Silent Way are reasoned from distinct
principles based on a theory of how learning takes place (Gattegno,
1985). In discussing the use of the cuisenaire rods for example, Gat-
etgno (1976) argues:

The overall result is that there are no really difficult forms which cannot be
illustrated through the proper situation involving rods and actions on them
about which one makes statements by introducing specific words whose
associated meaning is obvious. What teachers must do is to arrange for
practice so that students’ mind are triggered to use these new words sponta-
neously. (p. 43)

Gattegno takes the rational basis of the Silent Way in human
experience as self-evident. Like Community Language Learning
(CLCL) and other similarly based conceptions, proponents of such
forms of teaching find scientifically based verification to be narrow
and less than satisfactory (see Richards & Rogers, 1986). In its place,
they generally find empirical verification in their own classroom
teaching and attribute problems in classroom practice either to an
incomplete understanding of the principles involved or of how to
translate them into their practice (Curran, 1976; Gattegno, 1976). It
is important to note that in resisting so-called scientific or empirical
forms verification, those who base their views of teaching in theoreti-
cally reasoned conceptions are making an implicit critique of scien-
tically based conceptions of teaching. In so doing, they reflect,
although perhaps not consciously, the broadening debate in educa-
tional research about the nature of teaching and how evidence is
best gathered to examine its relation to learning (Cochran-Smith &

In view of the controversy and disagreement over their empirical
bases (McLaughlin, 1987), it is interesting to consider whether Sug-
gestopedia and the Natural Approach may belong under theory-based
conceptions. The fact that their proponents argue for the scientific
basis of their pedagogy underscores the need for the type of conceptual
framework which we are proposing. Clearly the categorization itself
needs to be agreed upon before the bases for these forms of teaching
can be analyzed and evaluated.
A different approach to conceptualizing teaching is to develop a model from the values one holds for teachers, learners, classrooms, and the role of education in society. Within this view, the aim of teaching practice is to promote particular values. This can lead to teaching which is encouraged as morally, ethically, or politically advantageous or which is criticized on similar grounds. This view of values does not imply that scientifically or theoretically based conceptions of teaching discussed earlier are somehow neutral. Quite the contrary; these conceptions promote a particular view which values science, rationality, and theoretical coherence. By this grouping, however, we want to refer to conceptions of teaching which take as their starting point “the restructuring of social values and practices in schooling as they relate to wider social agendas” (Popkewitz, 1992, p. 73).

In U.S. education, arguments between proponents of critical theory and those of cultural literacy provide a clear example of conflict between two conceptions of teaching which are based on different, often opposing, sets of values. Critical theorists hold that curriculum must become more inclusive and multicultural to offset the biases of social class and heritage which they find intrinsic to current forms of schooling (e.g., Anyon, 1981; Giroux, 1983; Giroux & McLaren, 1986). In the opposing view, proponents of cultural literacy argue that the job of education is to deliver a common core of values, reflected in the canon of Anglo-European literature and fine arts, to make students “culturally literate”; this they argue will ensure social cohesion (Bloom, 1987; Hirsch, 1987).

Values-based conceptions of teaching are equally prevalent in the field of second language instruction. For example, advocates of a literature in the language curriculum (e.g., Carter & Long, 1991), school-based curriculum development (e.g., Omaggio, 1986), action research (e.g., Kemmis & McTaggott, 1982), and the teacher-as-researcher (e.g., Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1990) essentially appeal to educational or social value systems in justifying their proposals.

Because these forms of teaching are based in values, they can evolve in sometimes contradictory ways; action research is a case in point. As it is now typically practiced in second language teaching, action research refers to individual teachers examining phenomena of teaching and learning in their own classrooms (see, e.g., Nunan, 1991). This differs from its original intent in which action research was closely linked to social change (Lewin, 1951). In its early forms, action research aimed at developing participants’ views of, and solutions for, shared problems in their work environments. Through such research by those who...
experienced the problems of the workplace a social agenda of empowerment was advanced.

As it has become incorporated in education, the values on which action research was based were subtly redefined. The concept began to lose its orientation toward social change and the activist orientation was diluted as it took on an individual classroom-based focus. Thus, Kemmis and McTaggott (1982), strong proponents of action research in education based on its original values, are forthright in their criticism of the values base which has been lost:

Action research is not individualistic. To lapse into individualism is to destroy the critical dynamic of the group and to risk falling victim to the fallacious liberal notion that all educational practices, and values which they purport to realize, are equally defensible. (p. 15)

It is interesting to consider action research as a case study in the development of values-based conceptions of teaching. Why and how did the original orientation towards values of social critique and organizational change evolve into values of individual reflection and self-examination? Why and how was collective action shifted to individual practice often disconnected from the wider social context of education? These questions should provoke further examination.

Other examples of values-based conceptions in language teaching include team teaching, humanistic approaches, the learner-centered curriculum movement, and reflective teaching. Team teaching is based on a view that teachers work best when they collaborate with peers because the interaction with a colleague in all phases of teaching is beneficial to both teachers and learners (Brumby & Wada, 1990). Humanistic approaches in language teaching refer to forms of teaching which emphasize the development of human values, growth in self-awareness and in the understanding of others, sensitivity to human feelings and emotions, and active student involvement in learning and in the way human learning takes place (Moskowitz, 1978; Stevick, 1980). CLL (Curran, 1976) presents an interesting case of a conception of teaching which is at once theory and values based. The Rogerian structures out of which it evolves gives CLL a defined theoretical base, while those structures are themselves based in a rather explicit set of values.

The “learner-centered curriculum” is one of a number of terms used to refer to forms of language teaching which are based on a belief in learners as potentially self-directed and responsible decision makers (Nunan, 1988). As in the learning-styles research, learners are seen to learn in different ways and to have different needs and interests. Language programs, and the teachers who work in them, should therefore set out to provide learners with efficient learning strategies, to
assist them in identifying their own preferred ways of learning. They should also help learners to develop skills needed to negotiate the curriculum, to set their own objectives, to adopt realistic goals and time frames, and to develop their skills in self-evaluation (Nunan, 1988).

It is interesting that proponents of learner-centered curricula advocate very similar classroom practices to those who base their conception of teaching on research in learning styles, discussed earlier. Although there is considerable overlap both in classroom practice and in writing about these forms of teaching, their justifications remain different in important ways. The learner-centered curriculum is based in values of learner decision making and autonomy; a learning-styles approach to teaching is based in the interpretation of empirical data. In this difference, we can see why it is useful to examine the conceptual bases of different forms of teaching. One might reasonably expect teachers who hold these two conceptions to explain their actions in different ways. Those who believe in values of learner centeredness might explain their practice through accounts of individual learners in classrooms. Those who see themselves as applying research on learning styles to the classroom will look to empirical findings to justify their teaching.

Theory- and values-based conceptions of teaching share a fundamental assumption about the social nature of education. Whereas scientifically based conceptions assume that what goes on in classrooms should be shaped by research findings and that empirical verification holds the key to effective teaching, theory- and values-based conceptions have a different emphasis. In these conceptions, the rational and the interpersonal nature of teaching and learning is central; effectiveness is measured in the reasoned exercise of belief rather than in the successful application of findings. Yet, in spite of this difference, both types of conceptions share a view which emphasizes the system of teaching over the individual practitioner. Thus, teaching is good or effective insofar as it implements a wider system of theory, values, or scientific empiricism. The role of teachers is to carry out the system, however it is derived, and not to formulate their own individual views of classroom practice. The final group of conceptions takes the opposite view.

ART/CRAFT CONCEPTIONS OF TEACHING

A third way of conceptualizing teaching is to view it as an art or a craft, as something which depends upon the individual teacher’s skill and personality. Zahorik (1986) characterizes this conception in the following way:
The essence of this view of good teaching is invention and personalization [italics added]. A good teacher is a person who assesses the needs and possibilities of a situation and creates and uses practices that have promise for that situation. (p. 22)

Art/craft conceptions portray teaching as a unique set of personal skills which teachers apply in different ways according to the demands of specific situations. Thus, in this view, methods of teaching are not generalizable. Rather, teachers seek to develop an approach to teaching which is often referred to as eclectic; the aim is to allow teachers to be themselves and to act on their own best understanding of what is happening in the classroom.

One of the clearest articulations of this view in second language instruction is seen in the work of Fanselow, who encourages teachers to explore their classroom practice through careful analysis of the communication patterns in their teaching. Fanselow (1987) lays out the rationale for this approach in his book Breaking Rules:

If you [as a teacher] are fascinated by observing, keen on generating alternatives on your own, interested in classifying communications to discover rules, have a compelling desire to explore teaching, and believe that ultimately we can depend only on ourselves to learn and develop, this book might be of interest to you. (p. 12)

This view of teaching is aimed at improving the ability and the craft of the teacher as practitioner through description and analysis. It thus overlaps in interesting ways with the individualist view of action research discussed earlier.

When teaching is seen as an essentially individual undertaking, the skills of self-assessment, reflection, and analysis take on central importance. Through such attention to individual practice the teacher develops both technical proficiency and pedagogical understanding. Yet attention also brings with it the responsibility to think carefully and critically about what one is doing and the outcomes which one is achieving. As Pennington (1990) observes of art/craft conceptions, success depends on the teacher and not on the form of teaching:

From this perspective, individual acts of teaching are essentially irreplicable and noncomparable, and the inherent characteristics of individual teachers are the strongest predictor of classroom outcomes. (p. 133)

A good teacher is seen as one who analyzes a classroom situation, realizes that a range of options is available based on the particular circumstances, and then selects the alternative which is likely to be most effective in that instance.

This intimate connection of individuality and responsibility is central to the art/craft conception of teaching. This view does not deny the
importance of knowing about different methods of teaching and how to use them. However, it suggests that, unlike the conceptions previously discussed, commitments to a single form of instruction may impede the development of the teacher's full potential because they shift the sense of responsibility from the teacher to an externalized idea of the form of teaching. In the art/craft conception, the teacher has both the freedom to act and with it the burden of needing to assess and to understand the consequences of those actions.

VIEWS OF ESSENTIAL TEACHING SKILLS

As we have said, each conception has embedded in it assumptions about the essential skills of teaching. Often when methods are debated, the discussions focus on the viability and appropriateness of particular ways of doing things in the classroom and fail to articulate the thinking which underlies those skills and behaviors. Scientifically based conceptions, theory- or values-based conceptions, and art/craft conceptions each represent different points of view about what teaching is. Summarizing the main difference in orientation towards the sources of solutions in classroom practice among the three conceptions, Zahorik (1986) writes, “Science-research provides ready-made specific solutions, theory-philosophy provides ready-made general solutions, and art-craft provides custom-and self-made solutions” (p. 23).

The scientifically based conception of teaching draws on learning theory or learning research to validate the selection of instructional tasks and to support the use of specific teaching strategies and techniques. Teachers are expected to monitor the learners' performance on these tasks in order to ensure the appropriate use of language or choice of learning strategy. Once the characteristics of effective teaching have been identified through research, teachers try to implement such practices in their own classes.

Theory- and values-based conceptions require teachers first to understand the principles which underlie the methodology and then to teach in ways which embody that thinking in classroom practice. With CLT, for example, lessons, syllabi, materials, and teaching techniques are often discussed and critiqued as more or less communicative. Specification of what constitutes communicative teaching can be developed and teachers' performance can be assessed accordingly. Likewise, the view of teaching which forms the basis of the Silent Way can lead to prescriptions about what teachers should and should not do in the classroom.

In both instances, the essential skills which a teacher needs to develop are those which reflect the particular theory, spirit, or philosophy of
teaching. The teacher’s personal interpretation of the method must operate within—and is judged as an interpretation of—the overall framework. Thus theory- and values-based conceptions of teaching are prescriptive, yet in a different way from their scientifically based counterparts. The choice of instruction in this case is not based on criteria developed within a scientific paradigm, through process/product forms of research, but on a wider set of beliefs, principles, or values. Accountability however continues to be top-down in both conceptions as teaching is evaluated by the extent to which it implements either scientific findings or theoretical principles and beliefs. So one speaks of a “good CLT” or “Silent Way” teacher, meaning a teacher who is successful at realizing those principles in classroom practice in the eyes of others.

Art/craft views of teaching on the other hand shift the relation between conception and practice to one which is more bottom-up than top-down. Teachers do not look to a general method of teaching or a prescribed set of teaching skills; rather, they constantly try to discover things that work, discarding old practices and taking on broad new ones through a process of decision making, reflection, analysis, and assessment. The different principles underlying these three conceptions of teaching are summarized in Figure 2.

MYTHS, MISCONCEPTIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

In our analysis of forms of second language instruction, we have argued that the ends and the means of teaching are intimately connected. We have made a case for the linkage between different conceptions of what “good” teaching is and the skills through which it is realized. This argument can give rise to several myths and misconceptions, however. It also has clear implications for the education of second language teachers. Turning to the misconceptions first, we will characterize them in terms of three pervasive myths: the myth of supremacy, the myth of correct choice, and the myth of chronological development as a teacher. Each of these positions has its corollary in turn in the programs and practices of second language teacher education.

The first myth is that one conception of teaching is somehow better or more effective than the others. This is neither the intent nor the conclusion of the analysis which we are presenting. Although arguments about the supremacy of one method over another certainly persist, we have taken the approach that methodology needs to be examined from a different perspective. Teaching cannot be treated as
According to scientifically based conceptions, teachers should
- understand the learning principles derived from a particular body of research
- develop criteria for tasks and activities based on these principles/findings
- monitor students' performance on tasks to see that desired outcomes, according to
task criteria, are being achieved

According to theory- or values-based conceptions, teachers should
- understand the coherent theory and principles on which a particular set of practices is
  based
- select syllabi, materials, and tasks based on the theory/principles
- monitor one's teaching to see that it conforms to the theory/principles
  or
- understand the values and beliefs which underlie a particular set of practices
- select those educational means (techniques, procedures) which conform to the
  values/beliefs
- monitor their implementation to ensure that the values/beliefs are being
  maintained

According to art/craft conceptions, teachers should
- treat each teaching situation as unique
- identify the particular characteristics of each situation
- try out different teaching strategies, procedures, techniques to address those
  characteristics
- reflect on and assess the efficacy of the strategies for the learners within that
  teaching situation
- through this iterative process, develop an internally consistent, personal approach
to classroom practice which responds to the unique demands of the situation

behavior separate from the reasoning on which it is based. In this
regard, we concur with Prabhu (1990) that efforts to assess methods
apart from the teacher who implements them, the setting, and learners
with whom they are being implemented are fallacious. As Prabhu
notes:

Objective evaluation [of method] has either to assume that methods have
value for learning independent of teachers' and students' subjective under-
standing of them . . . or to try to take into account teachers' subjective
understanding of teaching, thus ceasing to be objectively evaluative. (p. 175)

To understand teaching, we must look at how it is conceived, at the
thinking on which it is based. From this vantage point, disputes about
the supremacy of a particular methodology which are based in evalua-
tion of teaching behaviors become moot. We argue that comparing
classroom practices provides only partial information at best; one must
first establish the conceptual basis of the teaching involved. In fact,
research in our field which has attempted to establish the efficacy of
one methodology over another from this behavioral perspective has
been largely inconclusive (Smith, 1970).
The second myth is that teachers must choose a conception of teaching. Here we need to separate individual teachers’ conceptions of teaching from those which are collectively held by the profession. When an individual becomes a second language teacher, she or he does not select a conception of teaching. In fact, research on teacher learning suggests that the foundations of an individual’s ideas about teaching are well established through the experience of being a student, which Lortie (1975) refers to as “the apprenticeship of observation.” As researchers at the U.S. National Center for Research on Teacher Education note, “Teachers acquire seemingly indelible imprints of teaching from their own experiences as students and these imprints are tremendously difficult to shake” (Kennedy, 1990, p. 7). Teacher education programs generally concern themselves with the promulgation of various forms of instruction, without taking into account the fact that trainees come with preexisting conceptions of teaching (Freeman, 1992).

This leads to the third myth, which suggests that becoming a teacher entails chronological development. We have argued that the second myth of correct choice, of selecting the conception of teaching which one wants to follow, does not account for preexisting conceptions gained through the apprenticeship of observation. This third myth, which holds that teachers pass through the three conceptions of teaching—from scientifically based, through theory- and values-based, to art/craft—sequentially, implies the existence of a common thread in teachers’ development. Neither notion is borne out by research on teacher learning (NCRTL, 1992) or professional development (Levine, 1990; Oja, 1990).

These misconceptions of choice and chronological development confuse the individual’s thinking about teaching with the views of teaching and learning broadly held in the field. The analysis which we have presented addresses these collectively held conceptions of teaching which exist in the profession. These influence teachers’ individually held conceptions through teacher education and professional socialization, processes which are not yet well understood. In fact, we have suggested that a major element of the research agenda in second language teacher education ought to address how this interaction of individual and collectively held views of teaching and learning occurs in the education of teachers (see Freeman, 1992).

What then does this analysis mean for teacher education? Zahorik (1986) puts the issue as follows, “If we accept that teaching skills are not independent of conceptions of good teaching, and that there are multiple sets of skills, a problem arises: what teaching skills ought teachers to acquire?” (p. 23).

There are several ways of approaching this question, three of which
we wish to address here. One is the noncompatibility position which holds that each conception of teaching implies an independent and noncompatible approach to teacher education. A second option is the eclecticism position. The third is what might be called the developmental view.

The noncompatibility position appears to underlie, at least implicitly, many teacher education programs to the extent that one can often identify the particular values on which they are based. In some programs, technical/rational views of teaching dominate, and teachers are trained in the research skills needed to test out particular theories of teaching and learning in their own classrooms. In other programs, scientifically based conceptions of teaching are minimally represented and the focus is primarily on developing an art/craft conception or personal approach to teaching. In still other programs, specific methodologies such as CLT or the Natural Approach are presented as central orthodoxies, with alternative forms of pedagogy related to—and critiqued from—the dominant point of view.

The second option, the eclecticism position, holds that conceptions of teaching are equally valid and to be regarded as alternatives. This position promotes the myth of correct choice, as teachers are encouraged to select from among the various conceptions a correct choice according to personal preference. Teacher education programs subscribing to this view introduce trainees to each conception of teaching in order to enable them to choose according to individual beliefs and values, or needs. This position is problematic since the three conceptions represent fundamentally different views. Moreover, because programs always have a conception of teaching embedded within them, they cannot offer a neutral platform from which to make a choice.

Programs which espouse an eclecticism position leave trainees with the dilemma of trying to reconcile the alternative positions represented by the three conceptions, a task which is inherently unachievable. However, trainees in many teacher education programs experience this situation when they face faculty members who promote different conceptions of teaching. The trainees are then left to wonder whether the field, or the faculty, has any theoretical coherence.

The third position, the developmental view, sees the three conceptions of teaching as standing in a progression and therefore as appropriate at different points in the evolution of the teacher’s practice. Both scientifically and theory-/values-based conceptions, for example, which tend to be prescriptive, might be taken as appropriate for novice trainees who lack the depth of classroom experience to pursue the improvisational forms of instruction found in the art/craft conceptions. Then the art/craft and theory-/values-based conceptions can be taken as more appropriate when trainees are in professional settings in which
they are encouraged to think philosophically about the reasoning which underlies their teaching.

This developmental view is found in several preservice and in-service teacher education curricula such as the Royal Society of Arts scheme, for example. Although there is some research on the development of teachers' knowledge to bolster this notion of a progression from prescription to improvisation in teaching (e.g., Berliner, 1988; Carter & Doyle, 1987; Carter, Sabers, Cushing, Pinnegar, & Berliner, 1987), it is far from complete or definitive. The progression is perhaps attractive because it echoes the training/development distinction which has provided the prevailing conceptual framework for second language teacher education over the last decade (e.g., Freeman, 1982, 1989; Lange, 1983; Larsen-Freeman, 1983; Richards, 1989). We would, however, caution against the neatness of equating scientifically and theory-based conceptions with teacher training, and art/craft conceptions with teacher development. The evolution of teachers' knowledge and the place of teacher education in that process is, as yet, too little understood to establish this idea of progression in teacher learning.

There is, thus, a certain symmetry between the three positions on teacher education (of noncompatibility, eclecticism, and development) and the three myths (of supremacy, correct choice, and chronology) in conceptions of teaching which we outlined earlier. Teacher education programs which present the noncompatibility position are promoting the myth of supremacy, namely, that there is one conception of teaching which is most effective. This view is problematic for the reasons we have cited, principally that such claims are inherently impossible to substantiate. Programs which espouse eclecticism support the second myth of correct choice which holds that trainees and teachers select from among various conceptions of teaching. Again, this is unsatisfactory because it implies that trainees and teachers possess no implicit conceptions of how teaching and learning should operate and that they can somehow position themselves outside of these conceptions to reach a vantage point from which a "correct" choice can be made.

We argue that the noncompatibility and eclecticism positions probably encompass the majority of teacher education programs. In view of the cognitive analysis of teaching and the myths which it exposes, presented here, it seems that a rigorous examination of the conceptual bases of teacher education is necessary and productive. Programs organized around a developmental view, which are a minority, depend on the third myth that there may be a sequential relationship among the conceptions of teaching. Of the three, this view is perhaps the most intriguing because it places the issue of conceptions of teaching within the framework of a professional life-span. However, there is clearly a
role for substantial research to examine how teachers' conceptions of their work unfold throughout their careers.

We believe that the type of cognitive analysis promoted by this architecture of conceptions of teaching can play an important role in furthering our understanding of teaching and the role of teacher education. It is critical that we shift the focus of discussions of teaching from behavior and activity to the thinking and reasoning which organize and motivate these external practices. The broader construct of conceptions of teaching refocuses our conversations on precisely this level. To that end, we trust that this analysis will stimulate further thinking, debate, and inquiry into the nature of teaching in the field of second languages.
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CONCEPTIONS OF TEACHING
Investigative Research: How It Changes Learner Status

BRIAN KENNY
Asian Institute of Technology

What matters about an educational activity is how learners respond to it. This involves questions of “authenticity” (Widdowson, 1981) and of meaning, especially “meaning which is one’s own” (Prabhu, 1987). If a learner responds as a pupil, not showing much personal interest, I call this an exercise. If a learner responds in a creative way, with spontaneity and independence, I call this a piece of work. Work authored by the learners themselves is authentic in a way that assignments provided by a teacher or materials designer are unlikely to be. This is significant for notions of learner autonomy which is partly a matter of learners having an opportunity to define their own meanings and develop them. Investigative research facilitates learners pursuing their own interests and meanings, and releases them from the need to behave as pupils. The change of status is emancipating and is a way of engaging learner autonomy.

The belief that language learners need to focus on language as the subject to be learned has wide acceptance in the language teaching profession. But it can also be claimed that what language learners need most is freedom from the constraints of having to focus on language at all. This is not a new idea and has a history in both theory and practice. Its implementation, however, is infrequently found in formal educational environments, perhaps for reasons that are too obvious. Prabhu (1987) is an exception, but he has been criticized for not taking learner needs into consideration when designing tasks (Long & Crookes, 1992). However, as Prabhu (1987) says, his project was concerned with “developing teaching procedures” (p. 3), and in this situation, it is the teacher who designs the tasks. But concern for the development of learning procedures may go some way to answering Long and Crookes. For where learners initiate their own tasks, it is probable that these will relate to learner needs directly. The article examines a program concerned with the learners’ needs, through the expression of learners’ own meanings, and puts forward the concept of investigative
research as a suitable vehicle for more autonomous learning, through a change in learner status.

AN EDUCATIONAL ETHOS

The program I am writing about is an intensive English for specific purposes (ESP) program for engineering students from various Asian countries at a postgraduate institution, the Asian Institute of Technology (AIT) in Thailand. The teachers working on this 8-week program do not teach language nor teach at all in the usual sense of the word. Participants sometimes comment on this, and we confirm that we will not be teaching as such, that it is a deliberate decision. Participants usually accept this explanation. Perhaps the program serves as what Wenden (1990), citing Malcolm Knowles, describes as an “unfreezing experience” (p. 170), which challenges the learners’ assumptions about learning and frees them from preconceptions. We instructors have noticed that not teaching, so to speak, tends to release psychosocial pressures on the learners to behave as pupils, so they don’t. Indeed, we do not wish our learners to behave as pupils—not showing much personal interest and taking a passive role—because as teachers, we will not be imparting knowledge. We do want our learners to become active participants and to use their autonomy. We also feel that the role of pupil is often demeaning and imposes constraints on those treated as pupils with regard to what they may think, say, and do. Because we are interested in meaning, what our participants think, say, and do is all important. This is “to point to the individual’s ways of thinking and judging as the matter upon which the educator is to work” (Pring, 1976, p. 116).

Released from the need to be pupils, how do our learners behave? In their responses to the way in which the program organizes opportunities for learning experiences, we observe that the participants start functioning as investigative researchers. A typical piece of investigative research, defined and set up by the learners, will involve access to the findings and technologies of a number of subject disciplines, resource persons, and officials, as well as media and communication techniques and, of course, language. Investigative research, like project work, is at best a type of experiential learning (Kolb, 1984). But when it takes place in a foreign language, as in the situation I will describe, it is better to regard it as experiential learning in another language rather than as experiential language learning in itself, as advocating by Kohonen (1992). The first view transcends many of the limitations of the second. Not designed by a teacher with the intention of integrating knowledge, or of motivating the learners, or of unifying the work of a class over
a long period, what I am talking about is not a project in the accepted sense, though I will refer to some of the literature on language learning in projects later. It is, I believe, better called investigative research because this describes the activities of those doing it. The learners initiate it in collaboration, and in following it through, they bring about personal growth as they organize both themselves and their learning.

MEANING OF ONE’S OWN

A significant aspect of an educational activity is how learners respond to it. Different learners respond in different ways. If a learner responds as a pupil, going through the activity only because it’s required, I call this an exercise. If a learner becomes engaged by an activity, responding in a spontaneous creative way, I call this a piece of work. This is not to say that there is no place for exercises in education, only that what we aim for in a piece of work is more authentic. Because authenticity is found in the relationship between a learner and an activity, rather than in the activity itself (Widdowson, 1981), it follows that a piece of work authored by the learners will be more authentic to them than one made by a teacher or materials designer. A piece of work is not a simulation or a performance, it is what Prabhu (1987) calls a “meaning-focused activity” (p. 27) and relates firmly to “meaning which is one’s own” (p. 49). Prabhu (1987) explains this as follows: “When learners are dealing with meaning which is given (as in an information gap activity), they tend to look for language which is given as well—and, more importantly, to look on the language they use as being borrowed. If the meaning is not one’s own, it seems to follow that the language is not one’s own either” (p. 49).

What Prabhu is saying is of significance for notions of learner autonomy, which is partly a matter of having an opportunity for defining and expressing one’s own meanings. Exercises, designed to give practice in some defined area, are not about meaning and are not intended to be. More ambitious exercises, which nowadays may be called tasks, do not necessarily permit meaning of one’s own, either. For example, “tasks focusing on how language works” (p. 15) or “tasks to decide on a precise workplan” (critiqued in Candlin, 1987, p. 16) are going to remain meaningless exercises unless some specific learner wants to focus on how language works out of some personal interest or sees the need to decide on a workplan. A task in itself can neither focus nor make a decision; focusing and deciding are what people do. If one is motivated and the purposes and meaning are one’s own, then the acts of focusing and deciding can contribute to a piece of work. If one is not motivated, then appearing to focus or to decide is an exercise.
For example, a teacher may assign a learner to record an interview with someone about the latter’s job. Should the learner not be at all interested in what seems to be a teacher-assigned chore with little personal relevance and should the learner on this basis not take the interview seriously—making little response to the randomly chosen interviewee and asking prearranged questions in a mechanical way—then what we have here is an exercise. This is not necessarily the learner’s fault. A teacher may have given this assignment as an exercise, thinking of it perhaps as “a task focusing on making an interview,” and not seeing it as having any purpose beyond that. As part of a wider canvas, however, the same activity may be vital. If learners initiate and carry out some investigative research, it is likely that they will interview relevant parties. In this case, the learner is committed and has a personal interest in the outcome. Such an interview is no exercise. Realizing that conducting a successful interview requires so many and varied skills that these can only best be developed through practice, a teacher may arrange for such practice to take place. We may see this as an exercise. The learner, on the other hand, may not. The learner may see the point of the practice, take it seriously, and turn it into a piece of work.

In the AIT program, we have devised a framework through which we hope to elicit some of the participants’ own meanings. The program is 8 weeks long. The first 4 weeks provide an apprenticeship to the investigative research which finds fuller expression in the second half. Using the research framework of field-problem-solution, learners take an analytic look at a variety of discourses, both for its own educational value and as a means to get participants talking. Discourses include printed texts, recorded interviews on audio- and videotape, and participants’ own talk and writing. We are asking essentially the same question: How good are people at defining first a field (i.e., a range of inquiry), then a problem in a field, and finally a possible solution to a problem in a field? This does not all happen at once or with the same people and texts. What is going on here is at one level a generous dose of discourse interpretation, which is educative in its engagement of so many different types of human information processing (van de Veldte, 1988). The process is also educative from the point of view of self-directed learning because the teachers do not select either the texts the participants discuss and evaluate in small groups or the people to be interviewed. The process is also educative from the point of view of learner autonomy. In asking themselves how good they are at defining a field and a problem, participants are probing and questioning their own thought processes and embarking on a voyage of self-discovery as they begin to express some of their personal values and assumptions. This is a different view of autonomy from that expressed by Holec
(1979, 1987). For him, autonomy relates mainly to making choices (1979). Learners choose among materials and methods and thus make decisions about how they will learn a particular language. But when it comes to the definition of objectives, Holec (1987) says that learners have a lot of difficulty because they are unaware that “objectives are not acts of God to submit to but that they can, and in fact, must be chosen” (p. 149).

Holec’s learners are confined as language learners to choices and decisions among language learning and teaching resources, and this may be why they experience such difficulties with the management of the learning process. In our program the learners are not so confined. And it seems likely that the field-problem-solution pattern, approached empirically and experienced in depth, provides insightful practice in self-management and in coming to understand aspects of the learning process. On the other hand, our learners are not free, as Holec (1987) advocates, “to decide whether they want to self-direct their learning or to let others direct it for them” (p. 147). It is our intention that the learners should self-direct their learning, and we do not want them to opt out of this. During the first part of the program we are steering the learners toward becoming autonomous investigative researchers. We try continually to draw out and focus on the learners’ own meanings and to get them to provide content wherever possible. Most of our participants are not used to doing this and have often been schooled previously in situations in which teachers provide almost everything and do most of the talking, too. But it is surprising how quickly people adjust to a different approach, especially when it focuses some of the limelight onto them. People find that they do have things to say and opinions they don’t mind expressing. Some participants find it initially trying to formulate their ideas in a foreign language in public but become reassured when others, including teachers, listen and respond, addressing the content of what was said rather than its linguistic form. Any notion that learners, including Asian learners, might have problems adjusting to this sort of approach, or may deliberately resist it, is quite mistaken. What, after all, do most learners have to fear from a situation which is taking who they are and what they have previously experienced and learned seriously and as a basis for further experience and learning?

**FACILITATION AND INTERFERENCE**

In making a distinction between facilitation and interference I am referring to a teacher’s activities as these relate to learner autonomy.
It will be appreciated that this distinction is a delicate and personal one and not at all clear-cut.

Carter and Thomas (1990) have described work in which a group of adult EFL learners were prepared and went out to teach in English in local primary schools. The choice of work in schools was to

make our learners perform as language users in a way well beyond what they could prepare for by means of a teacher's script. They would have to respond in a host of unprepared situations where "learning by doing" is the most important factor. (p. 217)

An additional and important point Carter and Thomas make is that learners working in the community to achieve something “are no longer role-playing” (p. 216). It will be apparent that these learners are not engaged in investigative research as such but are contributing to a project designed by the language school. Nevertheless, the ethos which suggests that language learners cope better with language learning when doing something else and when their status of pupil is changed is clearly here. And it is very likely that many of these learners became investigative researchers if only to discover how to teach, an activity they had not engaged in before.

As a preparatory task, learners in the Carter and Thomas project were sent out to do interviews, and their initial anxiety and doubt about this is noted. In the earlier parts of our program similar doubts are sometimes expressed by participants concerning their ability to interview other people about their fields on audiotape or about problems and solutions on videotape. We tell learners that it will be all right and that even if it isn't, they can try again next time. We also offer advice such as: Check your equipment carefully before you begin; do not record in a noisy place; if you start an interview or discussion which isn't going well, then stop it and try elsewhere; and if you get entangled with a speaker whose accent is impossible (our learners rarely get to speak to native speakers of English), then say thank you and move on. Compensatory strategies, such as asking for clarification or for repetition are not brought up as it seems to us that the learners already have enough to do and think about in getting any sort of discussion or interview on tape at all. Most of them have not done this before. But, in fact, it is not the performance of the interviewer we are focusing on but that of the interviewee. In report-back sessions, when everyone gets to play their recording to other participants, what we consider and evaluate is how far the interviewee was successful in expounding a field or a problem. By implication, we also consider how good we are ourselves at doing this and what we may learn from the recorded example. This focus
on the person interviewed takes the pressure off the interviewer, though the performance of an interviewee does, to an extent, depend on that of his or her interlocutor. Should the quality of the performance of the interviewer come up in a report-back session, or should it be noticed for instance that clarification of a certain point would have been helpful, then this will be discussed and a teacher can contribute here. But people's interviewing techniques tend to improve with practice, and in our program, they get a lot of it. We let the participants learn by experience.

This is rather different from attitudes expressed by Montgomery and Eisenstein (1985), for example. Their learners go on field trips and also conduct interviews. However, the adult learners are not only taught compensatory strategies in advance but the language required as well. The people to be interviewed are also prepared beforehand, as their abilities “to make conversational adjustments appropriate for the learners” (p. 320) vary. They are also instructed “not to give the students any information unless they asked for it and to keep their answers short to encourage student initiative” (p. 324). Montgomery and Eisenstein justify this tight control on the grounds that their learners are working class and said to lack literacy skills in their own language. But this amount of shielding, by protecting the learners against the reality they are supposed to be coping with, can stifle autonomy and block learning. We should also be wary, as Auerbach (1986) has pointed out, of lowering our educational sights for specific groups.

In a situation with 11-year-old EFL learners, Legutke (1984a) emphasizes the value of “real-life encounters” (p. 11), when his investigators went to the airport to conduct interviews. Legutke (1984b) comments: “Quite often interviews developed into discourse going far beyond the predetermined limits of the interview questions” (p. 31). When the emphasis is on “the creative, meaningful and spontaneous use of language by the students” (Montgomery & Eisenstein, 1985, p. 321), then as teachers we may have to limit the degree to which we control real life and perhaps stop interfering with the learners and their autonomy altogether. As Wenden (1987) has noted, “the self-concept of the adult is that of a self-directing personality. . . . In learning situations which do not utilize this experience or which minimize it, adults may experience personal rejection” (p. 10). We can further note that if as teachers we do not treat our adult learners as partners, but treat them as pupils, then we are heading for trouble. Learners treated as pupils will tend to behave as pupils. Legutke's 11-year-olds were not treated as pupils but as investigative researchers exercising their autonomy.
INVESTIGATIVE RESEARCH

In their activities, investigative researchers are trying to find something out, to make a point, to define a problem, to put forward ideas for dealing with difficulties, to present a situation or evaluate a solution. They conduct their investigations in many ways, presenting their evidence and conclusions through various media. Investigators return to home base at regular intervals to tell others in a program how their work is getting on and what they intend to do next. They may also at this time receive criticism and suggestions.

In everyday life, many of us spend time in investigative research, hunting around for information. We are no longer hunters in the old-fashioned sense, however, but information processors with a special interest in information retrieval. This process, explains Hutchins (1985), “means the extraction of ‘information’ of some kind (data, texts, references) from a ‘store’ (memory, file, database, document collection) in response to an ‘information need’” (p. 106). But there is a difficulty here for “by its very nature, an information need cannot be expressed precisely and concisely” (p. 110). Hutchins (1985) has indicated four stages to the job of clarifying an information need. I paraphrase below.

1. An initial awareness of a “problem space”; a lack of understanding or a dissatisfaction
2. A preliminary, partly incoherent expression of the need or problem
3. A more coherent and rational statement
4. The formulation of how a search may proceed

We may compare these stages with the field-problem-solution pattern, which also moves from something general towards a specific problem and thus to a proposal for action in a solution. In addition to clarifying a need or problem there is the question of interpretation because the information we retrieve is raw data requiring assimilation. It is at this point that investigative research provides vital opportunities for us to exercise our language skills. A basic faculty of language is “the ability to come to new interpretations” (Heringer, 1985, p. 274). Although Green and Morgan (1981) see interpretation as being the only way in which we comprehend anything, they write that “a hearer INTERPRETS an utterance or discourse or text, rather than ‘understands’ it” (p. 177). Investigative researchers are not working solipsistically but have others in a program to whom they report back. The information found in an investigation needs interpretation by and response from interested parties. We look for a consensus of opinion. “We communicate in order to change the belief of the partner, and in
order to create a mutual belief' (Heringer, 1985, p. 269). Keller (1985) confirms this: "To communicate with someone means to bring him [or her] to do something specific and/or to believe something specific and/or to assume or to recognize the speaker's specific attitudes and views" (p. 233).

To sum up: the biological yearnings which language generates (i.e., the drives (a) to identify and do something about information needs, (b) to interpret anew, and (c) to persuade others) find fulfillment when the learner is an investigative researcher and the communicative and educative intentions are not in conflict with natural inclinations and faculties. This is not the case when the learner is a pupil. This change of status, from pupil to investigative researcher, which is a change of attitude and function, is a key factor for the effectiveness of the educational approach being discussed. Investigative research, which can include academic work also has a wider relationship with everyday life. In fact, one might ask whether there is a difference between investigative research and project work. Indeed, Legutke and Thomas (1991) have pointed out that “project learning is investigative” (p. 158).

The name given to an educational activity is less significant than the response of a learner to it. Thus any task, or investigative research, or project may remain at the level of an exercise if the learners persist in seeing it as such and in acting towards it as pupils. To become a piece of work, a project or a task has to be perceived by the learners as embodying meanings of their own and this is most likely to be the case when the task or project actually is their own and is initiated by them. Generally speaking projects are designed and set up by teachers. Legutke and Thomas (1991) argue that the structuring of learning is the responsibility of the teacher who does it by means of communicative tasks. Nunan (1992), in his review of the book by Legutke and Thomas, comments that

one of the dangers of task-based learning is that the curriculum can become a collection of disconnected classroom activities. In this book, the authors show how the potential for lack of coherence can be avoided by integrating tasks through projects. (p. 574)

Teachers structure learning for the benefit of their pupils, but it is possible from time to time to do things another way, such that learners may structure their own learning or at least try and plan it. In wanting learners to play a more active part and to use their autonomy, I see the need for a change in learner status. I am convinced that there is a significant difference between investigative research, as an expression of what the learners want (or think they want at that time), and project work, which may well be more often an expression of what a teacher wants.
DOING A PIECE OF WORK

The first 4 weeks of our intensive program provides its participants with practice in some of the skills of planned investigative research and constitutes a type of what we would see as learner training (Wenden, 1987b). Mainly this consists of a series of tasks which the teachers give the learners to do. Some of our learners regard these as teacher-assigned chores and exercises. But the nature of the tasks—which require the participants to fill them with content—and their vague definition—which requires learner interpretation—allows some learners to redefine these exercises in their own terms.

In Week 3 of the program, we focus on the concept of problem. In a large group we look first at a research article introduction provided by the teachers and go through it sentence by sentence to clarify precisely the problem on which the author will be focusing. This is not as simple as it sounds for there are real problems and false problems, and authors are frequently devious in defining what they intend even in texts dealing with science and technology. Such analysis of an author’s intentions demands a skillful use of inference. The text generates discussion and interaction because the unveiling of one sentence after another can often change what we see as an author’s field and the problem the author will examine. Later that day, participants look for their own text to analyze in a similar manner and to bring the following day for a discussion in small groups. It is in these small groups that participants begin to reveal their own interests and problems, which may later provide raw material for investigative research. The following day, participants find someone whom they interview in pairs with a view to discovering what this person’s “problem” may be. It may be anything from a financial to a marital problem, to academic research, or even a failure to understand what the interviewers are up to. In playing back these interviews in groups, we once again find that participants begin to reveal themselves and give indications of the sort of investigative research with which they may become engaged.

Finally, participants are asked to write what they would now regard as being their own problem, bearing in mind that the previous week we had gone through a similar procedure for the concept of field and that the following week we would be working on the concept of solution. As teachers, we hope that participants will see and establish connections between these three concepts in their writing, but they frequently do not. This does not indicate failure, however. The intentions behind the first half of the program are various. We want the participants to develop confidence in handling many types of content and to get used to doing this with as little teacher supervision as possible. We want them to start providing content of their own and to develop this
on a cooperative basis into investigative research. We hope too that they will see the value of field-problem-solution as a help in organizing ideas and making plans, and as opening up possibilities for further developments once the program is over. Participants have also gained practice in working together and in data collection through various media as well as in its collaborative evaluation.

Our participants are from various Asian countries, and about half of them will have a graduate background in some engineering discipline and intend to go on and pursue a master's degree at AIT. Other participants usually include specialists of one kind or another such as foresters, interpreters and teachers of English, government officials, doctors, managers of businesses, and persons involved in women's issues. They are people with considerable educational background, though the English they know ranges from good to almost nonexistent. But all are doing the program with the objective of improving their English language use. Aware that the program is different, most participants quickly become immersed in it and accept it as a valid way of learning. We tend to get occasional complaints at the beginning of the program such as "Why don't you teach grammar?" or "Why don't you tell us exactly what you want?" These we answer frankly and point out that anyone really needing grammar will find plenty of it in the library. We get more complaints at the end of the program, when people are much more able to explain themselves. For example, "Why did you let me go on speaking in Thai when I should have been talking in English?" is not really a question about the use of L1 in the classroom but more an expression of resentment that teachers have not acted as authoritarians. Or, "People teased me about my accent so I stopped talking" raises the question of why the complainant did not bring this up earlier, though one is pleased to have it brought up now. Another type of objection to the program, "There were too many people doing our piece of work and some of them didn't do much," betrays an increasing awareness among participants that learning is a personal matter and that no one else can do it for you nor force it upon you. This awareness is an important benefit of this kind of educational approach.

The approach is not successful with everyone, of course, and, from time to time, we have someone who drifts along making little effort. These learners frequently do not wish to collaborate nor to contribute, and there is little as teachers we can do. We hope that those who are not necessarily just shy will later come to see interaction as conducive to learning. Where this approach, with its emphasis on drawing out learners’ own meanings and content, was particularly successful, was with a group of 49 Lao technicians with whom we worked for 2 months in Vientiane (Kenny & Laszewski, 1993). The majority had little in the
way of education and only 5 knew any English at the start of the program. This required us to adjust our initial tasks, though not our principles or approach, and we were able to make good use of the photographs and drawings the participants produced.

At the beginning of this section, I discussed briefly the first 4 weeks of our program, which provides an apprenticeship to investigative research, and I must now look at the last 4 weeks. In articulating their own fields, problems, and solutions—orally and in writing—individual participants have, in a way, been providing themselves with a rationale for some investigative research, at least in theory. However, many of these prove impracticable as the bases of actual investigative research, given the constraints of time, place, and economic resources. We teachers are thus presented with a problem and tell ourselves that we have reached the “epistemological break” between theory and practice and, more prosaically, between Weeks 4 and 5 of our program. All is not lost, however. Extending the notion of investigative research to include matters in addition to the theoretical rationales that have emerged directly from field-problem-solution, we can see that the participants have indirectly been suggesting all sorts of ideas throughout the program—in the general process of talk and in revealing their thoughts and feelings. Initially these are rough propositions and fall into three categories: the academic, the personal, and the general (e.g., food in the canteen). Teachers have been making a note of these as they turn up, and in a miniposter session, the names of all the topics we have logged are posted. People do not always like what they see. It appears a vague, chaotic, and abstract presentation—which it is. These are topics, not pieces of work, and need a fuller response from the learners. During the following days, topics get thrown out or gradually changed as people talk, raise questions, and reach a more coherent and rational statement of what they want to do. New ideas also turn up. Teachers listen, ask questions, and confirm. What is going on is what we want: interaction and planning in English. People group together and start explaining how they will proceed with their research. “We can make a questionnaire,” someone may suggest. “We will first have to go and talk to people in a particular institution,” say others.

In a recent course, investigative research areas included: Coordinating Extension Work, Low-Cost Housing, Women Working in a Man’s World, and Thailand’s Image. The group looking into extension work consisted of two Chinese, a Vietnamese, and a Thai, who communicated with each other in English. They arranged to talk to some farmers and extension workers about the difficulties involved in implementing technical innovations. The interviews took place at different times and were recorded on video. The farmers and extension workers were Thai and spoke no English. This required the Thai member of the
investigating group, with at first little English of his own, to act as translator. This he did with limited and then improving success.

The group working on Thailand’s Image, which consisted mainly of people from another tourist spot in Southeast Asia, went through an experience worth elaborating. Not very motivated, seeing what was going on as an exercise only, and when questioned by others about their topic, they would respond vaguely with words like tourism, and AIDS, or prostitution, and environmental damage. Despite the potential of these issues, which are, of course, not confined only to Thailand, the group itself was prepared to do little but chat superficially to a few tourists about their impressions of Bangkok. Visitors said how much they were enjoying their stay and how nice Thai people were. But the group itself appeared nonplussed, seeming hardly to have even an initial awareness of a problem space, although the topic was of their initiation. It was suggested by others in the program that this group go and talk to officials in government departments and the tourist office. This they agreed to do, and made arrangements. The inflammatory image of Thailand being projected abroad at this time, especially in Europe, was receiving a lot of coverage in the local English newspapers, and this may have been distressing for the officials the group interviewed. Indeed, a phone call was received at the AIT Language Center inquiring what exactly this group was up to, and who was behind it. Whatever the case, the group received a cool reception to their probings and returned upset. One of the women explained that nobody would talk to them, and they had been told to go and look things up for themselves in a library. “We have nothing,” she said. The group was disheartened and appeared surprised that officials had taken them and their work so seriously that “no comment” was the main response they got in this highly political situation. Being taken seriously had the effect of an awakening on the group, who now in reporting back presented a more coherent and rational statement of what they wanted to do. But time had run short. The exercise had turned into a piece of work too late in the program for anything to be achieved in terms of a satisfying outcome.

In helping learners focus on their investigations, a teacher needs to be adroit at questioning and sensitive to embryonic ideas. But when a group comes up with a topic in which it has no real interest, this is awkward. Thailand’s Image was initially such a case. In another instance, after very long discussion and the visible example of those around them whose investigations were going well, a group was able to start taking itself seriously and find work more authentic to its members’ experience. As teachers, we remain reluctant to co-design investigative research with our participants. It would limit the learners’ autonomy and defeat our professional purposes.
That learner motivation in a program like this is generally not a problem eases pressure on a teacher to be the boss. Fried-Booth (1982) has noted the rewards of large-scale project work in terms of “student identification with a project” (even where the project was teacher-provided) and in “the spontaneous communication which resulted from the need to report back what had been directly experienced” (p. 99). In a situation where learners are not engaged in project work but with investigative research of their own initiation, these observations are even more applicable. In a brief consideration of what might be the major limitations of this approach, I think its success depends more on the disposition of the teachers doing it than on the disposition of the learners. A teacher who is not sympathetic to this type of education or who wants to be in control, talking rather than listening, is unlikely to get participants to start producing their own content and taking charge of their own learning procedures. A second factor for success is time availability. Investigative research takes up large portions of time and is best conducted in intensive learning situations. This may be 2 days or 2 months, but the long span is essential.

In conclusion, I would say that releasing learners from the need to be pupils, drawing out learners’ own meanings and purposes, organizing these in the direction of investigative research, and helping learners formulate how a search may proceed, changes learner status and is one way of engaging learner autonomy.
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This paper describes the evaluation criteria that nonnative-English-speaking children (Grades 2–6) employed when evaluating writing. Specifically, the paper discusses: (a) the range of evaluation criteria that children used, (b) whether authorship influenced evaluation criteria (not all the stories were written by the children), and (c) whether the evaluation criteria used by the children varied according to age. The study is grounded in 14 in-depth interviews of 9 students, in which they rated pieces of writing and explained why they had given each story its particular rating. An analysis of the data reveals that the students (a) were critical evaluators, (b) tended to focus on meaning regardless of their age and whether the piece of writing had been written by themselves or an anonymous peer, (c) were highly idiosyncratic in the range of evaluation criteria that they employed, and (d) were influenced by the pedagogical focus in their ESOL classes.

Effective writing requires one to make frequent and appropriate evaluations, thereby assessing the relative quality of one’s text. Whenever writers revise, they demonstrate that they are responding to their own (as well as other people’s) evaluations of writing. Writing process research has provided considerable evidence of the incidence and frequency of evaluation acts in the revision processes of native-English-speaking students (e.g., Bridwell, 1980; Calkins, 1983, 1986; Dyson, 1983; Emig, 1971; Flower & Hayes, 1981b; Graves, 1983; Perl, 1979; Sommers, 1980) and nonnative-English-speaking students (e.g., Gomez, 1985a, 1985b; Raimes, 1985; Samway, 1987; Urzúa, 1987; Zamel, 1982, 1983). Research suggests that the ability to make successful evaluations is critical to the writing process because neither revision nor generation of ideas and text would occur without evaluation (Flower & Hayes, 1981a; Hilgers, 1984, 1986). Little is known, however, about the standards that either adults or children employ when evaluating writing.
One of the earliest attempts to describe writers' evaluation criteria was reported by Beach (1976), who found that college students often employed criteria that were inappropriate. In case study research of college students, Newkirk (1981) found that students applied “invalid” criteria when evaluating their own work, often weakening the development of the text when revising. In one of the few studies in which young children’s evaluation criteria have been investigated, Hilgers (1986) asked young writers to evaluate stories written either by themselves or anonymous peers. Hilgers concluded that the emergence and development of evaluation skills is developmental in nature.

The purpose of my study was to investigate the criteria that non-native-English-speaking children employed when evaluating writing. What criteria did the children use? How did authorship of a piece influence evaluation criteria, especially when the pieces being evaluated were not their own? Did the criteria that children use vary according to age?

**THE STUDY**

For 4 months, I visited two pull-out ESOL classes two to three times a week as part of a larger study investigating the writing processes of nonnative-English-speaking students in the elementary grades (Samway, 1987). For most of the day the children were taught in their regular classrooms, but once a day they came to the ESOL teacher's classroom for specialized assistance. These students were enrolled in the ESOL program because of low scores on the Language Assessment Scales (De Avila & Duncan, 1976), an oral measure, and/or classroom teacher recommendations.

**Selection of Site**

In order to collect data documenting the potential for writing in young ESOL children, I judged it necessary to observe children in a classroom environment where the overall goal of writing instruction was writing to learn. I therefore sought out an ESOL classroom where: (a) writing was not regarded primarily as an opportunity to reinforce grammar and vocabulary; (b) writing was admired, respected, and critiqued in conferences with both teacher and peers; (c) first drafts were not regarded as finished pieces; (d) the teacher focused on the clarity of content and the power of expression, rather than on issues of spelling and punctuation, at least until the final stages of the writing of a piece; and (e) children were writing on a regular basis. Through contacts at professional meetings, I met an ESOL teacher from a large
school district in Upstate New York who talked enthusiastically about her ESOL program and the degree to which she was integrating literature and writing. She talked with animation about writing, writing conferences, and the need for children to read literature in order to become better writers. When I visited her class in the fall semester prior to gathering data, I was impressed with and stimulated by the enthusiasm with which her students approached writing. I arranged to visit two of her pull-out ESOL classes on a regular basis for approximately 4 months in the spring semester in order to collect data. The two classes (a group of 8 second/third graders and a group of 7 fourth/sixth graders) were selected because the children’s English language skills were sufficiently well developed for me to be able to investigate a wide range of children’s writing processes.

Collection of Data

I visited each of the two pull-out classes two to three times a week on days when the children were engaged in a writers’ workshop. Data collection in the ESOL classes continued for 4 consecutive months, from the beginning of January to the end of April. Throughout May and the early part of June, I continued to visit the school in order to interview individual children, but no more data were collected in the ESOL classroom. I observed classes, kept field notes, and audiotaped writing conferences. I also talked informally with the children. For example, I would ask them what they thought of the piece they were working on, what they had done in their writing, or where the idea for a particular story had come from. Towards the end of the project, I interviewed some of the children about the criteria they used when evaluating writing. Although 15 children participated in the larger study, only 9 children (for whom pseudonyms have been used) participated in this study of evaluation criteria: 4 second graders (Jorge, Hector, Liliana, Bernardo), 1 third grader (Pablo), 2 fourth graders (Maria and Ahmed) and 2 sixth graders (David and Miguel). The children participated if their classroom teachers were willing to release them from class; testing and end-of-school activities influenced the teachers’ decisions.

The Children

The second and third graders met together each day, as did the fourth and sixth graders. None of the children was a recent arrival to an English-speaking school environment, and they all communicated quite comfortably on an interpersonal level in English, albeit with syntactic miscues, nonnative English pronunciation, and occasional
difficulty with lexical items. The children tended to be struggling to some extent with English reading, as indicated by their report card evaluations and low percentile scores on norm-referenced tests. Several of the children had repeated one or more grades (Bernardo, Pablo, Miguel, and Maria). When Ahmed arrived in the U.S. from Turkey, he was placed in a lower grade than his age or educational background would have suggested. With the exception of Ahmed, the children were native Spanish speakers whose families originally came from Puerto Rico. All the Spanish-speaking children had received their schooling on the U.S. mainland, almost all of it in the same urban district.

The Setting

The school was an older inner city school, and from the outside it looked depressed and run down. The ESOL room was in the basement, along with other special services classrooms and the boiler room. A clothesline was strung across and around the room displaying books, pictures, seasonal cards, and drawings. The room looked messy and cluttered by the middle of the day, but it was a clutter made by activity and involvement. There were displays on a makeshift plywood board that was used to separate one corner from the rest of the room. A corner bore a hand-lettered sign, Writing Corner, where children were free to write. However, this was not the only area used for writing, even though it was popular. Children were just as likely to write at either of the teacher desks or at one of the four round tables of varying sizes that were placed around the room. A radio played softly in the background: Strains of Bach and Brahms could be heard from time to time. Workbooks that had been inherited from previous teachers were neatly stacked in cupboards. A variety of books that interested the children were displayed casually on a table close by the door. As the children came in, they frequently leafed through the books and later borrowed one.

The ESOL Classes

ESOL instruction focused on children’s literature and writing. The children wrote on a wide range of topics, usually initiated by the literature that they were reading. They would gather around the large circular table to read a piece of literature and talk about it. Later they would be offered the opportunity of writing their own piece based upon the reading and discussion. Although the teacher’s own clear preference was for imaginative fiction, the children also wrote about science and real-life experiences. Most class periods were characterized
by writing conferences held around the largest table. It was here that the children read their stories aloud, sometimes puzzling over what they had written. At such times their voices would become hesitant, almost inaudible. They would move backward and forward in their text, eventually making sense of their own messages. There were no rigid conference guidelines which the children followed. At times a conference would involve just the teacher and one child. At other times the whole class would ultimately gather around the table. Although the teacher sometimes asked the children to first comment on what they liked in the piece, they were more likely to ask questions and make suggestions, either directly or indirectly. Children could be heard critically analyzing their own writing and the writing of their peers. The classroom environment encouraged children to interact with each other and with the teacher. The children approached writing with enthusiasm, dignity, and a sense of ownership, and they enjoyed the literature that was frequently used to stimulate writing.

The Teacher

The teacher was assertive when modeling good writing and when instilling in the children the idea that they could become good writers. In conferences, she encouraged children to comment on and ask questions of the writer of the piece being listened to. However, she was just as likely to interject her own comments. She would spontaneously describe an imaginary character, generate a powerful lead sentence, or develop suspense according to the nature and limitations of the child’s piece; she modeled forcefully, rather than taking the chance or the time to slowly elicit it from the children. She did not ask children to complete skills-based worksheets; however, she occasionally taught a point of grammar or mechanics as the need arose in the children’s writing.

The Evaluation Tasks

I asked the children to rate six anonymous stories in order to have a standard set of stories to which all the children had responded. The stories, all written by fifth graders, were selected from the Writing Test for New York State Elementary Schools: Rater Training Packet (University of the State of New York, 1982). The stories represented a range of writing abilities and included well-written and poorly written stories, long and short stories, and conventional and unconventional mechanical features such as spelling. None of the stories was so long as to be daunting to the second and third graders. The topics were of generic interest to children, regardless of age. Each of the stories was
typed, but all mechanical features were retained exactly as written. The stories had been written in response to two assignments (see the Appendix for a description of the writing assignments/anonymous stories that the children evaluated). I explained to the children what the writers had been asked to do, reading from typed instructions that were identical to the ones that the writers had received. On occasion, the children chose to read the instructions themselves, usually aloud. The children then read the stories, sometimes silently, but more often aloud. At times, the younger children had difficulty deciphering the unconventional spelling, and in these cases, I read the stories to the children.

Whenever possible, I also asked the children to evaluate their own stories in order to investigate whether authorship would influence their evaluation criteria. Whereas the anonymously written stories provided a standard set of stories which all the children evaluated, their own stories provided an opportunity to explore whether children used the same criteria regardless of familiarity with the context of the writing.

Five children (Pablo, Jorge, Maria, David, and Ahmed) evaluated both their own stories and anonymous stories. Because of time constraints, four children (Hector, Liliana, Bernardo, and Miguel) evaluated only anonymous stories. The children who completed both evaluation tasks evaluated the anonymous stories first and completed the self-evaluation tasks on a different day. Each Evaluation of Writing Interview lasted 30–45 minutes. The children evaluated each story and put it in one of three piles (very good, okay, and not so good). The children then talked about their evaluations by responding to questions that were intended to elicit evaluation responses, for example:

1. You put this story in the okay pile. Why didn’t you put it in the very good/not so good pile?
2. What would you do to make this story a very good story?

The children responded to probing questions (e.g., Why else is this story a not so good story?) until they indicated that they did not have anything else to say about the story.

The children responded with enthusiasm to the evaluation tasks. Even the youngest children did not appear to be intimidated by the tasks or the accompanying tape recorder. The children’s comfort in the situation does not mean that the evaluation interviews were easy for them. On the whole, they were not accustomed to being asked to evaluate writing; they almost certainly had even less experience in explaining their opinions and choices. For example, Ahmed, one of the more experienced fourth/sixth grade writers, had been talking about how sometimes he did not like to have writing topics assigned:
3. **KDS:** Why don't you like it when you can't choose?

   **Ahmed:** I don't know.

   **KDS:** This is very interesting to me.

   **Ahmed:** And it's hard, too!

   **KDS:** What's hard about it?

   **Ahmed:** Like thinking.

A little later in the same interview, Ahmed said, “This is hard, isn’t it?” Ahmed’s comments appeared to be related to the complex nature of the task, rather than an objection to being questioned.

Despite their inexperience with evaluation tasks such as these, the children did not have difficulty establishing whether a story was very good, okay, or not so good. Sometimes they assigned stories to categories very quickly. At other times they needed more time to make their decisions. When I asked children to explain why they had put a story in a particular pile, it was rare for them to respond with “I don’t know” or “That’s why.” There were times when the children spontaneously offered their explanations, but usually they had to be prompted.

**Scoring of Evaluation Comments**

Whenever a child made a remark that was a judgment of a story, it was considered an evaluation comment. The remarks were scored according to a modified version of Hilgers’ (1984, 1986) classification scheme for evaluation statements. When a child offered the same response to probes about a story, the comments were scored as a single instance. When a single utterance generated more than one reason in a given category, each reason was scored as a separate instance. In cases where a single utterance generated multiple reasons that corresponded with different categories, each comment was scored as an instance of each of the categories. Each evaluation comment was scored as a member of 1 of 10 categories: Retelling, Liking, Surface Features, Understanding, Crafting, Value-related, Entertainment, Real/Fictional, Audience Response, and Miscellaneous. These categories will be discussed further in the following section.

**Evaluation Categories**

The children’s comments were classified according to the following categories:

**Retelling**

These were comments that paraphrased part or all of a story, often in response to questions, as the following exchange illustrates:
4. KDS: You put that in the very good. Why's that?
   David: Because, um, if he's a skunk nobody likes him. He hasn't got no
   friends. He said that he smells and that he's gonna make (inaud.).
   He's lonely and he said that (inaud.). He's trying to find out if
   why he stinks.

At times such as these it was impossible to decide whether the children
had understood my question or whether this was their way of commenting
on affective elements (Liking category), the degree to which the
story made sense (Understanding category), or the crafting of the story
(Crafting category). It appeared that the retelling acted as a means
for the children to validate their understanding of the text. When a
child generated multiple utterances involving a retelling of the story,
it was scored as one instance of Retelling. The Retelling category was

**Liking**

This category contained comments that were subjective, reflecting
personal liking of an element in or an association with the text:

5. I like my mother.
7. Because it makes me happy, that's why.
8. Because he [my father] doesn't live with me anymore.
9. 'Cause the husband didn't wanted take care of the baby.

This last comment is an example of a judgment of a character de-
termining the overall rating of a piece. For Ahmed, the Liking category
also included references to whether he had liked writing about a topic:
"I didn't want to write about this." As Newkirk (1982) and Hilgers
(1984) have pointed out, these evaluations are not really responses to
the text per se, so much as responses to memories and associations
cued by the text.

**Surface Features**

Comments in this category related to the form of the text (e.g.,
spelling, handwriting, or length of story), whether a story had been
finished, and the amount of time taken to write the story:

10. It's not finished.
11. I got lots of mistakes.
12. It takes a lot of time. It's shorter.
13. [The writer should] Correct all those words.
Surface Features comments were not concerned with the content of the text.

Understanding

In this category are comments that indicated efforts on the part of the reader to process or make sense of the text. Hilgers' descriptions of this category (1984, 1986) were limited to comments that referred to grammatical correctness (including word order) and elements that enabled a reader to make sense of a text on a more abstract level, such as making sense of a joke. In this study, the category includes comments that focus on issues of plausibility. For example, Pablo was talking about “The Grate Hambdog,” a story written by an anonymous peer. He had difficulty conceptualizing the sandwich and had rated the story as only okay. He read the part that detailed the ingredients and then said:

14. Pablo: See, that's what I don't understand.... A hotdog and a hamburger. You don't know if it's together or separate. And it says it had a bun around it.
   KDS: So, why didn't you put it in the very good pile?
   Pablo: Because it was not, you know.
   KDS: It wasn't what?
   Pablo: It wasn't right; the things. It didn't make, you know, it didn't make sense.

Pablo was having difficulty imagining a sandwich that combined a hotdog and a hamburger. The children in this study did not explicitly comment on syntactic elements not making sense. Instead, their comments reflected content-based concerns:

15. I don't understand the part where he knocked his head on the ceiling.
   Nobody could hit his head on the ceiling. The ceiling's up (inaud.). I don't understand that.

Clearly these children's comments indicate that a concept did or did not make sense according to a personal frame of reference. When Bernardo read the anonymous story about a child being turned into a skunk, he could not accept that a witch would ask children what animal they would like to be turned into:

16. That part I don't understand because how are you gonna say to a witch, “I wanna be a bird”? The witch just turn into any kind of animal she wants to.... Witches can't ask.... Because they're bad and evil....

Bernardo's literary experiences with witches apparently precluded the possibility of a witch offering a choice.
Crafting

This category comprises comments that focused on how well a story had been developed. The comments indicated that the young reader/writer was aware of the role of the author as draftsperson, one who “selects, arranges, and revises to accomplish a specific purpose with an audience” (Hilgers, 1984, p. 377). Many of the children’s Crafting comments incorporated terms such as explain and describe:

17. It didn’t explain it too clearly.
18. It don’t describe nothing.

The children sometimes commented on what they had neglected to do:

19. I didn’t write what was going to happen when I wrote it.
20. I think I wasn’t talking about, urn, the whole man too much.
21. Who was the author? I didn’t put it down . . . ’cause then people will know who I’m talking about.

Attention to being explicit and incorporating details were important to many of the children. Some children referred to elements that had been discussed extensively in their ESOL classes:

22. It’s not like the other two stories. There’s a lot of feelings.
23. Because it have a beginning, a middle, and a ending.

On occasion, the children referred to the choice of words (e.g., “It has good words”). The Crafting category incorporated a considerable range of text-based elements.

Value-related

Comments that focused on “the value of what a piece of writing intends to do, what it does, and how well it does it” (Hilgers, 1984, p. 378) may be found in this category. As Hilgers points out, “This may be evaluation on the most complex level; in its fullest expression, it included evaluation on all of the levels already discussed, to which was added some sense of purpose, value, and accomplishment” (p. 378). This category is the least well described in Hilgers’ taxonomy, perhaps because he found few examples of it. Value-related comments occurred infrequently in this study also. However, children did make Value-related comments on occasion:

24. Exciting to learn.
25. Because it teach you a lot about pocket books and stealers.
It is arguable that comments such as these more legitimately belong in the Liking and Crafting categories respectively, but within the context of the interviews, the children seemed to be referring to more global values.

**Entertainment**

Comments in this category referred to the degree to which a text generated an emotional response:

26. It was funny.
27. Exciting.
28. Because it's sad, but it's funny [too]. It makes people cry.

In Hilgers' (1986) taxonomy, Entertainment comments were located in a subgroup of the Miscellaneous category because of the possibility that they actually belonged in one of the other categories such as the affective Liking category, the Understanding category, or the Crafting category. For the purposes of this report, Entertainment comments are in a separate category in order to more clearly establish the degree to which children referred to this criterion.

**Real/Fictional**

In this category are comments that reflected a concern with the degree to which a story was based in reality or the imagination:

29. Because there isn't such a thing as Frankenstein.
30. 'Cause all this is true.
31. That one was okay, but it was a dream.

In Hilgers' (1986) taxonomy, Real/Fictional comments were placed in a subgroup of the Miscellaneous category. In this study the category stands alone in order to establish the degree to which the children were influenced by the fictional or realistic content of the story. Throughout the semester, the children had been exposed to a great deal of guidance and support in writing fictional stories. Although most of the children were at ease with fictional writing, their comments in conferences demonstrated an awareness of the two often complementary elements of fact and fiction, and they would quickly ask if they were unsure of the genesis of the story. Therefore, I was interested in finding out whether this concern would be reflected in their evaluation comments.

**Audience Response**

This category contained comments that related to the reactions of the audience to a story:
32. Everyone liked it in my class when I read it.
33. Because when I read it to the other kids, they were laughing. Because
they thought it was funny.

Hilgers (1986) excluded Audience Response as a separate category of
comments because he infrequently encountered it. He concluded that
readers' responses undoubtedly had an impact but functioned only as
reinforcement. Miller (1982) has pointed out that professional writers
frequently refer to the responses of their readers, especially critics,
when evaluating their own writing.

Miscellaneous

In all but a few cases, the comments made by children could be
classified as belonging in 1 of the 9 main evaluation categories. Ten
percent of all comments made by the children escaped clear-cut catego-
rization. These comments appeared to be idiosyncratic and were placed
in a 10th category, Miscellaneous.

FINDINGS

The data provide insights into various aspects of the children’s evalua-
tion criteria. The following analyses focus on two aspects: the overall
criteria of the children regardless of the task and the influence of the
task on the children’s evaluation criteria.

Overall Criteria

The largest percentage of comments focused on issues of Crafting
(Table 1). Almost half of the comments (47%) were placed in this
category.1 No other evaluation category approached Crafting in fre-
quency of occurrence. Four categories accounted for between 9% and
14% each: Understanding (14%), Retelling (10%), Miscellaneous
(10%), and Liking (9%). Despite the fact that many of the stories
contained unconventional mechanical features (especially nonstan-
dardized spelling) that sometimes caused difficulties for the children
when they were reading the stories, only 3% of the children’s comments
referred to Surface Features. There were very few comments in the
Value-related (1%), Entertainment (3%), Real/Fictional (1%), and Au-
dience Response (1%) categories.

When considering the distribution of evaluation comments between
the two groups of children, the same domination of Crafting was

1 Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole number.
TABLE 1
Frequency of Evaluation Comments (in Percent*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation categories</th>
<th>2nd/3rd graders (n = 165)</th>
<th>4th/6th graders (n = 186)</th>
<th>All children (n = 351)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retelling</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface features</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crafting</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value-related</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real/fictional</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience response</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n = total number of evaluation comments made by children within a given group. *Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

found (see Table 1). However, there were differences in the degree to which the two groups of children generated Crafting comments. Whereas 32% of the second/third graders’ comments fell within this category, 60% of the fourth/sixth graders’ comments were classified as Crafting. Responses of younger children showed more diversity. The dominance of Crafting comments for the older children is particularly noticeable when one considers that no other evaluation category accounted for more than 9% of all their comments. In contrast, although Crafting comments predominated for the younger group of children, the Retelling (16%), Liking (13%), and Understanding (20%) categories accounted for relatively large percentages of all comments generated by the second/third graders. There were two additional differences worth noting between the two groups of children. First, the younger children were more likely to Retell a story than were the older children (16% for the second/third graders compared with 5% for the fourth/sixth graders). Second, the younger children were more likely to make comments that were classified as Understanding than were the older children (20% for the second/third graders compared with 9% for the 4th/6th graders).

Although there were differences in evaluation criteria related to grade level, there was, in fact, considerable variation in the range of criteria used by children within a group (see Table 2). For example, in the second/third-grade group Liking comments ranged from 1% of all comments (Pablo) to 33% of all comments (Bernardo). In the case of the Understanding category, two children (Hector and Liliana) did not generate any Understanding comments, whereas 34% of Pablo’s
comments fell into this category. A similar situation existed for the older children. Neither Maria nor Miguel generated any Liking comments, whereas 27% of all of Ahmed's comments fell into the Liking category. Such variation was apparent also for the Crafting category. In this case the range was from 29% (Ahmed) to 85% (Miguel). Individual differences among children in the same ESOL group were apparent. This is clear in terms of the range of criteria that children used and the distribution of comments across categories.

**Influence of Task on Evaluation Criteria**

Table 3 shows the distribution of comments according to task, for all children, and by age (second/third and fourth/sixth graders)—only responses made by the 5 children who completed both tasks (evaluating their own and anonymous stories) are included. As this table illustrates, Crafting comments accounted for the major percentage of responses, regardless of task (44% for their own stories and 47% for anonymous stories). The largest differences were in the Understanding category. When the children were evaluating their own stories, only 9% of all comments were classified as Understanding. However, when evaluating anonymous stories, the percentage rose to 24%.

### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Category</th>
<th>2nd/3rd graders</th>
<th>4th/5th graders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jorge (O, A) (n=30)</td>
<td>Pablo (A) (n=77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retelling</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface features</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crafting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value-related</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real/fictional</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience response</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. n = total number of evaluation comments made by individual children; O = own stories evaluated; A = anonymous stories evaluated; NA = Audience Response category not applicable because the child did not evaluate his/her own stories.

* Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole number.
Differences in the distribution of comments across tasks for the two groups can be found in the Understanding category for both evaluation tasks and in the Crafting category for the anonymous story task. The second/third graders generated a smaller percentage of Crafting comments when rating the anonymous stories than did the fourth/sixth graders (25% and 63% respectively). In the case of the Understanding category, the second/third graders generated a substantially larger percentage of Understanding comments for both tasks than did the fourth/sixth graders. When evaluating their own stories, 15% of the younger children’s and 4% of the older children’s comments were classified as Understanding comments; when evaluating anonymous stories, 36% of the younger children’s and 15% of the older children’s comments were classified as Understanding comments.

The data suggest that for the most part, task did not have an impact on the evaluation criteria that the children used. Crafting comments continued to dominate the distribution of comments, regardless of the task. However, there was a tendency for the children to generate more Understanding comments when evaluating anonymous stories. This general trend was consistent also when comparing how the two groups of children approached the two evaluation tasks. Again, the data suggest that the task was not a predominant influence on one group or another.
another as there were few grade-dependent variations in the distribution of evaluation comments. In fact, very similar percentages of comments for both groups can be seen for most of the evaluation categories. However, the data suggest that age may have been a factor in generating Understanding comments as the younger children generated more Understanding comments on both tasks than the older children. When the children evaluated anonymous stories another discrepancy was apparent as the fourth/sixth graders generated a larger percentage of Crafting comments than the second/third graders.

There were marked differences, however, in how children in the same ESOL class evaluated their own and anonymous stories (see Table 4). For example, Jorge and Pablo, both second graders, differed from each other in terms of their relative use of evaluation criteria. Most of Jorge's comments fell into the Retelling, Liking, and Entertainment categories. This dependence of Jorge's on Liking and Retelling comments was consistent across tasks. However, although 24% of Jorge's comments were classified as Entertainment when evaluating his own stories, he did not make a single Entertainment comment when evaluating the anonymous stories. Conversely, 15% of his comments when evaluating anonymous stories fell into the Understanding category; when evaluating his own stories, he made no Understanding com-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation category</th>
<th>2nd/3rd graders</th>
<th>4th/6th graders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jorge</td>
<td>Pablo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retelling</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crafting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value-related</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real/fictional</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience response</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n = total number of comments made by each child when evaluating his/her own or anonymous stories; NA = Audience Response category is not applicable when the children evaluated anonymous stories.

Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole number.
ments. In contrast, most of Pablo's comments fell into the Understanding and Crafting categories, and there were differences in the distribution of his comments according to task in these two categories. He was more likely to refer to Crafting when evaluating his own stories (63%) than when evaluating anonymous stories (33%). In contrast, when evaluating anonymous stories, 43% of his comments fell into the Understanding category and 33% fell into the Crafting category.

Similar differences among children were apparent for the fourth/sixth graders also. For example, David did not generate a single Understanding comment when evaluating his own stories, but 36% of his comments fell into this category when evaluating anonymous stories. In contrast, María did not generate a single Understanding comment when evaluating either her own or anonymous stories. In addition, there was a substantial difference in the distribution of comments in the Crafting category for Maria. When evaluating her own stories, 44% of her comments fell into the Crafting category; when evaluating anonymous stories, this percentage rose to 88%. This illustrates that individual children approached the evaluation tasks differently.

**DISCUSSION**

The children demonstrated considerable reflective powers when evaluating the stories. They were engaged readers and evaluators of the texts, whether written by themselves or anonymous peers. In the evaluation interviews they expressed extensive knowledge of writing processes. This finding is all the more remarkable when one considers that the children were considered to be “high risk” students. They did not come from mainstream, English-dominant backgrounds, and they were generally experiencing difficulties in school. Nevertheless, in their ESOL classes they responded to the challenges provided by their teacher; this was reflected in their ability to evaluate stories.

The most striking finding was the emphasis that the children placed on Crafting issues, regardless of the task or their age. This finding is particularly important when one considers that focusing on Crafting is cognitively demanding because the reader must look at the text as an entity in itself, rather than simply using the text as a cuing system to past experiences, as Liking comments tend to reflect. The children focused on meaning, even when mechanics presented a substantial impediment to understanding; usually they were able to overcome the initial obstacle posed by, for example, nonstandard spelling and focused on the overall impact of the stories. There were times when the children had to backtrack in their reading and evaluating, actively
making meaning from the text. While Ahmed read the story about the girl being turned into a giraffe, he stopped frequently and questioned:

34. Ahmed: The day I turned into a giraffe. I was waking up. I got out of bed and banged my head on the ceiling. “Ouch,” I yelled. “Come quick,” I yelled. She ran up the stairs. Who’s? She said, I yelled She ran up the stairs. What does it mean, She ran up the stairs?

KDS: Maybe if you read on you might get the rest of it.

Ahmed: Okay. I was waking up. I got out of bed and banged my head on the ceiling. “Ouch” “Come quick,” I yelled. She ran up the stairs. I don’t know. She should put, “I ran up the stairs” [he continued reading the story] Is it lotion or potion?

By the time Ahmed had finished reading the story, he had understood the chain of events and rated it as very good. Unlike the other children, he had prior experience with the notion of a wizard and was able to extrapolate the humor inherent in the story. Even when prior experience or linguistic ability made understanding difficult for the children, they persevered as active users and consumers of language. They clarified their thinking and altered their evaluations to accommodate the updated understanding. The comments that they generated illustrated that they were actively seeking more information in order to capture meaning. In fact, many of the comments were generated in response to story elements that were outside the children’s realms of experience. For example, David, one of the most effective writers in the fourth/sixth-grade group, was thoroughly confounded by the subtly crafted and humorous story about a girl being turned into a giraffe and rated it as not so good. In talking with him, it was apparent that he had no knowledge of Merlin the wizard, key knowledge for understanding the story. Consequently, he did not understand the story and gave it a low rating.

The children were critical evaluators. For example, Pablo brought great insights to his evaluations, such as when he rated the story about the giraffe as very good and then explained his reasoning:

35. KDS: Why did you put that in the very good pile, Pablo?

Pablo: It (pause). It like tells you about it, you know. It tells you and they don’t have to tell you that you had a dream. You can figure it out easily.

In this comment, Pablo acknowledged that reading is a collaborative act between the writer and the reader, an act that requires the reader to actively use all knowledge available.

This ability to be critically aware of a story’s strengths and weaknesses was evident also when Pablo rated his own story about the night sky as not so good:
36. KDS: So, why did you put it there [not so good]?
   Pablo: Because I, you know. I kept on messing up all the time. And I
didn't make much sense.
   KDS: Why not?
   Pablo: Because this guy, this guy. It's supposed to be the yellow sky.
       And it doesn't talk about the yellow sky. All it does, it The sky is
       white at night and in the morning.

Pablo was critical of the story because he had not restricted his writing
to the topic at hand; the result was displeasing to him.

On another occasion, he was concerned with the abruptness with
which he made the transition from one idea to the next:

37. Pablo: It doesn't say. It just cuts, you know, like if, if it broke. See,
       right there, he took us in the car and then it say.
   KDS: What just felt like it broke?
   Pablo: See, it says, he took us in the car and then it says, then it says he
       dropped us off, up. And he told us to get back in the car and then he
       dropped us off in the farm. Instead of saying that he drove off and
       then (inaud.) officer.

Pablo had already internalized aspects that are integral to good writing
and that are referred to by teachers of much older students: cohesion,
staying on the topic, selective use of details, and subtle development
of a story.

The children were clearly conscious of the importance of Crafting
when writing. However, their comments did not necessarily indicate
complete understanding of the element being discussed. At times the
children's advice would not necessarily enhance the story, as
when they suggested that an author include a multitude of details,
some of which seemed extraneous. For example, Hector was evaluating
the story about a bird and said that he thought the story was very good
because “he describe the other birds.” In fact, this description of the
other birds appeared to detract from the story's cohesion. However,
the additional detail may have given greater life to the story, making
it both more interesting and comprehensible to Hector.

At other times, the children generated comments that contained
language that had been heard often in their ESOL classes. For example,
Pablo rated the story about a baloney sandwich as very good and said,
“It's got a beginning, middle, and end.” However, it was difficult for
him to point out the components of the story that corresponded with
each segment. As the story consisted of a listing of ingredients, it was
surprising that Pablo had referred to “a beginning, middle, and end”
at all. It is possible that Pablo used the stereotypical term to indicate
that he clearly understood the story. Periodically there had been brief
discussions in his class about this very issue, and it had sometimes been
couched in just these terms.
Liliana rated the baloney story as very good also:

38. Liliana: Because this one has a lot of feelings.
   KDS: You said that this has a lot of feelings in it. Can you show me where the words are where it has lots of feeling? Feeling words.
   Liliana: Well. He say he put it together by putting a piece of ham then cheese, baloney, salami, pieces of rye bread.
   KDS: All right. And what does that show?
   Liliana: That it have a lot of feelings. It's nice.

It sounded like a good sandwich to Liliana and because it appealed to her, it had good feelings. These comments were as stereotypical as Pablo's were. It is entirely possible that the children simply lacked the words to adequately express their thoughts. However, it is likely that they had accurately understood from their ESOL class that feelings and a clearly developed story (with a beginning, middle, and ending) were important and drew upon this knowledge when faced with the evaluation task. In effect, they had partial understanding of a criterion and were experimenting with it. These situations serve as indicators of knowledge of writing, however rudimentary or fragmentary. The stereotypical responses that the young writers in this study generated may be the result of inexperience as writers and revisers of stories. I see these stereotypical comments, not as weaknesses or limitations, but as indicators of emerging awareness of evaluation and writing criteria.

The predominance of Crafting comments may be explained by an examination of events in the ESOL classes. Whenever the children conferred, there was a great deal of emphasis placed on attending to Crafting issues. Time was always available for discussing criteria for enhancing the overall quality of stories. The teacher would model strong lead sentences and stress the need for clearly focused stories. The class would discuss the need to provide sufficient and pertinent information so that the audience would be able to understand the significance of a story. Minilessons dealt with the need to express emotions and to show rather than tell. It seems reasonable to conclude that the teacher exerted considerable influence over the children's evaluation criteria, particularly with regard to the overall domination of Crafting comments.

The influence of the teacher may be seen also in cases where there were only infrequent instances of a particular evaluation criterion. For example, the children generated few Liking and Surface Features comments. Whereas it is possible that Liking evaluations were masked by other, more dominant evaluations, it is likely that the distribution of comments is reflective of the attention the teacher placed on particular aspects of the writing process. For example, in conferences and after reading literature, the children rarely commented explicitly on what
they had liked in a piece. This may explain the infrequent occurrence of Liking comments. Also, the teacher did not stress mechanical conformity and accuracy, instead emphasizing the need to concern oneself primarily with the content of the story. This instructional focus appears to be reflected in the small percentage of Surface Features comments. Had the teacher placed more emphasis on these features, it is likely that more of the children’s comments would have been classified in this category.

Crafting comments were dominant between groups in this study, but such comments were more dominant among the fourth/sixth graders, suggesting that the older children were more likely than the younger children to focus on the text, stepping back from it to critically analyze it, as Ahmed did when talking about a story that he had written about galaxies. He realized that he had written the story with insufficient knowledge of the topic:

39. Ahmed: I shouldn’t have read all of the part in the book and write it.
   KDS: You what?
   Ahmed: I shouldn’t have read the book, all of it, then write it.
   KDS: Why not?
   Ahmed: I didn’t do that.
   KDS: Oh, so you should have?
   Ahmed: Yeah, I should have.
   KDS: Why’s that?
   Ahmed: Then I can write it here. Then I can write anything more.
   When I came to the period, The last one.
   KDS: Do you know quite a bit about galaxies?
   Ahmed: Um, not that much.

Although Ahmed had chosen to write about the topic because it was of interest to him, he recognized that he wasn’t sufficiently knowledgeable about the subject to write a good story. He felt that he should have done much more background reading and that not doing so affected the quality of the story. On another occasion, Ahmed rated the story about a baloney sandwich as not so good:

40. Ahmed: I didn’t like it. It’s such a long, like, explaining about food.
   KDS: And what would you like him to have done?
   Ahmed: Um, write a story or something.

Ahmed was clearly able to distinguish and talk about the difference between a listing of ingredients and the development of a story that will capture a reader’s attention.

A full range of evaluation criteria was available to and used to some extent by the children regardless of age. However, the older children were less likely to make Retelling and Liking comments and more likely to make Crafting comments. This may be interpreted as further
evidence that the older children were able to step back from the text and evaluate it more critically than were the younger children. The Retelling comments, for instance, were indicative of a verification process whereby the children established their understanding of the story. This may be seen as an early evaluation strategy, perhaps a preliminary strategy. Jorge was an enthusiastic second grader whose stories often lacked a clear focus. When Jorge made Retelling comments, he appeared to be verbally validating his understanding of the story. It is possible that the high incidence of Retelling comments is connected with his developing skill of clearly establishing a topic. Similarly, many of Liliana's stories were long, unfocused rambling stories. In her case the largest percentage of evaluation comments fell in the Retelling category, again indicating that there may be a connection between a child's writing skill and evaluation criteria. Pablo and Hector were more skilled younger writers whose stories were much better defined and developed. They both referred to Crafting issues extensively. It is possible that their focus on Crafting comments is related to their more advanced skill as writers. When rating the anonymous stories, none of the second/third graders assigned a single story to the not so good pile, suggesting that the younger children had less well-developed reflective abilities, possibly because they had had fewer opportunities over the years to write. Bernardo's explanation supports this interpretation:

41. KDS: It's interesting. You don't have any not so good stories. What would a story be like that went here?
Bernardo: Um, he writes a sentence and doesn't finish. And he writes, like, I was a dog. And I live in a hole. In a dog house. That's the end of it.

Bernardo indicated that Surface Features (length and whether completed or not) were key factors in rating a story as not so good. None of the stories fell within these evaluation parameters, so Bernardo did not assign any stories to the not so good pile. The older children frequently referred to Crafting and Understanding issues when rating the anonymous stories. It is possible that because of greater experience as writers, the older children had more options available to them and were therefore better able to discriminate between stories. For example, the older children often made comments that were indicative of the Understanding category, but then, in the process of suggesting how the author could improve the stories, their comments moved to the level of Crafting.

Despite differences in evaluation criteria between grades, there was considerable variation in the evaluation criteria that children in the same ESOL group relied on. In many cases these differences were unrelated to their relative ability as writers. Children tended to rely on
certain criteria, regardless of the task. For example, Jorge was likely to make Retelling and Liking comments; Pablo was likely to make Understanding and Crafting comments; David and Maria generated large percentages of Crafting comments; Ahmed was much more inclined to make Liking comments. It is clear that the range and frequency of usage of evaluation criteria was highly idiosyncratic.

As there were so few substantial discrepancies across evaluation tasks, it is reasonable to conclude that, on the whole, the children did not employ different evaluation criteria according to whether they were responding as author/evaluator or as evaluator only. Apparently they had equal facility with evaluating texts that they had written and texts about which they knew very little. This suggests that their range of evaluation criteria was not influenced by the degree to which they had been the creator of the text. However, there is evidence that children used different evaluation criteria according to the particular story that they were evaluating. For example, when Pablo was rating the anonymous stories, 9 of the 11 comments that he generated when rating the story about the hamdog were classified as Understanding. In contrast, when rating the story about the bird, 5 of 8 comments were classified as Crafting. Most of David's Understanding comments were inspired by the story about the giraffe, a story whose subtleties confused him enormously. All of Maria's Audience Response comments were generated when talking about her own stories. She clearly demonstrated that she valued the approval and respect of her peers when she rated her story about being alone as very good: “And when I read it to the other kids they thought that it was a good story.” Later in the interview she remarked that she had put another story in the okay pile because “I didn't talk to the other kids about it to see how they felt.” It is likely that the children generated more Understanding comments when talking about the anonymous stories simply because they did not have access to the genesis and development of the stories.

Certain categories received very small percentages of all comments generated (Value-related, Entertainment, Real/Fictional, and Audience Response). The most obvious explanation for this is that these criteria were in the early stages of their development. However, the low incidence of certain evaluation criteria may be the consequence of forces that were not directly related to the children's cognitive processes. For example, the content and tone of the stories, the evaluation tasks themselves, and the instructional foci may have influenced the children's choice of comments.

Evaluation criteria were clearly in the process of emerging, and the degree to which they were developed appeared to be related to both experience as a writer and success as a writer. The children showed great awareness of many facets of writing, and this information is
important for teachers. Through talking about what makes a story very
good or not so good, the young writers had an opportunity to discover
what they knew about writing.

Explaining their ratings was not easy for the children, perhaps an
indication of the complexity of the task and their lack of experience
with such a task and its related language. That the children generated
such a preponderance of Crafting comments appears to be directly
related to their ESOL classroom environment and the influence of the
teacher. With increased experience in writing, evaluating stories, and
working collaboratively with other young writers, there is tremendous
potential for even greater displays of evaluative powers.
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APPENDIX

Stories Used for the Evaluation of Anonymous Writing Task

Writing Task 1
The children had to write a story describing a new sandwich that they would enter in a contest. The audience consisted of the judges for the contest. The children were instructed to give their sandwich a name and describe it so that the judges would know what it was like.

Story 1: The Grate Hambdog
This was a brief description about entering a hotdog/hamburger (a hambdog) in a contest and winning first prize. There was some unconventional spelling and punctuation.

Story 2: Baloney
This very brief description of an untitled common deli sandwich made no reference to the competition. Essentially, it was a repetitive listing of ingredients. There was some minor unconventional spelling and punctuation.

Story 3: The Sandwich
This story described being chosen to enter the contest, making an unusual sandwich, and coming in first. The author spent much of the story describing a friend's entry. There was some unconventional punctuation. There was a lot of unconventional spelling that could impede understanding.

Writing Task 2
The children were asked to pretend that a spell would turn them into an animal of their choice for one week. They had to write stories describing life as that animal.

Story 4: The Skunk
The story was written from the perspective of a skunk. It was well focused, had a powerful lead sentence, and was written with humor and vivid description. There was some minor unconventional spelling and punctuation.

Story 5: The Bird
Most of this fairly brief story dealt with being put under a spell and explaining why the author wanted to be a bird. There was limited description of life as the bird. There was some unconventional spelling and punctuation, but most of it was unlikely to impede comprehension.

Story 6: The Giraffe
This well-developed and sophisticated story was about a girl who discovered that she had been turned into a giraffe. It was a subtle and humorous story that required that the reader infer a great deal. There was some minor unconventional spelling. Punctuation was fairly standardized, but there were some lapses in the use of quotation marks that may have impeded understanding.
ESL and Language Planning in Puerto Rican Education

MELVIN C. RESNICK
The University of Tulsa

For nearly a century, the stated goal of government language planning in Puerto Rico has been the bilingualization of the island’s population through use of English as the language of instruction or as a required subject in all school grades. Nevertheless, some 80% of the population remains functionally monolingual in Spanish. This study proposes that the apparent failure of the teaching of ESL in Puerto Rico is in reality a motivated failure—a society’s successful resolution of a conflict between government planning for bilingualism and social pressure for monolingualism. Educational difficulties that for generations have been attributed to deficiencies in textbooks, methods, and teacher preparation are in fact explainable through universal principles of language maintenance, spread, shift, and loss. The factors that impede the bilingualization of the island’s population—primarily nationalism, political uncertainty, and the association between language and identity—have created a societal imperative against the learning of English. The existence of such an imperative, whether overt or covert, must be considered by language planners, school administrators, and classroom teachers wherever language spread is attempted through the school system.

Practical bilingualism is possible. Naturally, American citizens should be able to speak English. (Ickes, 1943, cited in Osuna, 1975, p. 391)

This study examines historical, political, and sociolinguistic aspects of the teaching of ESL in Puerto Rico and attempts to demonstrate the extent to which success or failure of ESL instruction can be determined by factors external to the educational environment. The discourse needs of a society do not take place in a social, historical, or political vacuum. Motivation transcends methodology and all other narrowly “educational” considerations. In the case study presented

1 The epigraph is from a letter by Harold L. Ickes, secretary of the interior under Franklin D. Roosevelt, to José N. Gallardo, commissioner of education of Puerto Rico.
here, motivation is covertly negative and produces a societal imperative against the learning of English. Whereas the situation analyzed is specific to a unique island population, the principles involved are universal and should be considered by governmental, educational, and community groups involved in the spread of second languages through a school system.

For nearly a century, since Puerto Rico was ceded to the U.S. in 1898, the majority of the population of Puerto Rico has remained functionally monolingual in Spanish despite the compulsory study of English in Grades 1-12 and an expressed positive attitude toward the learning of English. Census data from 1980 indicate that less than 20% of the island’s population claims to speak English fluently. Fluency rates in English range from less than 7% of elementary-school-age children to 27% of those between 25 and 44 years of age. The highest rates of claimed fluency in English are for those who have lived on the mainland (57%) and college graduates (70%). With less than 20% of the population having achieved fluency in English, including those who have lived on the mainland, the school language policy has failed in its goal of creating a bilingual population.

The concept of nation is essential to an understanding of the failure of the teaching of ESL in Puerto Rico. Sociologists have long recognized a perhaps universal association between nation, on the one hand, and solidarity or homogeneity, on the other. Such solidarity or homogeneity can have a cultural, racial, or religious basis, but it is in most cases linguistic (see Edwards, 1985). The association between language and nation is not new. Gold (1982) cites numerous examples of the term language in the sense of nation in Biblical Hebrew, Latin, the early Romance languages, and several modern dictionaries. Johann Gottfried Herder wrote in 1772, “Has a nation anything more precious than the language of its fathers?” (cited in Edwards, 1985, p. 24).

The term nation also has another meaning, which we are not using here: that of an independent political unit, regardless of its homogeneity, such as those that can become members of the United Nations.

The derivatives nationality and nationalism, in general usage, reflect the two meanings cited above. For Fishman (1968) and others, nationalism refers to the various stages of sociocultural integration, whereas nationism refers to stages of political-geographical unification. As political-geographical nations expand, they may absorb smaller peoples or polities who may or may not eventually form part of a larger sociocultural nationality. Puerto Ricans clearly do not form part of a larger

---

2 For example, Meaning 7 of lengua in the 19th edition of Diccionario de la Real Academia Española and Meaning 4d of tongue and 6a of language in Webster’s Third New International Dictionary.
sociocultural nationality after nearly a century of association with the U.S.

The apparent failure of the teaching of ESL in Puerto Rico derives from the conflict between the language needs of Puerto Rico, which are based on sociocultural nationalism, and those of the U.S., which are based on political nationism. The sources of the conflict are found primarily in the political history of this Caribbean island.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The 20th Century

After four centuries of Spanish colonialism, Puerto Rico was ceded to the U.S. by the Treaty of Paris on December 10, 1898. In 1900, the U.S. Congress passed the Foraker Act, which replaced military occupation with a civilian government that included Puerto Ricans but which was headed by a governor and other officials named by the president of the U.S. In 1902, the Official Languages Act granted official status to both English and Spanish. In 1917, the Jones Act reorganized the island's government and granted U.S. citizenship to Puerto Ricans, but it was not until 1947 that Puerto Ricans gained the right to elect the governor of the island. The elected governor had the authority to name the commissioner of education, an appointment that previously had come directly from the president. The most recent pivotal development in relations between Puerto Rico and the U.S. took place in 1952, when, following a popular referendum, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico was established. The desire of the Puerto Rican people to maintain political ties with the U.S. was confirmed in a 1967 plebiscite, and subsequent general elections every 4 years have overwhelmingly rejected those political parties that advocate independence (Johnson, 1975). The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico has, in general, the same autonomy and the same limitations as the 50 states of the union. There is no distinction between the citizenship of Puerto Ricans and that of other U.S. citizens, but island residents do not pay federal taxes and do not vote in federal elections (see Garcia Martínez, 1982).

The Commonwealth is seen as an interim solution to the problem of the permanent political status of Puerto Rico. Three alternatives are being considered for the mutual consent of the Puerto Rican people and the U.S. Congress: (a) The continuation of the Commonwealth but probably with greater autonomy in foreign affairs: This is the preference that has been expressed by some 40% of the population. (b) Statehood: Some 40% have indicated they would vote to make
Puerto Rico the 51st state. (c) Independence: Between 5% and 10% favor the complete separation of the two countries (see Johnson, 1975). A new plebiscite on the political status of Puerto Rico may be held some time in the 1990s. As we will see, insecurity over their future political status has created serious linguistic repercussions for these 3.5 million Spanish-speaking citizens of the U.S.

Sources of Puerto Rican Nationalism

Puerto Rican nationalism has its roots in the island's history as a Spanish colony. Conditions during most of the colonial period were terrible. The extinction of the aboriginal Taíno Indians in the 16th century was followed by the importation of African slaves to continue work in the fields and mines (Babín, 1973). After grave economic and social problems, the 18th century ended with peace and the beginnings of an identifiable Puerto Rican society (Maldonado-Denis, 1980). The 19th century brought the beginning of a national consciousness and was, according to Maldonado-Denis,

the decisive period in our formation as a people, as a nationality. Our literature, our music, our painting, in effect all of our cultural expressions, give testimony that in this century there crystallized in a definitive manner a culture that we can call Puerto Rican. (p. 23; translation mine)

Puerto Rican nationalist movements arose with the intention of changing the conditions of Spanish colonialism. With most of its New World empire lost, Spain reacted by allowing reforms. These included the abolition of slavery in 1873 and the granting of civil rights such as limited suffrage, formation of political parties, and freedom of the press (Maldonado-Denis, 1980). Each municipality established a school board, but school buildings and educational materials were woefully inadequate and the number of school-age children who attended school never exceeded 15% (Epstein, 1967).

In 1897, a royal decree, the Carta autonómica del 25 de noviembre de 1897, established an island Parliament to rule Puerto Rico together with a governor general named by the king of Spain (García Martínez, 1982). The autonomy that was thus granted was taken away in less than a year by the arrival of U.S. troops.

In summary, the final years of the 19th century saw rural poverty counterbalanced by increasing peace, civil rights, and political autonomy; these were accompanied by the pride of a native culture, national consciousness, and an island identity. There was greater social equality and less racism or caste discrimination than in other parts of the former Spanish empire (Padín, 1916). In such circumstances, according to Epstein (1967), “Puerto Ricans had very little need to be liberated and
to receive the “cultured civilization” that the Americans were so anxious to grant them in 1898” (pp. 294–296; translation mine).

Even now, Puerto Ricans continue to look toward Spain as the mother country, or madre patria, a term quite common in the Spanish of the island. Spain is the acknowledged source of the island’s culture, legal system (with U.S. influences) and, above all, language (Alvar, 1982; Meyn, 1983). The nationalism of the Puerto Rican people does not derive from the relationship with the U.S., which began during the lifetime of their parents or grandparents but from the Spanish roots that provide both the name and the basis of their language and culture. Puerto Ricans born before 1917 were not born as U.S. citizens; and the population of Puerto Rico still includes many native-born first- and second-generation U.S. citizens who bear vivid memories of the island’s history prior to the establishment of the Commonwealth in 1952.

SCHOOL LANGUAGE POLICY

From the very beginning of the U.S. occupation, the implementation of Puerto Rican language planning has been through education: The schools have always been seen as the best means of introducing and spreading English. During the first half of the century, Puerto Rican education was dominated by numerous replacements of education officials and disruptive shifts between English and Spanish as the language of instruction. It was also dominated by the efforts of highly talented, devoted commissioners of education who were in many cases more knowledgeable and visionary than were the mainland politicians with whom they worked. Nevertheless, none of the commissioners, and none of their plans, succeeded in the bilingualization of the island. Decade after decade, in study after study, failure was blamed on deficiencies in textbooks, methods, and teacher preparation.

A summary of school language policies and their educational and political repercussions is found in the Appendix. The determination of U.S. officials to make the island’s population bilingual, even after four decades of controversy and failure, was expressed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1937. In his letter of appointment naming Jose M. Gallardo commissioner of education, Roosevelt made explicit the government’s language policy and the frustration it had produced.

It is an indispensable part of American policy that the coming generation of American citizens in Puerto Rico grow up with complete facility in the English tongue. . . . Only through the acquisition of this language will Puerto Rican Americans secure a better understanding of American ideals and principles . . . [and] be able to take full advantage of the economic
opportunities which became available to them when they were made American citizens. . .

Clearly there is no desire or purpose to diminish the enjoyment or the usefulness of the rich Spanish cultural legacy of the people of Puerto Rico. . . But bilingualism will be achieved by the forthcoming generation of Puerto Ricans only if the teaching of English throughout the insular educational system is entered into at once with vigor, purposefulness and devotion, and with the understanding that English is the official language of our country. (cited in Osuna, 1975, pp. 376–377)

It is the only time that a U.S. president has intervened so directly in the school language policy of the island; English was immediately reinstated as the language of instruction. It is also quite possibly the only time a U.S. president has ever declared that the U.S. has an official language.

The Organic Act of 1947 eased the school language problem in that it granted Puerto Ricans the right to elect their own governor, who would name the secretary of education. Spanish has since been maintained as the language of instruction with English as a required subject in all grades. In 1952, the new Constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico was ratified, further stabilizing the school language policy.

The debate about English in the schools broke out again early in the 1960s under Secretary of Education Cándido Oliveras. For decades, many private Catholic schools had retained English as the language of instruction, as they do today. Students of these schools do indeed become functional bilingual. In 1962, Oliveras threatened to withdraw accreditation from private schools that continued using English as the language of instruction (Beirne, 1976). Because the education received in these schools had long been recognized as being of higher quality than that available in public schools, and the elitist arguments of the early decades of the century were no longer being heard, one may reasonably conclude that the presence of schools in which students did achieve proficiency in English was viewed as a political or sociocultural threat.

**MOTIVATED “FAILURE”**

Why have successive school language policies all met with failure? Why, after nearly a century of intensive government planning for bilingualism, can no more than some 20% of the island’s population function effectively in English? Such questions have of course been posed in official circles in San Juan and Washington, and many costly studies have been commissioned to investigate the educational system
of Puerto Rico. The studies all come to the same general conclusion: deficiencies in textbooks, methods, and teacher preparation.

In reality, however, the textbooks, methods, and teacher preparation have not been so different from what has been available in the U.S. and in other countries; they have been, at least, the best available for their time. The Fries American English Series was prepared by the English Section of the Puerto Rican Department of Public Instruction. When we read the early reports and publications of numerous Puerto Rican and mainland educators who worked in the island’s school system, we discover a surprisingly high level of linguistic and pedagogical sophistication, with insights that are now important principles of language planning, contrastive analysis, error analysis, and communicative methodology. In recent years, the Puerto Rican Department of Education has begun to introduce task-based, problem-solving activities in ESL classes in an effort to better integrate English into the curriculum. The very active Puerto Rico TESOL chapter promotes cooperation with education officials and high standards for teacher training and certification.

In the battle against English as a language of instruction, some independence advocates (independentistas) made use of the close association of language, identity, and la madre patria in an effort to convince the Puerto Rican people that the learning of English meant the loss of identity and subjugation to a foreign colonialist power. They attacked the educational system as “an insidious attempt to eliminate Spanish, the thin, entering wedge, calculated to destroy the personality of the people of Puerto Rico” (Annual Report of the Commissioner of Education, 1940–1941, as cited in Osuna, 1975, p. 347).

Algren (1984) offers a rhetorical analysis of the role of the movement against English in achieving Puerto Rican political autonomy:

By a rhetorical analysis, I mean focusing upon strategies of argumentation and persuasion as they shape a social reality. . . . Previous studies failed to analyze the rhetorical roots of the relationship by assuming that the movement against teaching in English is simply a rejection of the United States’ attempt to Americanize Puerto Ricans through the public school system . . . . But the rejection . . . suggests the existence of a complex rhetorical transaction between American and Puerto Rican authorities which has yet to be identified. (pp. 3–4)

Algren’s analysis takes on renewed interest with the 1991 action of the then pro-Commonwealth government making Spanish the only

---

3 These include the Gray Report, 1936 Osuna, 1975, pp. 372–373); Michael West’s Report, 1936 (Osuna, 1975, pp. 373–375); El Consejo de Educadores Europeos, 1958–59 (Caselmann, Berghin, & Bredsdorff, 1960); the study headed by Commissioner Padin, 1930–34 (Padin, 1935); and others by the Departamento de Instrucción Pública.
official language of Puerto Rico and the 1993 action of the current
prostatehood government restoring English to co-official status with
Spanish.

LANGUAGE PLANNING AND
LANGUAGE MAINTENANCE

The Conflict

At least a dozen definitions of language planning have been offered
since the term appeared in the 1950s (see, e.g., Cooper, 1989; Eastman,
1983). Cooper (1989) offers a behaviorally oriented summary of its
essential components:

Language planning refers to deliberate efforts to influence the behavior of
others with respect to the acquisition, structure, or functional allocation of
their language codes. (p. 45)

Puerto Rican language planning has taken place in three chronological
periods. From 1898 to 1900, the military government was openly
assimilationist in its desire to eliminate Spanish and Americanize the
island. From 1900 to 1952, the official policy was the bilingualization
of the island. (See Negrón de Montilla, 1975, for documentation of
early efforts to Americanize the island.) Since the inception of the
Commonwealth in 1952, knowledge of English has increasingly been
seen and promoted for its instrumental value as a second language
whose mastery promises to bring educational and financial benefits.

It would appear that all stages of Puerto Rican language planning
have encountered insurmountable difficulties. Could implementation
of language policy perhaps have been achieved through some means
other than the school system? Fishman (1977) tells us that

where English itself is an import (i.e., it is not accompanied by the massive
presence of at least semifluent speakers of English from abroad . . . ), then
its spread is, of necessity, from the top down . . . . For language spread,
schools have long been the major formal (organized) mechanisms involved,
particularly for those considered to be of school age and school-worthy. (p.
116)

The frustration experienced in the implementation of language
policy in Puerto Rico is not necessarily reflected in the experience
of other countries where entire generations have become functional
bilingual using textbooks, methodologies, and teachers that surely
could not have been so superior to those of Puerto Rico as to explain
the failure of language planning on the island. Of particular interest
are Aruba, Bonaire, and Curaçao for success in the spread of Dutch through the school system in Caribbean islands where, like Puerto Rico, the entire population continues to speak the native language, Papiamento. Unlike Spanish, however, Papiamento is not a major world language.

On the other hand, the spread of English through the school system in areas such as postcolonial India, Singapore, and Africa (see, e.g., Pride, 1982) represents fundamentally different conditions from those of Puerto Rico. Such countries are ethnically and linguistically heterogeneous, and they actively sought lingua francas for both internal and international communication. They required languages of education that would give their inhabitants access to literacy in an international language of commerce, diplomacy, technology, and so on. Such countries that have adopted English as one of their official or national languages have accepted it as a tribally or ethnically neutral language left behind by a former colonial power.

In sharp contrast, Puerto Rico is ethnically and linguistically homogeneous. Spanish is a major world language. Puerto Ricans did not achieve independence in 1898, after four centuries of Spanish colonialism but instead perceived language planning as an attempt to replace the vernacular with a new colonial language.

The Paradox

The writings of generations of academics, politicians, social commentators, and newspaper editors indicate that Puerto Ricans have never seen a real need for a second national language. The internal linguistic needs of Puerto Rico have always been met with just one common language appropriate for all spoken and written registers and domains. In addition, many Puerto Ricans have never accepted the argument that they have the obligation to learn English as U.S. citizens. They have reasoned that if they already have that citizenship, that if they are neither immigrants nor ciudadanos de segunda clase (second-class citizens), then why should they be obliged to learn English? This language attitude directly contradicts the traditional U.S. value that every U.S. citizen should be able to speak English.

An expressed major obstacle to the granting of statehood is the fact that the population of Puerto Rico is not English speaking (see Tollinchi, 1967). That is, many officials view mastery of English to be a precondition for statehood, but many Puerto Ricans question why they should learn English if Puerto Rico is not a state. Epstein (1967) expressed the paradox of ESL in Puerto Rico:

There seems to exist a clear need to learn English, but there is absolutely no urgency to make it a part of the national character. Puerto Ricans seem
to believe that English occupies a legitimate place in the curriculum as a required subject, but they do not wish to internalize what they feel would make them less Hispanic... They are ambivalent regarding their political future, but even more so regarding the consequences of learning English. (pp. 313-314; translation mine)

In 1966, The U.S.-Puerto Rican Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico concluded that statehood would necessarily involve a cultural and language accommodation to the rest of the federated States of the Union. This does not require the surrender of the Spanish language nor the abandonment of a rich cultural heritage. (Status of Puerto Rico, 1966, cited in Fisher, 1971, p. 21)

Nevertheless, with statehood is seen the inevitable destruction of Puerto Rican language and culture, despite official statements to the contrary. Riestra (1971) comments:

We would immediately be called upon to understand the possible penalties that the Americans would impose on us as payment for our admittance to the Union. No intellectually respectable anthropologist can claim that our cultural identity and our nationality can survive under statehood. (pp. 410-411; translation mine)

The Solution

Language maintenance is the antithesis of language shift. Maintenance refers to stability in the allocation of patterns of language use to specific domains and functions, whereas shift involves instances when huge populations adopted a new language or variety into their repertoires, whether or not at the same time they also gave up a language or variety that they had previously used. (Fishman, 1972, p. 107)

Language shift of any kind... is an indicator of dislocation. It implies the breakdown of a previously established societal allocation of functions; the alteration of previously recognized role-relationships, situations and domains, so that these no longer imply or call for the language with which they were previously associated. (Fishman, 1985, p. 66)

Language spread, says Cooper (1982), may be defined as an increase, over time, in the proportion of a communication network that adopts a given language or language variety for a given communicative function. (p. 6)

Cooper (1982) also points out that the concept of language spread as geographical or numerical must be recognized as metaphorical because
it is speakers that acquire languages and not languages that acquire speakers.

I believe that Puerto Rican culture has responded to fundamental principles in the sociology of language. Language spread may lead to language shift, where shift means the replacement of one language by another in one or more domains. Language shift may lead to language loss in favor of a competing language (for a discussion of the process of language loss, see Fishman, 1985). This is what many Puerto Ricans fear.

Two steps would be crucial to the occurrence of L1 language shift, in this case to English. First, non-English speakers must learn English, whether through education, migration, or the workplace. Then these bilingual speakers must pass on English to the next generation as a language of the home. If the second step does not occur and each succeeding generation must again learn English outside the home, L1 shift and subsequent loss cannot take place (see Lieberson & Curry, 1971).

Puerto Ricans have deterred the spread of English by preventing its penetration into the home, where natural rather than academic bilingualism could have developed. Even while demonstrating great enthusiasm for the learning of this language, they have succeeded for nearly a century in limiting its roles to the domains of the federal courts, the military, and certain aspects of the workplace and the schools. We must, however, add a recently introduced subdomain to this list, one whose impact on the language of the home will warrant extensive study: English-language cable TV.

Puerto Ricans have not been alone in efforts to prevent the spread of English via the home domain. In 1969, for example, the president of Kenya, wishing to promote the official use of Swahili, declared that the ruling party “would not tolerate homes where mothers and children talk to each other in English, forgetting their way of life” (quoted in Pride, 1982, p. 2).

Outside the home, the functions and domains of spoken English are so few that opportunities to develop communicative competence are extremely limited for most of the population (but see Resnick, 1980, regarding written English).

That is, for the vast majority of the residents of Puerto Rico, the need for communicative competence in spoken English is and always has been minimal. The Puerto Rican can live his or her life perfectly well, raise a family, progress economically and socially, participate in the institutions of the island, all without speaking English. Up to a point. The best professions require fluency in English: advertising, executive management, executive secretary, law, medicine, technology, and so on. University students require English to read their textbooks.
Of course, employees may also make use of limited English in other segments of the workplace; these are, according to the 1980 census, mainly jobs in sales and tourism. Nevertheless, knowledge of English for these jobs does not generally come from a determined scholarly effort: What is usually the case is that the Puerto Rican will obtain such employment after having learned English while living on the U.S. mainland or serving in the U.S. military.

Despite the failure of the teaching of English in Puerto Rico, perception of the need to learn it has remained constant. Lack of success has never produced a readjustment of goals. Liado-Berrios (1978) asked rural and urban public school students about their attitudes regarding the learning of English. The students expressed a desire for more interesting methods and materials; they sought practical language skills and not grammatical explanations and exercises. They saw English as extremely important for international communication, socioeconomic mobility, tourism, university study, and relations with the U.S. No student claimed that the learning of English was unimportant (see also Livoti, 1977).

CONCLUSION

Fishman (1977) has posed a fundamental question regarding the spread of English as a language of wider communication (LWC):

Why is it that some non-English mother tongue countries . . . have witnessed greater utilization or acceptance of English . . . than others . . . ? There may . . . be something about the particular auspices and processes through which English and other LWCs have been diffused during the past quarter century or so that sets these limits at a lower level than those formerly set for Latin, Arabic, and Spanish, and even for French, Chinese, and Russian. (p. 114)

In the case of Puerto Rico, we may find answers to Fishman's question and to the failure of a century of language planning and educational policies in the contradictory pressures of Puerto Rican nationalism versus those of U.S. nationism and in fundamental principles of language maintenance, spread, shift, and loss. That is, there is an expressed instrumental motivation for the learning of English. But there is also an additional, negative, motivation (cf. Kelman, 1971) that creates a societal imperative to block the spread of English and the perceived potential destruction that would ensue. Language shift may well be an indicator of the failure of a culture to control the direction or rate of language spread. As Lieberson (1982) points out,
languages do not differ among themselves in their inherent power, but the
users of language do. Accordingly, the carriers of different languages differ
in their ability to alter the existing language-usage pattern, thereby affecting
the spread of languages. (p. 41)

In this case, one may conclude that the ability of Puerto Rican culture
to withstand the spread of English has been stronger than the ability
of language planners to bring about the planned spread.

The language conflict of Puerto Rico is not one of functions or
domains. It is not a conflict of politics or education, although these are
the battlegrounds of the conflict. It is the conflict of a people—a
nation—that defends its existence against the real and perceived politi-
cal and economic pressures that would force all U.S. citizens to learn
English. (Similar pressures exist on the mainland, as evidenced in the
current English Only movement.) Even so, the learning of English is
not imposed only from Washington: Puerto Ricans themselves hold it
as an ideal. But “the passport that gives access to the magic world of
the metropolis,” as Germán de Granda (1972, p. 142; translation mine)
characterized English in Puerto Rico, is also the forbidden fruit that
would deprive them of their Garden of Eden.

What, then, can those responsible for the teaching of English to
speakers of other languages learn from the Puerto Rican experience?
As stated earlier, motivation transcends methodology. Second lan-
guage teaching must take into account not just the usual instrumental
and integrative motivation, but also negative motivation. Societal im-
peratives, whether overt or covert, cannot be ignored. Language plan-
ing researchers must determine whether and in what ways language
spread may be perceived as a threat to a society’s sense of preservation
or identity. School administrators and classroom teachers must be fully
prepared to deal with such perceptions as part of the implementation
of language planning through the educational system.
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The Appendix presents a synopsis of the school language policies and their educational and political repercussions under each school system administration from the military occupation until the establishment of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADMINISTRATOR</th>
<th>LANGUAGE OF INSTRUCTION</th>
<th>LANGUAGE OF INSTRUCTION HAD U.S. APPROVAL</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victor S. Clark,</td>
<td>English in all grades.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>85% illiteracy rate and perceived similarities with Hawaii and Philippines led Clark to anticipate no resistance to English except from “the very small intellectual minority” (Osuna 1975, p. 342).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin G. Brumbaugh,</td>
<td>English in the few high schools.</td>
<td>No. Resigned under pressure from Washington.</td>
<td>Lindsay took 540 teachers to Harvard and Cornell universities for summer study, established scholarships for study in U.S.; founded the University of Puerto Rico; built high schools and rural agricultural schools; set up certification testing program for English teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>This policy continued until 1904.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Lindsay,</td>
<td>No. Resigned under pressure from Washington.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>Made English the only language of instruction in all grades. Required teaching of reading in English in first grade although there were insufficient teachers who spoke English. Falkner’s policies continued until 1916.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald Falkner,</td>
<td>Yes. But Puerto Rican people increasingly associated school language policy with permanent “political status of the island.”</td>
<td></td>
<td>The entire curriculum was subordinated to the mastery of spoken English. It does not seem to have occurred to those responsible . . . that under normal circumstances only a negligible minority of our population need English while the entire population has need of an education” (Padín 1935, pp. 10-11). Open criticism of textbooks, methods, and teacher preparation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In 1911–1912, 98.4% of all urban school classes were conducted wholly in English (Osuna 1975, p. 346).

Yes.

Spanish in Grades 1–4, Spanish and English Grade 5. English Grades 6–12. Miller's policies were in effect 1916–1934.

No.

Beginning in 1934, Spanish in Grades 1–8, with English as a "preferred subject." English in Grades 9–12.

No.

Reinstated English as the language of instruction in all grades.

Yes.

Spanish as the language of instruction in all grades. English as a required subject in all grades. This policy has remained in effect from 1946 until today.

Yes.

Deficiencies regarding textbooks, methods, and teacher preparation will continue to be criticized for decades to come.

Yes.

No.

Yes.

No. Resigned under pressure from Washington in 1936.

Padín's program, begun after a careful 4-year study of the educational system, was popular in Puerto Rico.

No.

Gallardo was appointed by President F. D. Roosevelt, who intervened directly in language policy. See text, Last presidential appointee (H. S. Truman); then elected in 1947. In 1952 the Constitution of the new Commonwealth stabilized the school language policy.
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Complaints as Positive Strategies: What the Learner Needs to Know

DIANA BOXER
University of Florida

This study is an analysis of the speech act sequence of indirect complaint/commiseration in conversational interactions between Japanese learners of English as a second language and their English-speaking peers. An indirect complaint (IC) is defined as the expression of dissatisfaction about oneself or someone/something that is not present. It differs from a direct complaint in that the addressee is neither held responsible nor capable of remedying the perceived offense. Data from a larger study on ICs among native speakers (NSs) showed that ICs are frequently employed as positive strategies for the purpose of establishing points of commonality. The focus here is a contrastive view of IC responses by NSs and Japanese learners. Consequences of nonsubstantive, noncommiserative responses on the part of the learners are explored in light of missed opportunities for sustained interaction that can lead to increased opportunities for negotiation of meaning in the L2.

Learners of English need to be aware that there are ways of interacting orally with native speakers that will enhance their ability to get to know and develop relationships with English-speaking peers. Such knowledge can be important not only in decreasing learners' sense of alienation in a foreign country but also in providing them with an opportunity to communicate more in their L2 in general, thereby increasing comprehension of input through negotiated interaction.

The term negotiated interaction is used here in two senses. First, from the perspective of sociolinguists interested in second language acquisition, it is viewed as a means toward the construction of social relationships. Second, from the perspective of L2 acquisition researchers, negotiated interaction has to do with exchanges between native and nonnative speakers in which they work toward mutual comprehension through their joint efforts at modifying their input and output (Pica, Holliday, Lewis, & Morgenthaler, 1989). It is posited that there is a direct link between the ability to carry on a sustained sequential interac-
tion and increased opportunities for negotiated interaction in which nonnative speakers (NNSs) signal their need for and receive input adjusted to their current level of L2 comprehension. This in turn provides learners with (a) opportunities to receive feedback on the comprehensibility and appropriateness of their interlanguage output; (b) opportunities to modify the phonological, morphosyntactic, lexical, pragmatic, and discourse features of their interlanguage in response to native speaker (NS) requests for greater comprehensibility; and (c) opportunities to further sequential interaction with NS peers through more nativelike and appropriate language use. The important point here is the distinction between sequential and negotiated interaction: Sequential interaction refers to the smooth, sustained progression of discourse in which a successful social exchange between learners and interlocutors is realized; negotiated interaction refers to the restructuring of discourse until mutual understanding is reached (T. Pica, personal communication, 1989). Successful sequencing can create solidarity with other speakers which can open up opportunities for negotiation, comprehension of unfamiliar L2 input, and interlanguage modification. Similarly, experiences in negotiated interaction can lead to an increased sense of rapport between learners and NS interlocutors who are able to help NNSs communicate in a more targetlike/appropriate manner in their L2.

This paper focuses on conversational interactions between Japanese learners of English and their U.S. counterparts. For all learners of English as a second language, and particularly for those whose L1 rules of speaking differ greatly from those of the L2, the knowledge of how to employ solidarity-establishing speech behavior with NS peers is at the root of successful sequential interactions.

In cross-cultural interactions in English between speakers of U.S. English and speakers of Japanese, a particular type of problem arises. When the native English speakers work to establish solidarity through rapport-inspiring speech behavior, they frequently do not receive the types of responses that allow for a sustained sequential interaction. This result is, by and large, a consequence of repeated backchannel responses (e.g., uh huh) on the part of Japanese interlocutors that do not ultimately lead to more substantive responses.

Recent studies on backchanneling behavior have looked at specific cross-cultural interactions to examine the differences in functions of backchannels between the two societies and the repercussions of such differences in conversational satisfaction. Maynard (1986) and White (1989) studied conversations between U.S. and Japanese speakers in order to ascertain the frequency and functions of backchanneling behavior. Both found backchannels to be much more frequent among Japanese than U.S. interlocutors. Japanese interactants, Maynard
noted, "possess a strong indication for mutual monitoring and cooperation" (p. 1104).

Based on her Conversational Satisfaction Inventory given to NSs of English, White (1989) concludes that "American speakers perceived Japanese listeners who gave more backchannels than other Japanese as showing more encouragement, concern, and interest." White states, "in conversation, the fear of deviating from the speaker's viewpoint and the eagerness to anticipate, understand, and accommodate the other's idea may, in part, be demonstrated by the frequency with which the Japanese listener interjects with a backchannel" (p. 67).

Research specifically focusing on Japanese women's language use (e.g., Lebra, 1984; Lebra, Paulston, & Powers, 1976; Smith, 1992; Wetzel, 1988) points to the apparent fact that empathy is ranked high and that frequent backchannels by Japanese women indicate empathy. Smith (1992), in discussing Lebra's as well as her own observations of traditional speech styles of Japanese women, notes that "modesty in speech" entails "reticence, softness of voice, a polite or feminine style of speech" (p. 62).

There are only sporadic hints in the literature that backchannels are insufficient responses under certain circumstances. Schegloff (1982) noted that perhaps the most common use of backchannels is when a listener wishes to acknowledge that "an extended unit of talk is underway by another, and that it is not yet, or may not yet be . . . complete" (p. 81). As such, backchanneling responses show a willingness to decline to produce a fuller turn at talk at a specific juncture. Schegloff notes that four or five repeated backchannels in a row may hint at disinterest on the part of an addressee. When backchanneling moves are employed in abundance or in succession and without other substantive responses, they frequently discourage a speaker from continued talk. This has also been noted by West and Garcia (1988), who state: "talk on some topic-in-progress may also be extinguished through conversationalists' lack of verbal activity" (p. 556). West and Garcia (1988) call these moves "acknowledgement tokens" and state that they can "discourage the continuation of talk on a topic in progress and thus provide a warrant for topic change" (p. 556).

It is part of the communicative competence of NSs to know how to employ rapport-inspiring speech acts and appropriate, substantive responses in an effort to achieve a further interaction. Examples of rapport-inspiring speech acts are compliments, expressions of gratitude, invitations, and apologies, to name a few. A considerable body of research on these speech acts has already been carried out by a group of scholars interested in the connection between sociolinguistics and TESOL (see, e.g., Beebe & Takahashi, 1989; Beebe, Takahashi, & Uliss-Weltz, 1985; Blum-Kulka, 1982; Blum-Kulka, Danet, & Gherson,
The present study looks specifically at a speech act sequence that is often overlooked as a potential solidarity-establishing/rapport-inspiring speech behavior. The focus here is on a type of negative evaluation termed the indirect complaint (IC). A negative evaluation is a speech act that evaluates some person or situation through a statement that carries a negative semantic load. An IC is defined as the expression of dissatisfaction to an addressee about oneself or someone/something that is not present. It differs from a direct complaint in that the addressee is neither held responsible nor capable of remedying the perceived offense (Boxer, 1991). The following are examples of direct and indirect complaints.

**Direct Complaint**

1. A is a male customer in restaurant; B is a male waiter:
   A: Excuse me, I didn’t order my hamburger well done. This is far from medium rare.
   B: Sorry. We’ll try again, but it will take a few minutes.

   Whereas it may be the cook here who is ultimately responsible, the addressee, the waiter, is the party capable of remedying the offense.

**Indirect Complaint**

2. Two male friends:
   A: I’ll tell ya, New York is terrible!
   B: It’s a zoo. Insane.

   Whereas both direct and indirect complaints have the potential of leading to lengthy interactions between speaker and addressee, it is generally only in the indirect complaint that one finds conversational material upon which shared beliefs and attitudes may be expressed. Direct complaints, by virtue of the fact that they confront the party that is either responsible for or capable of remedying the perceived offense, are typically face-threatening acts (Brown & Levinson, 1978). Whereas some research has already been carried out on complaints, few of them are published. These studies have, by and large, focused on direct complaining and on the complaints themselves rather than on the responses to them and the entire troubles-sharing speech event of which ICS are a part. Studies of direct complaints as a confrontational speech act have been carried out both on native-English-speaker behavior (see D’Amico-Reisner, 1985; Rader, 1977; Schaefer, 1982).
and other languages and/or cross-cultural interactions (see De Capua, 1987, on comparisons of U.S. and German complaining behavior; Giddens, 1981, on complaints in Spanish; Olshtain & Weinbach, 1987, on complaints in English vs. Hebrew).

As for complaints addressed to a party not responsible for the perceived offense, Katriel (1985) looked at Israeli "gripping" rituals; Jefferson (1984) and Jefferson and Lee (1981) studied "troubles-telling" encounters from a conversation analysis point of view. These studies make reference to the potential of establishing solidarity through the gripping/troubles-telling encounter. To date, however, there appears to be no existing research on either type of complaining activity among speakers of Japanese.

Indirect complaint sequences do not always function as rapport-inspiring speech interactions. Boxer (1991) showed that approximately 25% of IC sequences served to distance the interlocutors from each other. Notwithstanding, fully 75% of ICs were found to be rapport-inspiring by a group of 10 native-English-speaking raters. The study found that speakers of English frequently employed ICs in sequential interaction in an attempt to establish solidarity. An example of how this occurs can be seen in the following three sequences:

3. Three female interlocutors. A and C are doctoral students. B is their dissertation advisor:
   A: I'm depressed and also rather anxious. You know I just got back to work.
   B: Oooh!
   A: And I have been having, I thought I was having a heart attack 'cause I was having pains in the chest.
   B: Oh my God!
   A: And when I tried to exercise it just kept getting worse and worse, I couldn't breathe.
   C: Is it anxiety you think?
   A: Well, finally I said I think I should see a doctor and [her husband, who is a doctor] said, "Well, where's the pain?" and he said it's stress which is causing esophageal irritation and take some antacids.
   C: But you didn't manifest as a stomach disorder, did you?
   A: No, no. I didn't have any stomach problems. It was right in here [points to her chest].
   C: Heartburn like.
   A: No, pressure. And he said, you know, people who are having heart attacks go like this [hand gesture on chest] when they have heart-related pain. But people who go like this [different hand gesture on chest].
   C: That's interesting.
   A: But it's all part of, you know.
4. Following a short pause. The same interlocutors:
   C: I came in yesterday.
   B: Did you?
   C: Yeah, I stayed home with a sick kid until noon and [my husband] got
   home and told me he was sick. I was going to come here and return
   these books.
   Anyway, so I got the book, saw M [a classmate], talked to her for a
   few minutes, ran to the library, took the books out again and went
   home. I was afraid of leaving.
   A: Oh, sure.
   C: A sick man with a child with strep throat.
   B: Sure.
   A: God, that’s awful!
   B: If he gets strep, he’s in bad shape.
   A: Oh, that’s right.
   C: Anyway, I felt a little stressed yesterday

5. Following another short pause:
   A: Days like this are supposed to be sunny and springy and warm.
   B: That’s right. And I spent yesterday in the hospital getting my leg X-
   rayed . . . and he says, “It’s gonna be another month before you’re
   walking without the walker.”
   C: A month?
   B: Yeah.
   C: Hmm.
   B: Because of how bad a break it was. He said, “Oh you’re so lucky that
   you don’t have a big lump here. Your bone could have . . .”
   C: That’s supposed to make you feel better?
   B: Yeah.
   I’m tired of the whole thing! I’m tired of a broken leg!
   C: Boy, I can imagine how that must feel!

Each interlocutor took turns consecutively, with the others offering
commiserations. The first IC by speaker A in Sequence 3 was the
opener to health-related issues. The two addressees at this point took
her cue to relate a similarly negative tale of physical ailments. Through
this give and take of ICs and commiserations, a rapport was established
that possibly brought the interlocutors closer to each other by opening
up a more personal side to their relationship. This type of negotiation
of relationships was found in the NS study to be a heavily female
phenomenon.

For learners of English, particularly those whose sociocultural norms
differ greatly in the use/nonuse of troubles-telling speech behavior,
attaining an awareness of how to achieve such a sense of solidarity can
lead to increased opportunities for negotiated interaction. It is now
widely believed that communicative competence should be the goal of
language learning and teaching (Canale, 1983; Paulston, 1974; Rivers, 1973; Savignon, 1972; Wolfson, 1989). Learning to perform speech acts and to appropriately respond in the flow of discourse is an important part of achieving communicative competence. Before we can know how best to apply findings from NS studies on speech acts, we need data on what specific groups of learners are doing regarding speech act realization.

Sociolinguistic studies over the past several years have begun to provide such information (see, e.g., specific studies on pragmatic transfer between Japanese and English: Beebe & Takahashi, 1989; Takahashi & Beebe, 1987). These studies have begun to show the problems that Japanese speakers of English have in conversation with NS peers. Regarding ICs, however, aside from impressionistic observations that NS teachers may have provided their students, there is an absence of systematic information on how they are used, what the responses look like, and the social strategies entailed.

METHOD

Data for two studies on ICs are described here: (a) Briefly discussed will be findings on IC exchanges by NSs in conversation with other NSs. (b) Data on NSs from the same speech community in conversation with Japanese learners will be described in detail. For this second part, the central research question is the following: What are the ways in which Japanese NNSs, as opposed to U.S. NSs, responded to ICs in the flow of discourse in English, and what are the consequences of their responses for sustained interaction?

Conversational data used for the NS/NS portion of the study were taken from spontaneous speech that was either audiotaped or recorded in the form of field notes. The NS/NS data consists of 533 IC exchanges within 426 longer sequences recorded in and around a university community. These conversations were transcribed and analyzed with respect to types of IC themes, types of responses, social distribution, and social functions. Two hundred and ninety-five interlocutors were recorded in spontaneous conversation, 195 women and 100 men. A wide variety of speech situations was sampled. Approximately 95% of the data was audiorecorded, most of it in homes, in restaurants, and in student lounges or classrooms at the university. Sequences recorded in the form of field notes were, by and large, overheard by the researcher as an eavesdropper rather than as a participant.

In addition to the recording of spontaneous speech in various settings in the community, judgments from native-English-speaking in-
formants who were not recorded in conversation were used to aid in categorizations for those parts of the study specifically focusing on the social functions of ICs. Thus, categorizations were not solely carried out by the researcher but were cross-coded by a group of 10 native speakers from the community in order to achieve maximum reliability. A second group of 10 native-speaking informants took part in an ethnographic interview. The specific purpose of this interview was to examine the norms of the community. As such, native-speaker knowledge was uncovered in order to corroborate some of the findings emerging from the analysis of taped sequences of conversation.

The findings of the study indicated that female interlocutors who were status-equal friends, acquaintances, or strangers (i.e., nonintimates) were the most likely to employ IC sequences in which support was manifested. A part of the communicative competence of native-speaking women in the community studied was the ability to use the troubles-telling speech event to negotiate a sense of commonality with their interlocutors.

For the purpose of ascertaining the use of ICs in NS/NNS conversation, the learners studied were participants in an ongoing conversation partners program at a university English language program. Ten Japanese female students enrolled in the program were audiotaped in conversational interaction with their U.S. counterparts. All were in the intermediate or advanced levels of English placement.

In the NS/NS portion of the earlier study, the three independent variables were gender of interlocutors, their relative social status, and their social distance relationship. Relative social status is viewed here in a vertical sense; that is, of higher or lower status. Social distance had to do with the degree of friendship/intimacy between interlocutors along a horizontal scale of social distance. Recall that the most important finding of the NS study was that ICs were employed as rapport-inspiring speech acts most often among female friends, acquaintances, and strangers, as the above sequences (3, 4, 5) and following example illustrate:

6. A is a female graduate student; B is a library assistant, also a female graduate student. They know each other by face but not by name:
   A: They never have what you need in here! You’d think they’d at least have the important books and articles.
   B: They didn’t have what you were looking for?
   A: No.
   B: That’s typical!

Through such exclamation responses, addressees such as the one in the above example are able to signal their identification and commiseration with a speaker’s complaint.
The finding on the importance of gender as a variable in IC use in the NS study suggested that it might be most useful to look at female learners in conversation with female native speakers for a cross-cultural study on IC use. As for social status, the participants were status equals since they were all of approximately equal age, educational level, and social class. Regarding the social distance relationship, the participants were at first strangers, eventually becoming acquaintances and possibly friends.

Thirty-nine hours of NS/NNS conversation between 10 sets of partners were recorded and IC sequences transcribed for this portion of the study, yielding 223 IC exchanges. Coding was cross-checked by the same 10 native-English-speaking informants as above (for the NS/NS data). Conversations were recorded during an average of 8 half-hour meetings over a period of 1 semester. Thus, the interlocutors were virtual strangers during the first recording, gradually building a relationship at subsequent meetings.

There are several important points to be made about the design of this study. First, as is always the case with recorded interactions, it is impossible to account for the effects of the recording on the quality of the interactions. Second, one of the artifacts of analyzing the talk of conversation partners is that this is a speech event distinct from that of everyday conversation. Finally, as in all cases of NS/NNS interaction, there is a confounding of the social status variable, giving higher status to the native speaker of the language used as the medium of conversation. Thus, despite the apparent equality of status of the NS and NNS interlocutors, there is a status differential favoring the native English speaker. In addition, although participation was voluntary, the subjects might not have chosen to maintain almost 4 hours of conversation with each other under ordinary circumstances. However, one advantage of this situation was that, being forced to converse, the speakers had to find things to talk about and were therefore compelled to get to know each other. This point is important given the fact that Japanese speakers have been found to differ greatly from their U.S. counterparts in the amount of personal information disclosed during spontaneous conversation (Barnlund, 1975). Given these observations, there were anticipated differences in IC use and responses.

Although only 10 sets of NS/NNS conversation partners were studied, the total number of hours of conversation recorded for the partners was approximately double the total hours in the NS/NS study. Nonetheless, the NS/NS study yielded more than twice the number of IC exchanges.
FINDINGS

NS/NS responses

The manner in which the addressee responds to an IC can significantly promote further interaction. That is to say, depending on the type of response elicited, the complaint sequence can affirm or reaffirm solidarity among the interlocutors or alienate them from each other. The implication for learners is that if one wishes to accomplish the former—that is, establish some commonality with the speaker—the addressee will need to know how to respond to ICs when they are used as conversational openers and supporters.

Six types of IC responses emerged as major categories of ways in which NSs in this university community responded to indirect complaints. Table 1 provides three types of information: (a) The first column indicates overall percentages of each response type in the corpus. (b) The second column indicates the percentages of female responses to female ICs for each response type. (c) The third column indicates the percentages of male responses to male ICs for each response type. Examples follow.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response type</th>
<th>NS/NS IC responses</th>
<th>NS/NS Female responses</th>
<th>NS/NS Male responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joking/Teasing</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>6.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonsubstantive reply</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>12.16</td>
<td>10.36</td>
<td>24.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice/lecture</td>
<td>14.12</td>
<td>10.36</td>
<td>16.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contradiction</td>
<td>15.29</td>
<td>11.16</td>
<td>17.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commiseration</td>
<td>45.29</td>
<td>56.97</td>
<td>32.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Joking/Teasing

7. A is a female graduate student; B is a female office worker:
   A: How are ya doin B?
   B: Oh, not so great. I can't find S. Maybe she told me she was doing something this morning and I don't remember.
   A: You're getting old!

Nonsubstantive Reply

8. Overheard in a dentist’s office. A is a female employee; B is a male patient:
A: They keep tearing down those historical buildings. If one supermarket went up in that location, who's to say... maybe if it were something else altogether, but when they replace it with the same thing...
B: Hmm (nods head repeatedly).
A: So you have the summer off?

**Question**

9. Two female graduate students:
   A: I was up all night with C [A's daughter].
   B: What's wrong?
   A: She's had this hacking cough, and it's gotten worse. So I'm gonna take her to the doctor.
   B: You know, M [B's daughter] is home sick today too.
   A: Why?
   B: I'm not sure, she's still sleeping. She's either exhausted or caught a chill or both.

**Advice/Lecture**

10. A is a male office employee; B is a female office manager:
    A: This vacuum doesn't pick up the little pieces.
    B: You probably have to put more pressure on it.
    A: It still doesn't work.

**Contradiction**

11. A is a male graduate student; B is a male lecturer:
    A: This doesn't follow your basic economic, uh, theories.
    B: It has to. I would have a fit if you said that.

**Commiseration**

12. Two female acquaintances:
    A: My husband is in Greece this week, so I'm packing myself. Most of it is books and manuscripts.
    B: Oh, that's the worst!
    A: I told him that after this move I'm never moving again.
    B: That's what I said after our last one. It's tiring.

The six categories of responses to ICs in this study demonstrate the extreme variation in the possibilities for responding. Joking/Teasing responses serve to make light of a situation. Nonsubstantive responses include null response, nonverbal backchannels, and verbal backchannels in repeated succession without an ultimate response of another
category. This response type usually indicates the unwillingness of the addressee to express mutual concern, at least with respect to the topic in question. When a nonsubstantive reply occurs as an IC response, it typically results in a failure to engage in an elaborated sequence in which support is manifested. The question category includes questions that request elaboration of the IC as well as questions that challenge a speaker to defend his or her IC. The former, those that draw out the complaint, were by far the most frequent type of question and typically served as interim responses that eventually led to one of the other types of responses. Advice/Lecture incorporates responses that moralize as well as give simple advice on how to solve the problem. Contradictions include disagreements and often serve to defend the object of the complaint. It should be noted here that these last two categories were heavily male responses.

It is in the response type termed commiseration that we clearly see the sort of responses that may lead to discussions of shared concern and that may therefore be considered among those strategies that establish or reaffirm solidarity and in turn promote successful sequencing. Commiserative responses show agreement or reassurance, tell a speaker that the addressee knows the feeling through a mutual complaint, or sometimes merely commiserate through a short exclamation such as oh, no!

**NS/NNS Responses**

For the NS/NNS portion of the study, this research attempted to ascertain whether the NSs and the Japanese learners differed in the distribution of their IC responses. A chi-square analysis was carried out using five of the six categories of responses, excluding the Joking/Teasing category, where the ns were too small to be included. The chi-square probability statistic indicated a significant difference in types of responses between the learners and the native speakers: $X^2(4, n = 222) = 72.282$, $p < .00001$.

A comparison of frequencies of commiserative responses in the NS/NS data and the NS/NNS data yielded a statistically significant difference. A 2 x 2 chi-square was run with rows being commiserate noncommiserate and two columns being NS/NS IC response and NS/NNS IC response. Recall that in the NS/NS corpus, the incidence of commiserations among those who had responses ($n = 499$) was approximately 45% overall. Similarly, in the NS/NNS corpus, clearly the overwhelmingly highest frequency response for native speakers responding to NNS ICs ($n = 85$) was in the category of commiseration: 61. 18% of all NS responses. NSs gave commiserating responses to NNS ICs significantly more than to NS ICs: $X^2(1, n = 584) = 5.17$ $p = .023$. 
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TABLE 2
IC Responses of NSs and NNSs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response type</th>
<th>NNS/NS</th>
<th>NS/ NNS</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NNS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed Frequencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonsubstantive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contradiction</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joking/teasing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice/lecture</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commiseration</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentages of Column Totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response type</th>
<th>NS/NS</th>
<th>NS/ NNS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>33.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonsubstantive</td>
<td>21.18</td>
<td>18.84</td>
<td>19.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>4.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contradiction</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joking/teasing</td>
<td>10.59</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>5.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice/lecture</td>
<td>61.18</td>
<td>20.29</td>
<td>35.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commiseration</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* NNS/NS – nonnative speaker utters IC, native speaker responds; NS/NNS = native speaker utters IC, nonnative speaker responds.

FIGURE 1
IC Responses of NSs and NNSs

COMPLAINTS AND COMMISERATION
However, in computing a 2 x 2 chi-square for female NS/NS responses and NS/NNS responses, the differences were not significant: $X^2(1, n = 335) = .08$ $p = .77$. Thus, although NS women commiserated somewhat more frequently with NNS women than NS women, the difference was not significant. The salient contrast here is the frequency of NNS responses to NS ICs: 52.9% of the NNS responses to NS ICs were nonsubstantive. This was due to the preponderance of repeated verbal and nonverbal backchannel responses by the NNSs. Though commiserations were the second highest frequency response for learners, they totaled “only 20.29% of all NNS responses.

Nonsubstantive Replies

Whereas nonsubstantive replies accounted for only 2.35% of the NS responses to NNS ICs, it accounted for more than half the total NNS responses to NS ICs (this difference is significant, $p < .0001$ using Fisher’s exact test). The Japanese learners were frequently unaware that a substantive response to the IC was called for. Thus, they often responded with no more than a backchanneling move. The majority of these were insufficient responses because they almost invariably led to a topic switch. Topic switch and acceptance of topic switch have been found to be typical of the strategies and tactics employed by both interlocutors in NS/NNS conversation (Long, 1983). This appears to be true particularly for NNSs with low proficiency, decreasing as proficiency increases. Recall, however, that in this study, the learners were intermediate and upper level learners. Given this fact, it would be expected that there would be much less abandonment of the topic and more sustained sequential interaction between the interlocutors.

A majority of the sequences in the NS/NNS data contained examples of nonsubstantive responses on the part of the learners that caused the NS to eventually abandon the topic under discussion. The Japanese learners were often unable or unwilling to sustain their part of the conversation. Given the information known about Japanese discourse style, it may very well be due to lack of awareness on the part of the NNSs that they are expected to substantively reply to ICs. The following sequence illustrates a typical nonsubstantive response:

13. NS: I found it very hard in France, when I was there to take a regular French university course because it was structured differently.

   NNS: Yeah.

   NS: And I found it really hard to understand the structure and to be able to understand what he wanted us to read and what kind of things to do. Sometimes I didn’t study the right thing.

   NNS: ø response.
Given the learner’s lack of response, there was no way for the NS to continue in an elaboration of her IC or for both participants to continue a sequence of talk based on some commonality. Whereas it is probable that the learner had never studied in France, this would have been a good opening for her to discuss some of the difficulties she was having in adjusting to living and studying in the U.S. Thus, the NS’s IC could have been used as an opener for the NNS to ask questions or talk about some of the problems she was encountering, and likely the NS would have commiserated and offered suggestions based on her membership in the native-speaker community. The learner’s nonsubstantive response may have resulted in a missed opportunity.

In 1 of the 10 dyads, the NS was a Japanese-American student from Hawaii. She received many more elaborated responses than all of the other U.S. participants. Despite the fact that all of the NS partners were able to speak some Japanese (they were all studying Japanese at the University), apparently the U.S. participant in this particular dyad was more fluent in Japanese than most of the other NSs, as she was reared in a Japanese-speaking home. In this case a situation of shared ethnicity might have been the reason for the learners increased propensity to respond (Erickson & Shultz, 1982; Gumperz, 1982) as is evident in the following example:

14. NS: My mother plays Koto [musical instrument]. It’s very difficult to take care of because Hawaii is so humid. The wood . . .
NNS: Hawaii is humid?
NS: Humid.
NNS: But Japan is same, Japan is also humid.
NS: Yeah, but we live in an especially rainy area of the Oahu Mountains. So it rains almost every day . . . everything in the house can get mold, mildew.
NNS: Mildew?
NS: That green [translates into Japanese]. The inside of the house, you have to be careful of leaving water.
NNS: Oh?
NS: It’s not that bad, but it’s pretty moist.
NNS: Moist?
NS: [explains in Japanese].

There is a striking difference in the apparent willingness of the learner to talk to her conversation partner. Also, the amount of negotiated interaction that took place was far greater than what was seen in the majority of IC sequences between the other partners. This finding suggests that there is a relationship between a sense of solidarity and a feeling of freedom on the learners part to seek clarification, use confirmation checks, and check her own comprehension. However, shared ethnicity is but one possible factor leading to the creation of a
sense of rapport between participants in an interaction. The establish-
ment of solidarity between participants in an IC sequence through the
employment of commiserative responses also has the potential to set
the stage for a conversation in which negotiated interaction is possible.
A sustained sequential interaction in which rapport is manifested can
thus be important in opening up opportunities for increased compre-
hensible input and output.

By asking for clarification and checking on her own comprehen-
sion, the learner in the above sequence was doing something to participate
actively in the conversation. But such negotiation was so uncommon
in this data and nonsubstantive responses so prevalent that one NS
even went so far as to complain to the NNS that she felt she was doing
all the work:

15. NS: My plane trip [to Japan] was pretty difficult, I mean it wasn't
direct from New York to Tokyo or anything. I had to go to
Toronto . . .

NNS: Mm hmn.

NS: I had to go to Toronto and then I had to spend a night in a hotel
in Toronto, and then I had to get to the airport again the next
day, and go to Vancouver and switch planes, and I mean, that's
a lot of traveling, and I was really tired.

NNS: Yeah?

NS: And then when I got to Tokyo after I had been traveling for 20
hours I had to catch a cab into Tokyo station . . .

NNS: Uh huh . . .

NS: Then get another cab and find my way, you know, and I had to
explain to the taxi driver where my hotel was because he didn't
know where it was.

NNS: Right, uh huh . . . Where did you stay?
(a few exchanges later about hotel)

NS: It's so funny, I sit here going on and on and you just say, "uh
huh," it's like I'm in an interview or something. (both laugh)

Apparently this NS, and no doubt other NS partners, found the NNSs'
backchannel responses to be inadequate and frustrating. The NS
quoted above was the only one who ventured to say something explicit
about how this made her feel.

Hence, whereas it may indeed be true that backchannels in some
contexts have the potential of functioning as encouragement to a
speaker, findings from the present research indicate that this is true
only up to a certain point in an interaction. That is, when backchannel-
ing responses surpass a certain critical mass, when they are overused
and/or do not eventually lead to or co-occur with a more substantive
response, they can and indeed frequently do lead to the extinguishing
of the topic under discussion and frequently the abandonment of a
conversation.
Thus, contrary to the prevailing view of backchanneling as encouragement to the speaker, this study appears to indicate that an overuse of such responses discourages rather than encourages further talk on a specific topic. With ICs, successful sustained interaction depends on responses that do more than merely indicate that the listener is paying attention. It requires a more active response, one in which the addressee indicates a more definitive reply, whether it be in the form of questioning, agreement or disagreement, or commiseration.

Commiseration

Recall that in the NS/NS data of the larger study, 45.29% of the responses overall and 56.97% of the female responses to female ICs were commiserations. In the NS/NNS data, this percentage was even higher for NSs who were responding to NNSs ICs (61.18%). Commiserations by the NNSs when in the role of addressee were much less frequent (20.29%, significantly different from 16.18%, \( \chi^2(1, n = 223) = 38.224, p < .00001 \)), and this was primarily due to the preponderance of nonsubstantive responses (52.9%). When we think of how commiseration functions toward the establishment of solidarity, leading to smooth sequential interaction that opens the door to opportunities for negotiated interaction, we see that there are missed opportunities when learners fail to respond or respond only minimally with a backchannel when they could have been agreeing or commiserating. The following example demonstrates a rare learner-to-native-speaker commiseration:

16. NNS: Someone reads your diary in your house?
   NS: My brother did.
   NNS: Oh, no!
   NS: It was terrible. He just picked it up. ‘Cause I write novels in notebooks and he saw the notebook and thought, “oh, a story” so he picked it up to read it.
   NNS: Oh my!
   NS: And then he saw lines like “I really hated lying” [both laugh]. So now I’ve made sure no one reads my diary.
   NNS: So you must keep a key.
   NS: Key?
   NNS: For your diary.
   NS: No, it’s just an ordinary notebook, but it’s in four different languages now so that anyone who just knows English won’t be able to figure anything out!

Two simple and short exclamations served to express commiseration. Because exclamations as commiserations are simple to learn and use for NNSs, these might be formulaic devices that learners can incorpo-
rate into their conversations with NSs. Such exclamations are as easy to use as backchannels; however, they show the speaker that the addressee is doing more than just listening but showing empathy as well. It was the rare learner who knew how to commiserate in much the same way that NSs do. The majority maintained their part of the conversation as minimally as possible, responding only with short, nonsubstantive responses that did little to make the NS want to continue talking.

Nonsubstantive was one of only two types of responses that the NNSs gave more than NSs (the second being contradictions). Both of these types of responses work against the establishment of solidarity. The NNSs in this study were unaware that a more definitive response is expected when replying to an IC. By merely changing an um hm to an oh, no!, learners can change their response from an insufficient one to a commiserative one and thus redirect the course of the interaction. It does indeed begin to appear that responses in the form of agreement, reassurance, and commiseration work to establish a stronger bond between NS and NNS interlocutors that can lead to increased opportunities for NNSs to augment their linguistic abilities in the L2.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The data for this study indicate salient differences between NNS and NS use of ICs and responses to ICs. An attempt was made to track the presence of IC sequences in the data by recording the meeting during which each sequence took place. The suspicion was that a gradual building of rapport would result in an increased frequency of ICs/commiseration sequences during later meetings. This turned out not to be the case. The few NNSs who did initiate ICs with their conversation partners appeared to be exhibiting idiosyncratic behavior and used ICs as much if not more in the earlier meetings as the later meetings.

The differences in frequency of nonsubstantive responses and commiserative responses between the two groups may reflect differences in the way talk in general is valued in their two societies. Yamada (1989) points out that “Americans have a positive orientation towards talk, where talk is seen as a way of coming to a better understanding of one another, and resolving problems and difficulties; Japanese have a negative orientation towards talk, where talk is seen as of kind of problem-maker itself” (p. 12). Hence, it may well be that Japanese verbal and nonverbal backchanneling behavior attempts to avoid what is perceived as the possibility of face-threatening behavior.
The different orientation to talk, then, may be one important reason for the significant difference in responses to ICs between the Japanese and U.S. interlocutors in this data. Repeated backchannels such as yeah, uh huh, and hm, almost always resulted in topic abandonment. The high incidence of topic switch subsequent to backchannels indicates that the NSs found such moves on the part of their conversation partners to be discouraging rather than encouraging (see Example 15 above).

One of the problems with such interlocutor dissatisfaction, of course, is the missed opportunities for learners to engage in conversations with their NS peers in which they feel comfortable participating in what can be viewed as negotiated interaction, one in which both interlocutors are able to ask questions, contradict, joke, and give advice. By missing these opportunities, learners may be depriving themselves of the opportunity to stretch their linguistic abilities in their second language.

Even if learner motivations are more instrumental than integrative in orientation, and they are not interested in establishing closer ties with NSs, they may be missing opportunities to augment their linguistic skills by not knowing how to sustain interaction leading to a heightened level of input/output. I am not suggesting that learners, particularly adult learners, give up their culturally based conversational styles to conform completely to L2 conversational norms and give up part of their culture by doing so. What is suggested here is that a recognition of what NSs do in their discourse provides cues as to what types of responses by the NNSs may lead to increased opportunities for interaction. Thus, whether or not learners plan to stay in the U.S., they need to acquire a certain level of communicative competence even for a successful instrumental orientation.

The NS/NS part of this research has begun to demonstrate that negative evaluations such as ICs frequently have a solidarity-building function. In at least some U.S. speech communities, they have the potential to open and support conversations, interactions, and even relationships. If Japanese speakers transfer their rules of speaking to English and initially respond to ICs with noncommiserative replies, they may well be missing opportunities which would lead to further interaction. Because of these basic differences in speech behavior, the building of rapport and the subsequent establishment of fertile ground for interaction appear, from this research, to be very difficult for Japanese learners of English.

What, then, are the implications for language pedagogy? Although the controversy continues over whether sociolinguistic rules can or should be taught (Kachru, 1988; Widdowson, 1988), it is clear that for a large segment of learners in contexts where English is not a nonnative
in institutionalized variety, the ability to communicate with native speakers appropriately as well as correctly is crucial. For the ever-increasing population of adult learners studying ESL in the U.S., the acquisition of sociolinguistic competence is a necessary component of successful language learning. As TESOL professionals we have long recognized the need for acquiring sociolinguistic competence with the aim of avoiding miscommunication. What is posited here goes a step further: Sociolinguistic competence is necessary not only for avoiding errors that are typically interpreted as breaches of etiquette but also for establishing fertile ground for increased interaction between NNSs and their NS interlocutors.

There is now at least preliminary evidence that sociolinguistic rules can indeed be taught with some success. Billmyer (1990) carried out a study that sought to ascertain the effects of teaching complimenting behavior in adult ESL classes. Her results indicated a significant effect of overt teaching about complimenting on the subsequent ability of her students to appropriately use compliments and their responses in conversations with NS peers.

As for IC use, preliminary lessons have now been carried out by this researcher and her colleagues on a heterogeneous group of adult ESL students in several classes of an intensive university ESL program. The students have overwhelmingly indicated that they find the lessons to be useful in pointing out differential use of IC/commiseration sequences between their society and the L2 speech community. One Korean woman's comments are illustrative. After performing videotaped role plays on IC exchanges, she stated:

This activity was uncomfortable to me. Because I didn't want to complain about thing to anybody. But this activity was useful. Before this, I didn't realize the complaining would be possible to open or start a conversation. And I knew this kind of skills was needed for daily life. I learn some skills and I want to use that I learn in English.

Clearly the awareness of the social strategies underlying ICs is important for NNSs in learning one way of getting to know and developing relationships with NSs. To this end they should be made aware of what some NSs are trying to accomplish through their use of ICs. Equally important, NNSs should learn the possibilities of responding appropriately when an IC is addressed to them. As we have seen, an IC requires a response in order to be effective. Through information on how ICs work, language learners can learn one way to initiate talk with their NS peers that may lead to increased opportunities for interaction. The negotiation of meaning resulting from such increased interaction should have a two-pronged and circular effect: enhanced social life and enhanced linguistic ability.
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Comments on Ann Raimes’s “Out of the Woods: Emerging Traditions in the Teaching of Writing”

Up the Garden Path: Second Language Writing Approaches, Local Knowledge, and Pluralism

A. SURESH CANAGARAJAH
University of Jaffna, Sri Lanka

Ann Raimes’s remarkably readable article (Vol. 25, No. 3,) covers quite comprehensively the history of L2 approaches to teaching writing, including the methods of instruction and research tradition influenced by each approach. Although she uses the motif of a fairy tale journey through the woods by L2 scholars in search of new approaches, she judiciously refrains from championing any single approach in order to avoid taking “false trails.” Rather than indicate any alternatives or correctives for the future, Raimes simply notes the “plurality of approaches, designs, and procedures” (p. 421) characterizing contemporary composition classrooms and outlines “shared recognitions” on the diversity and complexity of teaching and learning writing that have emerged out of the search—which, she takes care to warn, indicate “where we are now rather than . . . where we are going” (p. 421). Although Raimes’ treatment of the subject is prudent and controlled, this very stance eventually contributes to our dissatisfaction. Additionally, we are disappointed because her stance seems to derive from a lack of confidence or insight to make definite theoretical and pedagogical commitments; her “pluralism” sounds too easily achieved and not based on sound principles; she fails to provide a sustained angle or perspective to her account; teachers are not offered specific implications for classroom practice deriving from the “search.”

What does pluralism amount to for Raimes? We are left with the
impression eventually that any of the four approaches described (i.e., those focusing on form, the writer, content, or the reader) would equally serve the purposes of the teacher, provided they are used in combination with the other approaches and with a wise balance. Although it appears at times that Raimes just wants to leave us with her pluralistic “recognitions,” allowing the question of what approach would further these recognitions hanging in the air, at other places in the concluding section she suggests that the existing models can be pressed into service:

Despite all the false trails and some theorists’ desire to offer one [italics added] approach as the answer to our problems, what seems to be emerging is a recognition that the complexity of the writing process and the writing context means that when we teach writing we have to balance the four elements of form, the writer, content, and the reader. (p. 421)

What should be noted is that Raimes’s position here is not sufficiently influenced by her five concluding recognitions. She fails to inquire which of the approaches is consistent with the “Recognition of the Politics of Pedagogy” or “Recognition of Student Diversity,” for example. In fact, Raimes’s structuring of the paper into separate compartments consisting of “approaches,” “issues,” and “recognitions” enables her to get away with mentioning divergent assumptions and models of writing without having to commit herself to any or allow any one to affect the presentation of others. The failure to discriminate between the divergent approaches sharply, to apply sound principles to discern their effectiveness, and the attitude of “anything goes” account for a pluralism that lacks challenge and complexity. For such reasons, Raimes’s pluralism resembles rather an escapist, indecisive, stultifying relativism.

More problematic are the reasons for which Raimes opts for a pluralistic standpoint. At times, her more than frequent references to “false trails” suggest that her stance results from an obsessive fear of making wrong pedagogical and theoretical choices. A more acceptable basis might be suggested by her repeated references to Clarke and Silverstein (1988) and Pennycook (1989) and their ideas of challenging an “explicitly mandated reality” and developing “local forms of knowledge,” respectively. The pioneering papers by these scholars in recent editions of the Quarterly reconstruct the dominant pedagogical prescriptions and call for local forms of knowledge to guide ESOL teaching. However, their critiques are also ideologically motivated, and expose the political-economic “interests” underlying these prescriptions. But when Raimes enthusiastically quotes these writers and scaffolds her pluralism on local forms of knowledge, no such ideological critique
sustains her paper. Nor is she explicit on where she sees potential for what forms of local knowledge. Lest a misunderstanding of Clarke and Silberstein (1988) and Pennycook (1989) set up a relativistic bandwagon in TESOL like that which has already misdirected many other disciplines in the humanities and social sciences, it is important for us to quickly put pluralism on the right track.

Because the approaches outlined by Raimes ignore or simplify questions of power and difference, they are insensitive to the conflicts facing ESOL students in writing to the academy. In practicing academic writing, students are acquiring not only a skill, certain cognitive processes, or communicative competence, but also the set of preferred values, discourses, and knowledge content of the academic community. Students coming from non-English-speaking communities will confront the need or temptation to give up their native discourses based on local knowledge and take up the academic discourse which enjoys much more power and prestige. Apart from the identity crisis or rootlessness this encounter will create, the community allegiances of students will also be affected as they face the danger of being ostracized by either their native or the academic community. That is, if they insist on membership in their native community (and maintain the identities and values associated with it) they will be judged unfit for the academic community, or vice versa. Even if they gain membership in the academic community, at whatever psychological or social costs, the chances are that they will be provided only negative subject positions by its discourse, such as being cognitively deficient, deviant, or even pathological. Moreover, considering the collective costs, such ideological reproduction will destroy the distinctiveness of local communities in the long run and simply make them clones or satellites of the Western academic-military-industrial complex. That is, the internationalization of academic discourse through writing will be instrumental in ushering in the international hegemony of Western discourses and institutions. Although such issues are not treated in ESOL writing research or scholarship, they find ample expression in the biographical and creative writing of “Third World” writers in English, such as Chinua Achebe (1975), Gabriel Okara (1964, 1990), R. Parthasarathy (1976), Richard Rodriguez (1981), and Ngugi wa Thiong’o (1990).

RECONSTRUCTING A SUITABLE APPROACH

The challenge, therefore, is to formulate writing approaches that will unravel much hidden curricula in ESOL academic writing and enable students to employ their own local knowledge and counter-discourses to resist ideological domination, forge positive subject positions, and engage in emancipator interests. Although Ngugi wa Thio-
ong'o (1990) insists on abandoning the use of English as the only way to avoid ideological reproduction while developing indigenous languages and culture, his an escape from the problem rather than a solution to it. Recently, fellow African, Okara (1990) has contested Ngugi’s position and argued for the need to negotiate with English and its discourse for richer expression, with the full consciousness of one’s local discourses, thus creatively constructing an alternate English discourse that is ideologically and rhetorically satisfying. Okara (1964) himself in *The Voice* and other Third World creative writers, such as Raja Rao (1938) in *Kanthapura*, have provided examples of such novel English discourses influenced by their own local oral traditions in an experimentation that is both linguistic and ideological. What Okara’s position implies for the academic writing of ESOL students is that they will communicate with the academy and contribute to its construction of knowledge as members of their native communities. For this purpose, they will have to construct alternate discourses that derive from a negotiation of the academic discourse and English language in light of their indigenous forms of knowledge, discourses, and languages. Although such experimentation could seem unsettling to the academy, as the multiplicity of alternate discourses represented by ESOL students would be at tension with the dominant academic discourses, it would turn out to be beneficial in making the educational environment more democratic, pluralistic, and thus, enabling of intellectual advancement.

This recognition, that for ESOL students, academic writing involves a negotiation of competing discourses, cannot be realized by any and every writing approach. In fact, the preceding critique suggests that the existing approaches might defeat this recognition. As we move towards the task of developing approaches consonant with this recognition, we need to consider one that would have a focus on social context. Although this approach would accommodate Raimes’s interest in integrating the elements of form, content, the writer, and the reader, it would more significantly situate each of these in the relevant social contexts to realize how writing is context bound, community specific, and power ridden. This involves teaching students, not only how the form and content of texts will be influenced by the discourse, ideology, and communicative conventions of the audience they address, but also ways to negotiate the tensions that result from the writer’s coming from a different social background. We can adapt for our purposes some of the methods used to teach L1 students from outside the mainstream by composition scholars influenced by radical versions of poststructuralist thinking (see Bartholomae & Petrosky, 1986; Bizzell, 1982; Bruffee, 1983). Using a collaborative, learner-centered pedagogy, students are encouraged to collectively negotiate the meaning of their own and
established scholars’ texts, simulate the process of knowledge construction in the academy, realize the socially constructed nature of knowledge, and practice reading and writing as social acts. This would also involve making students sensitive to the difference between their own discourse conventions and those of the academy and to the discursive nature of knowledge. Thus, by demystifying academic discourse and demonstrating its nonfoundational character, we can build confidence in ESOL students to participate in academic knowledge construction in light of their local knowledge and native discourses.

Noting, then, that the existing approaches to ESOL writing are shaped by the dominant discourses in L1 composition scholarship and the intellectual and philosophical traditions of the West and that they are inimical to local knowledge whether in writing practice, approaches to literacy, cultural values, or forms of knowledge, we are now ready to take Raimes’s motif of fairy tale a step further. Raimes’s account is veritably a “fiction” (fairy tale or otherwise). That is, the approaches described are fabricated or discursively constructed in complicity with a limited range of discourses. Despite the impressive empirical research Raimes describes, she cannot attempt to ground these approaches in incontrovertible, universal “truth” or “fact.” It is this socially or discursively constructed nature of ESOL composition theory that explains its “interested” and partial character. But this recognition cuts both ways. I cannot deny that the development of my own recognition and approach are influenced by certain emergent discourses in the Western academy (such as poststructuralist theories of discourse) however much I borrow from Third World writers and discourses. The problem is that it is through the available discourses that we must conduct thought and construct knowledge. However, the critical difference is that I undertake a clear position on behalf of ESOL students (whom I consider linguistic and cultural minorities), adopt interests that are emancipator, and negotiate with a wider range of available discourses (including local knowledge) for a pedagogy of possibility (Pierce, 1989) for these students. What I do in this essay in relation to composition scholarship is what we would encourage our students to do in relation to their respective disciplines in academic writing—negotiate with the dominant discourses for expression of local knowledge and, thereby, achieve positive subject positions and empowerment.
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The Author Responds . . .

ANN RAIMES
Hunter College, The City University of New York

Dr. Canagarajah takes issue with my article because it doesn’t un-equivocably support a “social context” approach to teaching writing. In my article, commissioned as long as 2 years ago for the TESOL Quarterly’s 25th-anniversary issues, my charge, as I understood it from the editor and further articulated for myself while writing drafts, was to analyze ESOL writing instruction over 25 years and to describe current approaches—and to do all this in 20 typed pages. That was what I aimed to do. Canagarajah obviously would have liked a more political stance, one aimed critically at, as he puts it, “the Western academic-military-industrial complex.” But that isn’t what I found when I examined our literature and teaching practices, and Canagarajah admits that he did not find them either (“such issues are not treated in ESOL writing research or scholarship”). Yes, one can cite Third World authors and L1 “composition scholars influenced by radical versions of poststructuralist thinking” as Canagarajah does, but the connection to ESOL teaching and research is not historically explicit. One could, of course, also cite L1 composition scholars who are critical of poststructuralist approaches (e.g., Sledd, 1987; Stewart, 1990) and who complain that teachers “seem more concerned about converting their stu-
I am grateful to Canagarajah for his careful reading of my article. However, he misleads readers when he refers to “her [i.e., my] pluralism” as one “not based on sound principles,” as if pluralism were what I invented or proposed rather than reported. I’m disturbed, too, by the implications of his saying that the approaches I describe are “fabricated.” He himself acknowledges they have a strong basis in empirical research. So these approaches I described might not be the ones Canagarajah approves of, but they are the approaches our field has discussed in its literature, even if that occurs “in complicity with a limited range of discourses.” In addition, he takes me to task for not committing to an approach when I thought I had indicated my own theoretical and pedagogical preference. Since the history of our field (both L1 and L2 writing) has shown that there is seldom one unequivocally acceptable approach, I recommended “a balanced stance” that nevertheless presents a “governing philosophy” (p. 422). And I also explained which governing philosophy seemed to have the most potential for balance and for paying attention to all the complex facets of writing instruction (including the ideological, let me add) when I said that “the process approach more than any other seems to be providing unifying theoretical and methodological principles” (p. 422) and pointed to the emphasis on content-based approaches as a “false trail.” And I thought I’d expanded on how the process approach provided for more balance than other options when I referred to reader-focused approaches in TESOL as teaching “prescriptive patterns” to satisfy “a powerful outside reader” (p. 412).

But Canagarajah wants a more explicit, more exclusive “focus on social context.” In our field, though, an emphasis on social context has been usurped by a “social constructionist” approach (Johns, 1990, p. 25), which has departed radically from its original (L1) ideological connections. In TESOL literature, this approach usually has little to do with a “negotiation of competing discourses” that Canagarajah calls for and everything to do with preserving the authority of the teacher and the academy, what Santos calls a “pragmatic” rather than an ideological approach (1992, p. 9). As I point out repeatedly in my article (pp. 416, 418, 422-423), when theorists write about social context and TESOL, they stress the rules that readers in a powerful discourse community establish and that writers have to learn to obey. Since “the social constructionist views language as an outgrowth of the discourse community for which a text is written,” (Johns, 1990, p. 33), the faculty audience in an academic setting is seen as “particularly omniscient” (Johns, 1990, p. 31). So teachers teach students how to produce “realistic simulations of academic demands” (Horowitz, 1986, p. 142). Along
with the paradox of “realistic simulation,” goes the fact that challenges to those “academic demands,” demands which come from outside the ESOL classroom, are not frequently mentioned—except by Land and Whitley (1989), whose article is not only cited but discussed in mine (p. 418). Nor is the idea of “negotiation,” a word much favored by Canagarajah, frequently mentioned. So it is because of this “pragmatic” slant, emphasizing the demands of the academic community and prescribing forms of rhetoric and syntax to satisfy those demands, that I view the so-called social constructionist approach in our field as one that unduly favors form and the readers’ world view at the expense of writer and content. Auerbach, too, who has done a great deal to further considerations of politics and classroom pedagogy in our field, has criticized theorists like Horowitz who “advocate teaching language in a way that emphasizes conformity to socially imposed academic standards, forms, and conventions” (Auerbach, 1991, p. 5). Social constructionist in TESOL literature has been stripped of its ideological basis and fails to offer an approach that authentically examines and questions the aims of education and society. Apart from the work of Auerbach and Wallerstein (1987) and others involved in adult literacy programs and the workplace rather than academic programs, there is little evidence in our field of a sustained approach that critically examines “power and difference.”

Canagarajah obviously has such an approach in mind and wishes that my article had made a commitment to an ideological approach. If some of the vociferous self-proclaimed social constructionists in our field have booted ideology out of their camp, where is it to go? As I pointed out in my article, it is important to work on transforming the academic community for the benefit of our students (pp. 416, 418). And yes, it is important to address issues of power and difference. How? A balanced process approach—balanced because it also pays attention to form, content, and readers’ expectations (and, by extension, to social context) along with its focus on the individual writer—is one that currently seems to me to offer the best bet. It allows students and teachers the time and the opportunity for exploratory activities. Through the generative process of writing about themselves and the world around them, about society, culture, language, and literature, students can discover and resist any “hidden curricula” imposed upon them, including those informed by the teacher’s political agenda. In addition, a feature of process approaches is group work and collaborative tasks, and it’s worth noting here that according to Santos (1992), “the pedagogical concomitant to the theory and politics of social constructionist that has received the most attention at conferences and in journals is collaborative learning” (p. 5).

This inclusion of written exploration of the content of social, linguis-
tic, literary, and cultural forms within a process approach probably does not present a sustained enough political approach for Canagarajah's taste, so it's time for me to explain why I opt for recognitions rather than solutions, balance rather than dogma. A classroom is itself, with its teacher and students, essentially a context for manifestations of power and difference. A teacher who begins from assumptions that students will inevitably be “ostracized” by one language community or another, as Canagarajah asserts—one who claims that students will be accorded positions as “cognitively deficient, deviant, or even pathological” by the academic community all in the service of “the international hegemony of Western discourses and institutions”—is likely to impose a political agenda that takes precedence over form, writer, content, and reader. Those assumptions are not presented as open-ended or negotiable. They form the focus of a teacher-centered class. Certainly, an authentic social constructionist approach devalues “both the idea and the importance of the individual” (Santos, 1992, p. 4) as it lauds the idea of “a participatory learning community” (Trimbur, 1989, p. 604). The issue, though, is what the students are participating in and what the community is learning. The larger academic community as the locus of power that students need to be liberated from is not a construct that has been clearly enough defined or even established to make it our sole focus of inquiry. It is not a stable entity from which students can be liberated by a well-meaning teacher. An academic community cannot even be clearly characterized by its discourses; some claim that we “can't teach academic discourse because there's no such thing to teach” (Elbow, 1991, p. 138). And after more than 25 years of teaching writing to ESOL students of all nationalities, I see no clear evidence for Canagarajah's claim that all ESOL students face conflicts when writing for the academy. So I opt for balance in approach: attention to form, content, writer, and reader, all representative of the larger social context, and attention to the interactions among them, which both determine and reflect the social context. Relativism is, to my mind, a lot less stultifying than demagoguery.

As a teaching approach, rather than a poststructural theoretical construct, social constructionist leaves a lot to be desired in both its pragmatic and its ideological manifestations. However, that does not mean that issues of ideology go by the wayside. There is a need to examine and question social order as it is presented in the culture and literature of a language community, and a place for examining the individual in relation to reader and reality is often found within a process approach. But while I acknowledge the importance of teachers and students addressing ideological considerations in the writing classroom, I would not go along with Canagarajah and suggest that ESOL writing teachers should assume the existence of “ideological domina-
tion” and emphasize resistance to it. That does many of our students a disservice. They are adults, formulating their own value structures, with their own political views. Many of them from totalitarian regimes have spent their lives resisting domination. They don’t need a course in how to do it. In addition, writing involves ideology, to be sure, but it involves much more. Writer, content, form, and reader, and in the classroom, the teacher—all are players in the surrounding social context. Writing is far too useful a tool in language learning to limit it to examining—even negotiating—the discourses favored in the context of the academic community.
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Comments on N. S. Prabhu’s “The Dynamics of the Language Lesson”

A Reader Reacts . . .

JOHN M. MURPHY
Georgia State University

In his recent article (Vol. 26, No. 2), N. S. Prabhu raises a number of intriguing issues concerning ways in which second language students,
teachers, and specialists influence events that take place during classroom lessons. He suggests that learning opportunities provided to students are influenced by a teacher’s long-term pedagogical plans, his or her evolving theoretical approach, and immediate plans for the day’s lesson. At the same time, a teacher’s influences are tempered by interactively defined classroom roles, routinized behaviors, shared expectations, and both planned and unplanned contributions being made by everyone present in the room. After discussing these various influences, Prabhu proposes that teachers and TESOL specialists need to interact as fellow theorists striving to construct better-informed understandings of the pedagogical, social, and personal dimensions of classroom lessons. Although I agree with Prabhu’s central themes, as briefly outlined above, and appreciate his call for more genuinely interactive collaborations between classroom teachers and specialists, there are several pressing issues that merit further consideration.

Although Prabhu acknowledges a legitimate role for theorists and specialists in L2 pedagogy, he sometimes refers to them with a pejorative tone. This is particularly evident in the article’s final paragraph, where he observes that, “perhaps teachers will be helped to function as theorists if those who regard themselves as theorists begin to function as teachers [italics added]” (p. 240). Although this sentiment rings true, I am somewhat uncomfortable with related aspects of Prabhu’s discussion because he tends to employ a rather restrictive sense of who these theorists are. Prabhu uses the labels theorist and specialist in L2 pedagogy in reference to one particular category of writer, that is, those who provide broad prescriptive advice to classroom teachers concerning “the best possible curriculum and the most promising method” (p. 232). Such theorists are best exemplified by proponents of global TESOL methods and designers of broadly targeted curricula. Potential benefits as well as likely problems associated with their contributions to the field are widely discussed (Pennycook, 1989; Prabhu, 1990; Richards, 1984; van Lier, 1991). Prabhu’s reservations are well taken and are supported in the literature.

In addition to proponents of TESOL methods or curricula, however, it may be useful to broaden the scope of Prabhu’s discussion in order to acknowledge roles played by at least two additional categories of TESOL specialists. A second category consists of specialists who contribute to our better understandings of specific subtopics in the teaching of second languages. This category might include, for example, specialists best known for their work in the teaching of writing (e.g., Connor, 1987; Hedge, 1988; Leki, 1991; Raimes, 1991; Zamel, 1987), reading (e.g., Block, 1992; Carrell, 1989; Carson, 1993; Grabe, 1991; Grelet, 1984; Silberstein, 1993), listening (e.g., Dunkel, 1986; Mendel-
sohn, 1993; Richards, 1983; Rost, 1991; Ur, 1990), pronunciation (e.g., Acton, 1984; Gilbert, 1987; Morley, 1991; Pennington & Richards, 1986; Wong, 1988), grammar, learning strategies, intercultural communication, etc. As this cursory list indicates, there are many specialists who devote considerable attention to specific subtopics within the general field of L2 pedagogy. Their contributions to the field are quite different from those mentioned in the first category. For the sake of clarity, it seems useful to differentiate between them.

A third category it may be helpful to specify includes theorists best known for their work in L2 teacher preparation. There is a long tradition of specialists who encourage preservice and in-service teachers’ efforts to increase awareness of their own instructional techniques and principles in order to better understand, at a local level, what they and their students are attempting to accomplish in classroom settings. In a previous discussion in the TESOL Quarterly, Prabhu (1990) suggests that a teacher’s heightened awareness of classroom dynamics serves to foster a sense of personal and professional “involvement” in teaching (p. 171). Many teacher educators have modeled ways of assisting classroom teachers in learning to become more reflectively engaged in what they do. In Prabhu’s terms, these specialists try to facilitate teachers’ efforts to articulate for themselves and others their own “pedagogic notions and intuitions” (Prabhu, 1992, p. 240). In addition to Prabhu, other discussions that address these topics are provided by Bartlett (1990), Clarke (1984), Clarke and Silberstein (1988), Day (1990), Fanselow (1988), Freeman (1989, 1982), Gebhard, Gaitan, and Oprandy (1987), Nunan (1991), Richards (1987), Richards and Nunan (1990), and Strickland (1988). (See also Freeman & Richards in this issue.) There are, of course, many other available sources. Because most of these theorists function as classroom teachers, specialists, and teacher educators, their contributions, it could be argued, already play a major role in the field of L2 instruction.

Though his discussions are theoretically sound, descriptively efficient, and make significant contributions to the field, an unsettling concern in reading both of Prabhu’s recent TESOL Quarterly articles is that he fails to reference the considerable work of this third group of specialists. A lack of acknowledgment of others’ contributions would not be of concern if the existing literature contrasted significantly with the major themes underpinning Prabhu’s position. A lack of congruence, however, is clearly not the case. Both of Prabhu’s recent TESOL Quarterly articles are valuable reading-for-discussion assignments in MATESOL courses precisely because they are supported by the current literature on L2 teacher preparation. Dick Allwright’s (e.g., 1984) work, for example, is referenced in each of them though more attention could be given to the topics of exploratory teaching and
action research as highlighted by Allwright and Bailey (1991) in their teacher preparation text. Nor does Prabhu make many references to available suggestions for engaging in processes of exploratory teaching as outlined by these authors, Bartlett (1990), Gebhard et al. (1987), Nunan (1989, 1990), and other writers. Although there is insufficient space in a journal article to give much attention to specific procedures for exploratory teaching, it would be helpful to indicate what appears to be a very promising direction for achieving the degree of investment in one’s teaching that Prabhu advocates. A related concern is Prabhu’s use of the rather dated term teacher training (pp. 232, 240) as opposed to more satisfying alternatives such as teacher education or teacher preparation (Freeman, 1989; Richards, 1987). Taken together, these features of Prabhu’s discussion may serve to weaken his contribution for some readers.

In an effort to bridge the gap between theory and practice, several specialist in L2 teacher education indicate possible directions for the future. As mentioned above, both Allwright and Bailey (1991) and Nunan (1989) provide comprehensive, book-length surveys of some of the tools and topics available to classroom teachers who would like to become explorers of their own and their students’ classroom behaviors. While using each of these texts in MATESOL courses, I have found that preservice and in-service teachers really seem to appreciate their practical focuses. Although a definitive set of procedures for achieving some of the goals Prabhu advocates continues to be elusive, the literature clearly indicates that there is, in fact, a generous menu of options already available to interested teachers (e.g., stimulated recall procedures, diary studies, collaborative analysis of classroom transcripts). A growing number of writers indicate that combinations of such procedures are useful in enabling teachers to function as theory builders with respect to their own and their students’ classroom experiences (Johnson, 1992). The direction for professional self-development Prabhu advocates currently is being explored by TESOL specialists and classroom teachers, and their efforts are widely discussed. In short, the current state of the art in L2 teacher education is not as bleak as the conclusion to Prabhu’s article would seem to indicate. As a relatively new L2 teacher educator myself, it seems important that we acknowledge the contributions of those who have preceded us while at the same time working to address some of the important professional challenges Prabhu continues to articulate with clarity and precision.
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The Author Responds . . .

N. S. PRABHU
National University of Singapore

John Murphy points out that (a) several specialists in language teaching are in fact engaged at present in enabling classroom teachers to reflect on their teaching and develop their ability to theorize and (b) my article does not make adequate reference to related work by others. I applaud the first fact and apologize for the second.
The TESOL Quarterly publishes brief commentaries on aspects of English language teaching. For this issue, we asked two educators to examine the role of technology in the language classroom.

Edited by SANDRA MCKAY
San Francisco State University

Technology and the Language Classroom

Available Technology

TRACEY FORREST
Baruch College, The City University of New York

When one thinks of technologies in language education, two things generally come to mind: the videocassette recorder (VCR) and the microcomputer. Indeed, these are the basics in terms of equipment for numerous technological approaches to language instruction. Add to this picture the capabilities of closed-captioned video, optical-disc technology such as compact disc read-only memory (CD-ROM) for microcomputers, interactive videodisc systems that combine the microcomputer with pictures, a plethora of software programs (see Healey & Johnson 1991; Thomas, Passentino, & Hambrook 1991), as well as the possibilities offered by satellite transmission, and the view that emerges is a complex set of technological applications that are increasingly available and popular in educational settings.

The mainstay technique for the VCR is the use of prerecorded materials. Teachers record authentic video and television programs on their home VCRs (i.e., feature films, documentaries, sitcoms, news programs) and create their own instructional materials for classroom use. A 1991 pilot survey of 119 U.S.-based members of the TESOL Video Interest Section (Stempleski, 1991) revealed five major tendencies in the use of video: (a) integration of video with other course content; (b) teacher-made support materials; (c) teacher-student in-house video production; (d) emphasis on aural/oral skills; and (e) focus on cultural content. Video producers and educational publishers are collaborating on the development and production of video-based language courses that follow a predetermined scope and sequence and are complete instructional packages including videotapes and accompanying print materials (see Thomas, Passentino, & Hambrook, 1991),
while closed-captioned and subtitled materials are appearing more frequently (Vanderplank, 1988, 1990). Numerous teacher's guides and books have been published on using video materials (see, e.g., Lonergan, 1984a, 1984b; Stempleski & Arcario, 1992; Stempleski & Tomalin, 1990; Tomalin, 1987, 1990), and symposia and workshops are plentiful at local, national, and international conferences.

Videotaping students at work on learning tasks and in communicative situations expands the scope of language activities in the ordinary classroom by providing an opportunity for students and teachers to examine, reflect on, and revise linguistic and paralinguistic behavior (Forrest, 1992; Lonergan, 1992).

Videodiscs (interactive video) combine the interactive nature of computers with the motion picture capabilities of video (Chung, 1985). Moving pictures, still pictures, and sound are stored on discs that are accessed by videodisc players or computers. This is a truly multifaceted approach because students can extrapolate linguistic information from context, nonverbal cues, and reading, as well as sound.

CD-ROM systems can store hundreds of thousands of pages of text and are particularly useful in education for keeping large data bases, particularly in school libraries. Familiarity with CD-ROM may become important as a research tool for students as educational institutions make more use of this technology for storing large bodies of information.

Technology is the state of the art in English language teaching, and well-informed language teachers are seeking to avail themselves of information with respect to instructional possibilities and resource materials in this realm. Teachers worldwide are experimenting with prerecorded video and classroom video production, and absent hard data, the consensus is a keen appreciation for the medium as an enhancer of language lessons.

Whereas the field of English language teaching can hardly be said to be short on enthusiasm with respect to technologies in the classroom, more research is needed on the effectiveness of video and computers for language acquisition. Teachers need to be guided in discerning effective materials and making selections that accord well with language teaching objectives and course curricula. Quality standards need to be established with respect to software production, and the careful exploration of classroom techniques must continue.

It is obvious that the technological boom and the language teaching techniques that have arisen as a result have given creative impetus to the art of language teaching. Precisely how the media will influence language acquisition is not yet clear. Nonetheless, at this juncture, teachers seem to agree that the new technologies offer a yet unrivaled range of possibilities for student-centered language study. As with any instructional technique, however, teachers must remember that the use
of media will only serve teaching goals to the extent that teachers continue to be responsible for their thoughtful and meaningful implementation.
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Tracey Forrest is on the English Department faculty of Baruch College, The City University of New York and is the 1992–1993 Chair of the TESOL Video Interest Section.
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Ways of Using Technology in Language and Literacy Teaching
HEIDE SPRUCK WIGLEY
Southport Institute for Policy Analysis

As Forrest’s discussion shows, today’s computer and video technologies hold a great deal of promise in supporting second language learn-
ing and literacy development. Yet the use of high technology in TESOL remains controversial. On the one hand, such technology holds the promise of making language and literacy learning easier and more exciting for teachers and learners. On the other, poorly designed software often threatens to reduce language to its simplest forms and counteracts good teaching practice. The field now faces the challenge of examining the role that technology can play in supporting the language and literacy development of adult L2 learners without compromising the integrity of sound language education.

Whereas many language educators maintain a critical stance when told that computer-based technology will revolutionize language learning, they nevertheless try to keep an open mind when it comes to the possible uses of technology in ESL programs. In examining possible uses of computers and videos across the U.S., I found five distinct ways of linking language and literacy with technology (see Guth & Wrigley, 1992; Wrigley & Guth, 1992). First, there is the option of simply helping learners to access technology, followed by the possibility of using technology to facilitate literacy tasks. Another option involves using video technologies to provide a visual context for teaching language and literacy. Technology can also be used as a tool to promote social interaction and communication in the ESL classroom. Finally, there is the possibility of using computers to teach directly, a promise that in many ways has yet to be fulfilled.

HELPING LEARNERS TO ACCESS TECHNOLOGY

Although many teachers have found the educational software designed for ESL and/or literacy quite disappointing, they still see the need to help their students access and use computers. They want their students to become comfortable with computers, gain familiarity with the keyboard or with a mouse, and learn how to use various types of software. These teachers find that when they put the emphasis on promoting access to technology and developing computer awareness (rather than on using the computer to teach ESL), the kind of literacy “taught” by the software does not matter as much.

Such an approach has worked well for programs that are not happy with the ESL software presently on the market. By seeing a value in students’ using technology for its own sake, not just for the learning of language and literacy, teachers can concentrate on finding software that is both easy to learn and fun to work with. We find that many of these ESL programs use a dual approach, spending some time in a computer center helping learners become “computer literate,” but expending most of their efforts on developing rich language and literacy activities that involve interactions with people, not machines.

THE FORUM
USING TECHNOLOGY TO FACILITATE LITERACY TASKS

Many ESL literacy teachers use computers to demonstrate how technology can make complex literacy tasks easier. They may show beginning students how to use clip art to illustrate their writing or how to use simple graphics software to create flyers, posters, or announcements. ESL programs also use computer software to create and publish learner-generated materials such as language experience stories, yearbooks, or biographies, and some teach learners how to use a simple database so they can build their own bilingual dictionaries. Workplace programs sometimes use spreadsheets to help learners design a budget for a class party or to calculate the money workers make working overtime.

USING VIDEOS TO PROVIDE A VISUAL CONTEXT

Many ESL teachers use video technology to provide a visual context for language teaching. They may present videotapes of the evening news as a springboard for discussing social and political issues or use videotaped conversations as a starting point for examining the way language is used in various social situations. Some teachers also show learners how to record their own videos: Learners may tape their own role plays and then analyze the verbal language, nonverbal behavior, or tone that might be most effective in a given situation. We now also find ESL programs that have secured funding to do their own video productions through which they develop oral history projects for family literacy or vignettes that illustrate critical incidents at the workplace. These situations then become the starting point for discussions, problem solving, or problem posing.

USING TECHNOLOGY TO PROMOTE COLLABORATIONS AND SOCIAL INTERACTION

Many teachers ask learners to work together in pairs or groups and make decisions about how best to use the technology available to them. Some teachers encourage learners to work with a partner to discover the answers to grammar, vocabulary, or pronunciation exercises that appear on the computer. Such activities allow learners to debate correct and incorrect responses and in this way to develop language awareness. Other teachers invite groups of learners to use computers in designing literacy projects (such as developing a learner’s guide to ESL programs), creating texts (such as class biographies), or responding to a story that someone else has put on the screen. We also find family literacy programs that have set up intergenerational projects that en-
courage parents and teachers to use computers for family math or storytelling. In other programs, learners from different sites take part in cultural exchanges through telecommunication (see Cummins & Sayers, 1990).

USING COMPUTERS TO TEACH LANGUAGE AND LITERACY

This approach holds some promise for learners who are motivated to use technology on their own and are eager to work with computers. Existing technologies include large self-contained learning systems or courseware focusing on reading skills, grammar knowledge, and vocabulary building; individual skill-and-drill software programs; “authorable” programs that allow teachers to take existing software and customize it for their class; and interactive videos. For teachers who want to combine classroom teaching with computer support, software programs are available to design quizzes, cloze tests, or vocabulary games. In some cases, teachers can adapt available programs to include vocabulary or reading passages generated by learners in the class.

Now that computer-based ESL learning programs are widely available, many educators caution against using them as the primary means to teach language and literacy. They point out that most software on the market is based on a very narrow skill-based definition of literacy that ignores the social aspects of learning and reduces literacy to a series of discrete chunks to be mastered before any kind of natural reading and writing can take place. For the most part, existing software denies learners the opportunity to look at literacy holistically. In addition, the very features that make technology attractive to some (privacy, independent learning) may be counterproductive to the development of communicative competence because technology may cut learners off from the social support they need to gain confidence in their ability to understand and use English through meaningful interaction with others.

In visiting computer labs, talking to teachers, and reviewing videos and software, one issue becomes clear: Unless we examine available technology-based materials critically, we risk allowing hardware and software vendors to define literacy for us. If we want technology to fulfill its promise as the electronic teacher (or teacher’s aide), we must find ways to integrate video and computers into the best practices that language and literacy teaching has to offer. If we do anything less, we are in danger of betraying our students as well as our profession.
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Enlisting the Help of U.S. Undergraduates in Evaluating International Teaching Assistants

GEORGE YULE and PAUL HOFFMAN
Louisiana State University

The steady increase in the numbers of international graduate teaching assistants (ITAs) in U.S. universities has prompted most large public universities to initiate both training programs and screening procedures in order to ensure that those ITAs whose first language is not English have adequate spoken English skills for the task of presenting instructional material to U.S. undergraduates. The focus in most of this work is on the training aspect of the programs and much less on the screening aspect. In many situations, screening is tied to specific score levels on standardized instruments such as the TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language) or the TSE (Test of Spoken English), rather than being entrusted to those who provide the actual training. However, the validity (and even the availability, in some cases) of these general proficiency measures has been the subject of some criticism (see Eck, 1987; Scheider & Stevens, 1987), particularly because such instruments fail to measure specific aspects of the effective spoken presentation of instructional material in front of a live audience.

Where those ESL teachers who are involved in the preparation of ITAs do have responsibility for making local evaluations, there is often a dilemma posed by the ambivalent nature of this responsibility. On the one hand, there is a responsibility felt towards those international graduate students who work extremely hard at improving their spoken English skills yet have to be given a negative evaluation with regard to instructional duties. On the other hand, there is a responsibility to the U.S. undergraduates who may have to take their classes with ITAs (typically in their first teaching jobs) whose poor spoken English turns out to be a major barrier to making sense of the subject matter.
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Maintaining an objective balance between these two responsibilities is not an easy task, yet there is a way of treating these apparently separate responsibilities as two aspects of a single process which allows the ESL teacher to maintain a supportive role with the ITAs while ensuring that the required evaluation/screening takes place. The solution is essentially a development and extension of suggestions made by others (e.g., Carrell, Sarwark, & Plakans, 1987; vom Saal, 1987) to foster greater involvement of U.S. undergraduates in versions of the ITA screening process.

METHOD

We recruited undergraduates (UGs) from a large enrollment, sophomore-level, introductory linguistics course to become audience members listening to ITAs presenting basic instructional material from their fields. We provided those UGs with the evaluation sheet shown in the Appendix, which had to be completed during or immediately after a 10-min presentation by each ITA.

Having initiated this form of UG involvement, we were able to begin using their evaluation scores as part of an ITA profile, incorporating the ESL instructor’s evaluation, which was used in arriving at final recommendations regarding readiness to assume instructional duties. During one semester, we compiled a database of several sets of evaluation scores and tried to determine whether we had dependable interrater reliability on the student evaluations.

A total of 73 ITAs, giving 10-min presentations (between 6 and 9 individuals per session), were evaluated by a total of 43 UGs in panels of between 4 and 6 members. We also collected independent yes/no recommendations from those ESL instructors who were familiar with the ITAs’ spoken English abilities from class sessions throughout the semester. The administrator of the program, with substantial experience in language testing and the teaching of English as a second/foreign language, also provided an independent yes/no decision with regard to whether each ITA’s spoken English presentation was sufficiently clear and comprehensible for instructional duties within the university. (Final recommendations for the population were 53 positive and 20 negative.)

RESULTS

When we analyzed the UGs’ consistency as members of a panel (n = 4–6) evaluating individual ITAs, we correlated their assigned scores, each rater paired with every other rater within a panel (for a total of 687 pairs), to arrive at an overall Pearson product-moment correlation of .64 (p < .001).

Having confirmed that the UG evaluators were generally reacting in a fairly consistent and reliable manner to what they observed in the ITAs’ spoken presentations, we then had to make sure that their overall perspective was consistent with that of the ESL professionals involved in the
program. Table 1 presents the mean ratings by the UGs (using the scale) for those ITAs who were given positive versus negative recommendations by their ESL instructor, on the one hand, and the program administrator, on the other. The mean rating of UGs for those ITAs receiving the ESL instructor’s negative vote was significantly lower than the group receiving a positive vote ($t(71) = 7.41$, $p < .001$), with an identical relationship found between the UGs’ ratings and the recommendations of the administrator, $t(71) = 9.96$, $p < .001$.

These strong relationships are based, not on any individual UG’s evaluation, but on an average rating from groups of 4 or more. We then used a majority yes or no recommendation (Category 7 of the evaluation sheet in the Appendix) among a panel of 4 or more UGs in order to check whether the UG verdict in this category coincided with those yes or no votes of the ESL professionals. Agreement between the majority UG verdict and that of the ESL instructor was 91% (kappa = .78, $p < .01$); between the UGs and the administrator, it was 97% (kappa = .92, $p < .01$); and between the ESL instructors and the administrator, it was 93% (kappa = .84, $p < .01$).

**DISCUSSION**

These findings represent supporting evidence that groups of UGs whose observations are focused via the types of categories presented in the evaluation sheet can provide a majority vote regarding the readiness of an ITA to assume instructional duties which matches very closely the votes of professionals in the field.

We have continued to enlist the help of UGs each semester in a number of different ways, but it is their role as evaluators that remains their most significant contribution. During one recent semester, we had a very large number of participating UGs and arranged for them to randomly complete their evaluation assignment at any one of three different points during the semester, in Week 3, Week 8, or Week 14. One advantage of this procedure was that the ITAs received much more frequent feedback on their oral presentations. An additional advantage was that we obtained

**TABLE 1**

**Undergraduate Ratings (Means and Standard Deviations) of ITAs Receiving Positive or Negative Recommendations from ESL Professionals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>ESL Instructor</th>
<th>Administrator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC rating</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>8.12</td>
<td>10.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
measures of how the UG population rated the performances of the ITAs as they progressed through the course. As a result, we had some external indication of whether the ITAs were in fact perceived to be improving (or not) during their semester-long course. Using the yes/no final category of the evaluation sheet as a guide, we calculated the percentage of positive evaluations at the three points during the course. During Week 3, the level of positive responses to the question, Would you like this assistant as your instructor? was 38%; at Week 8, it was 55%; and at Week 14, it was 58%. Remembering that these responses were from different groups of UGs each time, we can treat this substantial increase in positive responses, from early to later in the semester, as one independent indication that the ESL course for these ITAs was indeed bringing about a positive change in the perceived quality of their oral performances.

CONCLUSION

In the introduction, we observed that where local screening procedures are used to determine which ITAs are ready to assume instructional duties, they tend to place a substantial responsibility on ESL instructors to make potentially difficult decisions. Those decisions can be made less difficult if a local group of undergraduates can be involved in the evaluation process. Our experience has shown that, in small groups, undergraduate observers can reach decisions which are overwhelmingly in agreement with those of the ESL professionals observing the same ITAs. The clear advantage of involving UGs in the evaluation process is that it provides the ESL professionals with a powerful validation of their verdicts regarding the readiness of ITAs to assume instructional duties. It must also promote what Carrell, Sarwark, and Plakans (1987) describe as “better public relations” (p. 354) with the constituency in many colleges (undergraduates in general) whose complaints provided the original impetus for ITA programs to be created and screening procedures to be required. Because they were the instigators of a responsibility which has generally been passed onto ESL professionals, it would seem quite appropriate that U.S. undergraduates should be encouraged to share that responsibility with us.
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**APPENDIX**

**Evaluation Sheet**

1. Pronunciation
   - Generally Clear (2)
   - Sometimes unclear (1)
   - Not clear at all (0)

2. Vocabulary
   - Easily understood (2)
   - Sometimes difficult to understand (1)
   - Very difficult to understand (0)

3. Rhythm of Speech
   - Close to American English (2)
   - Sometimes too fast or too slow (1)
   - Very different from American English (0)

4. Blackboard Drawing/Writing
   - Very clear (2)
   - Sometimes confusing (1)
   - Very confusing (0)

5. Contact with Audience
   - Frequently looked at audience (2)
   - Sometimes looked at audience (1)
   - Rarely looked at audience (0)

6. Overall Presentation
   - Easy to follow (2)
   - Sometimes difficult to follow (1)
   - Very difficult to follow (0)

7. Would you like this assistant as your instructor?
   - Strong Yes ______ Weak Yes ______ Weak No ______ Strong No ______

8. Comments:

---

**Employment and education of teaching assistants.** Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University, Center for Teaching Excellence.
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Differing Reading-Writing Relationships in L1 and L2 Literacy Development?

JOHN HEDGCOCK
University of Houston

DWIGHT ATKINSON
University of Southern California

The complex nature of L2 literacy has recently become an area of special concern to applied linguists and second language acquisition researchers. Carson, Carrell, Silberstein, Kroll, and Kuehn (1990), for example, studying reading and writing relationships for ESL students from two different L1 backgrounds, found that although measures of reading and writing proficiency were significantly related for their Japanese subjects in Japanese, a similar relationship held among Chinese subjects only in English. Likewise, Eisterhold (1990), in a theoretical comparison of L1 and L2 literacy development, noted two conceptual complexities in the case of the latter: Many L2 acquirers come to the task of second language literacy acquisition with well-developed L1 literacy skills; and L2 acquirers typically do not have full oral competence available in the second language to support acquisition of its literacy.

Even without considering the question of spoken language influence, however, the process of L2 literacy development is a highly involved one. Studies of reading-writing relationships such as those mentioned above suggest that L2 literacy acquisition may result in varying outcomes depending on the nature of L1 literacy and/or the extent to which it has been mastered (see, e.g., Alderson, 1984; Carrell, 1991; Carson, 1991). In this short report, we describe parallel studies of L1 and L2 school-based literacy development in order to point out differences between study results which appear to highlight the complex nature of L2 literacy acquisition.

METHOD

The two studies compared here (Atkinson & Hedgcock, 1990; Hedgcock, 1989) were designed to measure the effects of overall and genre-specific extensive reading habits on performance on tests of school-based writing. The variables investigated and the data-collecting instruments employed were highly comparable across studies.

Subjects

The first study included 157 native speakers of English, all of whom were completing the first-semester composition requirement at a major West Coast university. The subjects in the second study were 115 fully matriculated students enrolled in intermediate- and advanced-level ESL
writing courses at the same university. More than 90% of the second study’s subjects were native speakers of Mandarin, Korean, Indonesian, Japanese, or Thai.

Procedures

Both groups of students were asked to complete a questionnaire soliciting the following information concerning their English language reading habits: (a) amounts of pleasure reading done during periods of attendance at elementary school and high school; (b) estimates of time currently spent reading for pleasure and school; (c) frequency of reading in four specific genre areas (textbooks and technical books, narrative fiction and biographies, newspapers and news magazines, and comic books) while in elementary school, high school, and currently; and (d) student self-assessments of reading and writing skills. In addition to the questions concerning English-language reading habits, ESL subjects answered otherwise identical questions on reading habits in their L1s. Questionnaires yielded sets of 21 (for the L1 study) and 42 (for the L2 study) separate reading-habit variables. Of these, only the variables in Groups 1 (amounts of pleasure reading in elementary and high school) and 3 (frequency of reading in the genres) above (14 variables for the L1, and 28 variables for the L2 study) were considered potential predictors of English expository writing performance in the present study. Questionnaire results for these variables are summarized in Table 1.

Scores on timed measures of expository writing proficiency were taken as the criterion variables in both studies. In the first (L1) study, writing scores consisted of composite grades assigned holistically by three trained raters on subjects’ first-semester final-exam essays. Essay prompts required students to present, in expository form, arguments for or against a proposed solution to a U.S. social problem recently discussed in class. In the second (L2) study, writing scores were also assigned holistically by groups of three trained raters; in this case, a placement-exam essay question querying the concept of work in subjects’ native cultures constituted the writing prompt. The mean score for the L1 measure was 5.73 on a 0- to 8-point scale (SD = 1.40, range = 2.0—8.0), and for the L2 test, 5.75 on a 0- to 10-point scale (SD = .94, range = 3.3—7.7). Two clear limitations regarding the writing proficiency measures used in this study should be noted: (a) One-time writing proficiency measures can be considered, at best, only very rough indicators of subjects’ levels of literacy acquisition; and (b) the range of scores on the L2 writing measure, given above, is moderately restricted.

Omnibus and stepwise multiple regression analyses using the SAS 5.18 package were employed to identify the reading-habits variables which predicted expository writing performance with a high degree of statistical probability.

RESULTS

In the L1 study, omnibus regression analysis yielded a statistically significant relationship ($F[14, 142] = 3.15, p \leq .0003, R^2 = .237$) between
the 14 predictor variables and scores on the expository writing measure.
A subsequent stepwise regression procedure focusing on the 12 genre-
frequency reading variables produced the three-variable model shown in
Table 2. The three-variable model was significant, $F(12, 144) = 2.63, \ p \leq .0033, R^2 = .154$.

In the L2 study, omnibus regress analysis indicated no statistically signif-
ificant relationships ($F(28, 86) = .98, \ p \leq .51, R^2 = .137$) between L1 and L2 reading-habit variables considered together and L2 writing perfor-
manence. No further analyses were undertaken because probability levels exceeding .05 for the omnibus procedure customarily preclude additional tests.

BRIEF REPORTS AND SUMMARIES
DISCUSSION

The results of the L1 study indicate that academic expository writing proficiency is (a) significantly related to the 14 aggregate reading-habit variables; and (b) significantly but not strongly related to (i.e., the shared variance $R^2$ between all three stepwise predictors and the writing test scores is small) a subset of three genre-specific reading-habits variables. Interestingly, two of the latter set of variables measured reading behavior during the elementary school years, a period believed to be critical for L1 literacy development (Anderson, Wilson, & Fielding, 1988; Smith, 1982). In sum, it appears that L1 school-based writing proficiency of the type measured here can partly be accounted for by learners’ extensive reading experience, with some indication that experience with specific text types in the early school years may be particularly important.

In contrast, the L2 study yielded no significant regression results whatsoever. Given that this study was a close replication of the L1 study, the markedly differing results are in need of theoretical explanation. Constructs such as Cummins’ cognitive academic language proficiency, or CALP (Cummins, 1981), Heath’s (1986) transferable generic literacies, or Krashen’s reading hypothesis (Krashen, 1984; 1988)—all of which assume that L2 literacy (or significant components thereof) is acquired via the same basic processes as L1 literacy—do not appear to account for the marked differences found between our two studies.

Instead, the contrasting results reported here suggest, at most, that extensive exposure to written texts—whether L1 or L2—may have little impact on nonnative writing proficiency of the type measured here or, at least, that such impact is difficult to measure using the present methodology. If the former is true, it may be necessary to reconceptualize L1 and L2 literacy acquisition, operationalized here in terms of the relationship of extensive reading to performance on tests of school-based writing, as distinctly different enterprises. But only through further research featuring direct comparisons of native and nonnative literacy development will an adequate understanding of the complex nature of L2 literacy be achieved.

### TABLE 2
Stepwise Regression Analysis for L1 Study: Best Three-Variable Model Out of 12 Reading-Habits Variables Considered ($n = 157$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Predictor variables</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$df$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Frequency of elementary fiction reading</td>
<td>0.0841</td>
<td>0.2043</td>
<td>1,155</td>
<td>14.23</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Frequency of elementary textbook reading</td>
<td>0.1339</td>
<td>0.1947</td>
<td>2,155</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Frequency of university fiction reading</td>
<td>0.1536</td>
<td>0.1100</td>
<td>3,153</td>
<td>9.26</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Teach it... Learn it... like it really is in life

Foreign Accent begone!... if the teacher has smarts!
Your recorded voice doesn't sound like you to you... but it does to others. This phenomenon is a critical factor in teaching sounds. Do you use, ignore or just blunder through such things... the 8 pronunciations of that, the 17 forms of you (slow, fast, before consonants/vowels, negative, past, conditional) "One size does not fit all" when speaking naturally in real life.
Free for the asking... a check-list of little things ESLers ought to know.

200 Questions you didn't know to ask!

How do Americans really speak English?

Starter Kit for those beginning to teach or learn American English as it really is spoken. Introductory Basics, Urgent Survival (with only 3 or 4 hours even rank beginners are out on their own alone in spoken English)

Basic Course All that it takes for fluent natural speech. See-hear-do-say -- no need for oral explanations in any language. Common Expressions - 76 voices in real-life context. Real Life Selections 125 voices, 41 2-minute excerpts from real life. Listeners Digest - a 60-minute monthly of what is heard in the US.

American Spoken English, 210 W 21, New York, N.Y. 10011 USA 212-989-2719
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English in China

With the growing awareness of the global impact of English language teaching and the suffusion of World Englishes throughout the globe, it is encouraging to find this timely anthology on English teaching in the most populous nation on earth. Within the past decade, a great deal has been published in English about English teaching and learning in China, including some comprehensive and well-researched doctoral dissertations (e.g., Garrott, 1991; J. Scovel, 1982), but Dzau’s anthology is the first book in English devoted to the topic written by and for TESOL professionals. The title is a bit of a misnomer because the collection of essays deals exclusively with the teaching of English in the Peoples Republic of China (PRC) and not with the broad range of topics such as the use, extent, and influence of English that is implied by the title. But because Dzau’s anthology is focused clearly on teaching, and primarily on English language teaching (ELT) at the university level, it provides a comprehensive and useful description of the many problems and the few promises that English teachers face in contemporary China.

The book comprises 20 short articles roughly balanced between Chinese and British contributors, with five of the most insightful contributions written by Dzau himself. It is not surprising that the editor of this anthology is so keenly in touch with ELT in the PRC since he spent almost half a century teaching English in Shanghai before moving to the University of East Asia in Macau in 1984. Except for an article entitled “Teaching English in Chinese Secondary Schools” by Hu Yining (mistakenly surnamed Yu in the Table of Contents), all of the contributions focus on the teaching of English at the tertiary level. There is a fairly wide range of ELT situations represented, however, with descriptions of traditional universities, open universities, and in-
service teacher-training classes, and though only the Shanghai and Guangzhou areas are represented geographically, the descriptions and analyses are representative of ELT institutions throughout this large nation. The only limitation I see in scope is that the foreign contributors to this book are exclusively British and predominantly from the British Council. Granted that of all the English-speaking nations, Great Britain was the first to establish diplomatic ties after the 1949 Revolution and that the British Council, under the leadership of such able professionals as Alan Maley (one of the contributors to this anthology) has played an influential role in modernizing ELT in the PRC. Nonetheless, it is a bit disappointing to see very little representation by non-British authors and programs especially because the book focuses on developments of the past decade.

The anthology is divided into three approximately equal parts: The first third presents a historical, political, cultural, and pedagogical background to ELT in contemporary China; the second part describes problems that both Chinese and foreign English teachers face; and the final section is devoted to the British Council–sponsored Advanced Teacher Training Courses (ATTCs).

In the first section, Dzau’s introductory “Historical Background” provides a succinct but comprehensive and accurate review of ELT in China since the 1949 Revolution. Those who know the historical events that drained and flooded China during those decades cannot help but empathize with the plight of teachers during the momentous years which Dzau depicts so tellingly. Another insightful introductory contribution is Dzau’s “Teachers, Students, and Administrators,” which details in superb fashion the way in which institutions and administrations play an even more powerful role in the shaping of ELT than methods, materials, or teaching. Dzau contributes yet another equally insightful essay on “How English is Taught in Tertiary Educational Institutions.” This is an excellent summary of the nature, extent, and influence of “intensive reading,” the popular ELT practice in China of carefully analyzing the structural and semantic content of a text in detailed and meticulous fashion. Because of its pervasiveness in Chinese education, intensive reading is a popular topic in this anthology.

In the second part of the book, both Charles Meyer and Roger Everett write succinct and useful articles on the ways that English teachers in China can move beyond intensive reading to more extensive and communicative activities. These two essays bracket a contribution on “A Lesson to be Learned: Chinese Approaches to Language Learning” by Paul Harvey, which stands out as the only article in the anthology which defends the continued use of intensive reading in ELT classrooms.
Besides these contributions on intensive reading by foreign English teachers, the second part of this book contains an article by Alan Maley written in 1983 when Maley was responsible for British Council ELT efforts in China. Although the article is almost a decade old, its description of problems which Chinese and foreigners face in China is not entirely dated—partly, I believe because of the political events which precipitated and which evolved from the Tiananmen Square incident in June 1989 and partly because of some inherent contradictions which characterize the relationships between “foreign experts” and their Chinese colleagues (T. Scovel, 1983). This section also contains several experimental studies conducted by Chinese English teachers.

The last section of this anthology is composed of four articles describing a British Council–sponsored set of ATTCs in Shanghai. The authors describe in frank and accurate detail the problems encountered and the ways in which both the British and Chinese expectations for this large program were modified and compromised to ensure the continuance and the success of the courses.

Dzau aptly concludes his anthology with a postscript, written after the Tiananmen Square incident which like so many other events over the past century of Chinese-foreign relationships, has seemed to rip years off the calendar with one abrupt sweep of fate. Dzau’s observation is a fitting summary of not just the ELT situation in China but of any English teaching program in the world today:

The problems of ELT should be studied in the light of its total linguistic, cultural, and political environment, to determine the constraints, the difficulties and the special problems that arise from such an environment in order that really effective solutions may be worked out. (p. 282)
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Humanism in Language Teaching.

For some years now, Earl Stevick has been one of a number of writers who have explored humanistic ideas and techniques in the teaching of languages (see, e.g., Moskowitz, 1978; Morgan & Rinvolucci, 1983). In previous books, notably his Teaching Languages: A Way and Ways (Stevick 1980), he has employed a personal style and used the example of his own teaching to explore how humanistic methods, particularly the Silent Way and Counseling Learning, are realized in the language classroom.

Though these methods have often been popular with teachers, and in some areas of our profession they have been adopted on a large scale, they have also met with skepticism from applied linguists who have often dismissed humanistic methodology as unscientific, that is, as rooted in dogma that has no basis in scientifically ascertained fact. In Stevick’s latest book, Humanism in Language Teaching, he attempts to do what has not been done before: to meet the critics of humanistic methodology on their own terms and to provide an academic discussion of the methods in question that may not amount to a rationale but at least takes a more sympathetic attitude towards its subject matter.

Stevick begins by considering different meanings that have been assigned to the word humanism. He notes that the term has been used variously, but he succeeds in extracting five key concepts, or values, at least some of which recur in each definition:

1. Feelings, both emotional and aesthetic
2. Social relations, and the encouragement of friendship and cooperation
3. Responsibility
4. Intellect, including the free exercise of critical reason
5. Self-actualization, which entails the pursuit of individuality rather than conformity.

All forms of humanism seem to promote at least some of these values. Stevick then attempts to disarm some of the criticism that has been leveled against humanistic language teaching methodology in general. His overall aim is not to defend humanistic methods but to expose underlying assumptions made in discussions on the subject as well as to make an important distinction in the types of argument used in academic discourse—the difference between logical and rhetorical arguments. He demonstrates that arguments used against humanistic methodologies have largely been of a rhetorical nature, often using emotive and tendencious language; furthermore, he reveals fundamental logical flaws even in those arguments that claim to be grounded...
in logic, such that what seems at first glance to be disproof is, in fact, only dissuasion.

Stevick then provides detailed analyses of the principles underlying the thinking of two major figures—Charles Curran and Caleb Gattegno. In the case of the former, Stevick is more concerned with handling criticism of Curran's ideas and methods, whereas the chapter on Gattegno concentrates on giving a detailed account of Gattegno's philosophy.

Finally, Stevick identifies three key features that Counseling Learning and the Silent Way seem to share:

1. An emphasis on the uniquely human attributes of the learner
2. A commitment to the freedom of the learner
3. A regard for human dignity

As a favorably inclined academic presentation of humanistic language teaching methods, Stevick's book is only partially successful. Stevick is most effective first in disarming the critics of humanism by pointing out logical flaws and overreliance on rhetoric in their argumentation, and second in cutting through assumptions and, in some cases, prejudice to underlying beliefs about language teaching. He also succeeds, to some extent, in presenting a demystified rationale for the methodologies, particularly the Silent Way, and in showing that they were never intended to be treated as dogma or to become irrevocably bound up with props such as color charts and cuisenaire rods. Finally, he is able to distill the qualities common to various methodologies, and in this way, he brings us closer to an understanding of what humanistic teaching actually is.

Other facets of the book are less well managed. Stevick scarcely mentions work in humanistic psychology that underlies much thinking in humanistic teaching. There is no reference to Abraham Maslow (e.g., 1968), for example, and very little to Carl Rogers; no mention is made of the latter's important books Freedom to Learn (1969) and Freedom to Learn for the 80's (1983), which much more directly than Rogers' psychoanalytical writings address issues of humanism in mainstream education.

More importantly, Stevick fails to deal head-on with the prevailing image in the U.S. of language teaching as an applied science. He deals effectively with critics of humanism, but he does little to examine in detail the assumptions underlying the accepted view of language teaching as a pursuit that can be improved only with the aid of innovations based on "scientific" research. Without such a critique, it is difficult to make an impression on the U.S. applied linguistics community.

Also missing is a discussion of the broader political context in which
language teaching takes place. With the increasing influence of critical theory on mainstream education and a growing awareness of power issues in language teaching (Phillipson, 1992), one wonders whether a rarefied humanism can prosper without taking political and societal factors into consideration. Perhaps one way forward is a synthesis of humanistic notions and critical theory such as that proposed in Nemiroffs (1992) concept of a "critical humanism."

These reservations aside, however, Stevick's book has much to recommend it. It provides a thoughtful and sympathetic account of humanistic beliefs while always avoiding the kind of dogmatic, prescriptive approach that is often associated with such ideas; and as in his other books, Stevick is able to stimulate his readers to think for themselves. It is a book that teachers will benefit from; whether it has any effect on the academic community, for whom it is partially intended, is another matter.

REFERENCES


BILL JOHNSTON
University of Hawaii at Manoa

Longman Keys to Language Teaching Series.
Neville Grant (Series Ed.), London: Longman.

When I first approached the Longman Keys to Language Teaching series, the issue of intended audience was on my mind. I found a preliminary answer in the Preface¹, where the reader is told that this series was designed to counter the trend toward books for "privileged teachers in privileged environments—teachers with large classrooms,

¹The first three paragraphs of the Preface are the same in each of the handbooks reviewed here, with the exception of Mistakes and Error Correction, which repeats only the third paragraph of the common preface, including the text quoted here.
large budgets for expensive equipment, and small classes!” After completing my survey of the series, however, I found that in addition to providing its intended service to “ordinary teachers in ordinary classrooms,” it also has something to offer other audiences. For example, from the perspective of someone responsible for a MATESOL methods course or teaching practicum, the series could be used as a reference to generate discussion for introducing teachers-in-development to many of the central issues they will face in the classroom. For use by more experienced language teachers, the series offers a concise and relatively up-to-date refresher course, short on professional jargon and long on practical recommendations grounded in examples from current ESL/EFL materials and classroom vignettes.

Available in the U.S. at the time of this review were books on the use of textbooks, grammar teaching and learning, classroom management, classroom interaction techniques, error correction, classroom testing, and visuals (four of these are reviewed here). A handbook on teaching children is reviewed in the Book Notices section of this issue.

Making the Most of Your Textbook.

This handbook is organized around the language skills of listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Grant is quick to point out that this does not imply that these skills should be thought of, or presented to learners, as isolated entities. He also aims to establish an interactive relationship with the reader by posing a set of teacher types, or styles, in the form of opinion statements that readers are asked to consider in terms of their own teaching philosophy and by posing the traditional Questions and Activities at the end of each chapter. For each of the language skills, Grant presents excerpts and teachers’ notes from textbooks in current use and suggests activities that the teacher can use to modify or go beyond the existing text and notes. The final chapter of the handbook presents a process for evaluating textbooks from the perspective of student, teacher, and syllabus needs. Making the Most of Your Textbook is at its best when providing examples from actual textbooks and recommendations for supplemental activities rather than when it is defining and commenting on language skills and teaching objectives.
Teaching and Learning Grammar.

This handbook presents a sentence-based notion of grammar that “focuses on the practice rather than the study of grammar” (p. 1) and argues that the language teacher can help foster both acquisition and conscious learning. Harmer, like Grant, consciously strives for an interactive relationship with the reader, beginning the handbook with a set of agree/disagree statements concerning grammar and language learning as a prereading task. This type of task—asking the reader to agree/disagree with a statement or to come up with examples of grammar points—is repeated frequently throughout the handbook as Harmer provides examples of identifying, presenting, practicing, and testing grammar points. At the end of the handbook, the reader is asked to repeat the original agree/disagree task as a posttest. Teaching and Learning Grammar does an excellent job of providing the reader with ideas about sentence-based grammar in the language classroom. However, the connection between discourse type and grammar form and function is never discussed although examples of discourse contexts for grammar beyond the sentence level are provided.

Effective Class Management.

This handbook provides a thorough inventory of the factors teachers need to consider when addressing their role as managers of the classroom environment. The first three chapters encourage the reader to know themselves, their school, and their students. This process is aided by questions concerning (a) teacher talents, skills, and knowledge; (b) school philosophy, responsibilities, and staff behavior; and (c) student background and attitudes. The rest of the handbook offers suggestions for a positive classroom atmosphere. It discusses the physical conditions of the classroom and offers insights on the understanding and planning of a syllabus, on lesson plans, and on timing within lessons. Finally, it offers advice on the use of a variety of audiovisual aids and on reducing the teacher's workload. The importance of classroom management is debated by no one; however, it is rarely given the amount of attention received by language skills and teaching techniques. Underwood's handbook will be, for many, the most important “key” in the series.
Mistakes and Correction.

In the interactive style that characterizes the Longman Keys to Language Teaching series, this handbook begins with a question: “If making mistakes is a part of learning, and correction is a part of teaching, how do the two of them go together?” (p. 1). Edge begins his answer by distinguishing two types of mistakes: those of meaning (Chapter 1) and those of form (Chapter 2). In the remaining chapters, he discusses the notion of mistakes as learning steps, to understand when and how mistakes need to be seen as a part of the learning process. He also discusses correction in terms of the goals of fluency and accuracy in spoken and written English and presents suggestions concerning attention to correctness in teacher speech (primarily for nonnative speakers of English). Overall, the ideas and suggestions given in these chapters provide the answer to the question that Edge poses at the beginning of the handbook. He summarizes that answer: “Learners need a clear idea of the language that exists outside them, and a strong feeling that the language is developing inside them” (p. 69).

The Longman Keys to Language Teaching handbooks reviewed here will be of value to the intended audience of teachers with large class sizes and limited budgets. The series seems especially geared toward teachers at the beginning and intermediate levels as well as teachers who are nonnative speakers of English. The Underwood and Edge handbooks, in particular, have sections written especially for nonnative speakers. As I stated in the introduction to this review, however, readers beyond the targeted audience will find uses for this series as well.

BRIAN K. LYNCH
University of California, Los Angeles

Learning in Two Languages: From Conflict to Consensus in the Reorganization of Schools.

As contributor Rudolph Troike astutely observes in Learning in Two Languages, with the possible exception of sex education, no other issue within the historical context of U.S. schooling has evoked a debate so fiercely emotional as bilingual education. Contrary to popular belief,
bilingual education has had a lengthy history in the U.S. and can be easily dated to the 1800s when many states offered bilingual instruction for German immigrants (Hakuta, 1986). However, it was not until 1981 that Congress considered a proposal for an English Language Amendment (ELA). The ELA declares English to be the official language of the U.S. and would jeopardize the implementation of bilingual education. Two years later, Senator S. I. Hayakawa founded U.S. English, a political lobby whose advocacy of the ELA has led to its role as one of the chief combatants in the battle over bilingual education.

Admittedly, it is difficult to conceive of a work engendered by a U.S. English-funded conference that could achieve an impartial portrayal of the current debate over language policy in the U.S. Nevertheless, advocates of bilingual education may discover that, at least in some aspects, Learning in Two Languages exceeds their cynical expectations. As editor Gary Imhoff testifies in his introduction, U.S. English did not govern the selection of participants nor the editing of contributions to the 1989 conference on “Public Policy Issues in Bilingual Education.” In addition, Imhoff has assembled a stellar cast of participants, juxtaposing the perspectives of such scholarly proponents of bilingual education as Joshua Fishman, Rudolph Troike, and Henry Trueba with those of keen critics such as Rosalie Pedalino Porter and Christine Rossell.

James Banks opens the deliberations from a pluralistic perspective. Drawing on current demographic trends, Banks underscores the urgent need for cross-cultural competency as well as cross-cultural literacy. He maintains that “a major goal of schooling in a pluralistic democratic society should be to help all students to develop literacy and competency in at least two languages” (p. 9) and predicts that such a policy would encourage much-needed cultural literacy and sensitivity within the U.S. population. Although he rejects the term bilingual education, preferring the concept of language literacy, Banks is merely expressing a preference for additive, or maintenance bilingual education, whereby the native language is preserved, rather than subtractive, or transitional programs, which tend to result in native language attrition. (For further information on additive and subtractive bilingual education, consult Lambert, 1977.)

John Edwards provides an excellent overview of the ELA polemic, claiming that his is a critical rather than a hostile stance toward bilingual education. Nonetheless, Edwards unmistakably rejects maintenance bilingual education. Edwards himself admits that many “proponents of U.S. English . . . currently give at least a grudging nod in the direction of transitional bilingual education” (p. 56), an attitude which is due in part to the fact that the primary goal of transitional bilingual education is often rapid mainstreaming of the child into English-only
classrooms (Spener, 1988). Finally, whereas Imhoff's introduction misleadingly claims that Edwards opposes the naming of English as the official language of the U.S., what Edwards actually states is that since "the United States is not going to become a bilingual country, and the dominance of English rests firmly upon socioeconomic pillars unlikely to tumble" (p. 54), the ELA is simply unnecessary.

Sally Peterson does nothing to conceal her distaste for bilingual education and provides one of the most powerful arguments against it in the book. Her relating of its abuses, particularly the controversy over forged parent permission forms, is extremely provocative. Peterson seeks to halt the "misguided notion that TBE [transitional bilingual education] is a success," arguing that "never before in the history of education has a program that has been such a failure received so many accolades" (p. 245). Peterson relies primarily on her own experience. As a practitioner, Peterson's experience demands attention. A voice heard from within the bilingual classroom itself oftentimes carries more weight than one sounded from the confines of an academic's office. Interestingly, Imhoff presents the views of Peterson and Porter, two antibilingual education practitioners, leaving the pro-bilingual education viewpoint to suffer in the absence of comparable voices.

Henry Trueba emphasizes cultural sensitivity in "The Role of Culture in the Acquisition of English Literacy by Minority School Children." He asserts that cultural sensitivity within the schools is not only essential to the development of a healthy self-image for such students but also has the potential to positively affect their academic achievement. Trueba's chapter provides a convincing argument for native language instruction for language minority students, but its impact is undermined because it is preceded by Christine Rossell's 50-page chapter (the longest in the book), which offers an overwhelming amount of research data contradicting the effectiveness of L1 instruction for such students.

Rossell's data directly concern the Teresa P. et al. v. Berkeley Unified School District case. In fact, as she informs us, this paper is a revised version of her report to the U.S. District Court. Actually, Rossell appeared as an expert witness in the Berkeley case, which is intriguing, since Rossell's field of expertise is not applied linguistics or education, as would be expected, but rather political science (Crawford, 1992). In the Teresa P. case, Rossell testified that during her evaluation of Berkeley's program she observed that limited English proficient (LEP) children fared as well in ESL classes with individual tutoring as in bilingual classrooms; her report concluded that there was no need for an expansion of bilingual programs (Crawford, 1992). However, Crawford notes that under cross-examination, Rossell admitted that her conclusions were based on extremely limited classroom observation.
(three minutes), abbreviated conversations with instructors, and a study of 20% of the district’s LEP students (1992). Obviously this information brings the validity of Rossell’s quantitative evidence into serious question.

In Learning in Two Languages critics such as Rossell specifically address bilingual education, relegating the task of evaluating the broader implications of language policy, cultural plurality, and bilingualism to their adversaries. Unfortunately, the divergent levels of analysis conducted by the two camps have resulted in an unbalanced presentation.

Those who intend to acquire true literacy in the field of language policy would be well served by supplementing Learning in Two Languages with James Crawford’s (1992) Hold Your Tongue: Bilingualism and the Politics of English Only, in which Crawford honestly admits to his personal advocacy of bilingual education. Although Imhoff may profess aspirations of impartiality, of having “simply invited the best people... who represented a wide range of viewpoints,” he nevertheless quietly falls short of achieving an equitable representation of both sides of the bilingual education debate.
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As the political landscape in South Africa undergoes rapid change, so too do educational trends and priorities. A striking example is the growing field of Adult Basic Education (ABE) in the country. The edited volume Adult Basic Education in South Africa skillfully reflects the diversity and complexity of this developing field. The volume is a cooperative effort by seven contributors, representing a variety of ABE programs in South Africa. These programs include those run by the established universities of Cape Town, the Witwatersrand, and Natal, as well as grassroots organizations such as USWE (Use, Speak, and Write English).

The book is divided into two sections. The first section (Chapters 1 and 2) focuses on the contested history of the teaching of adult literacy and ESL in South Africa. In Chapter 1, Elda Lyster describes the debates which characterize ABE, provides some definitions of literacy, and locates ABE in South Africa within a wider international context. In Chapter 2, Edward French provides a comprehensive summary of the history of adult literacy in South Africa, highlighting the work of grassroots organizations such as Learn and Teach, the English Literacy Project (ELP), USWE, and the Adult Learning Project.

The second section in the book (Chapters 3–7), introduced by Tony Morphet, focuses on adult learning. In Chapter 3, Elda Lyster addresses contemporary approaches to first language methodology. While arguing that “no method is neutral” (p. 104), she examines the strengths and limitations of a variety of language teaching methodologies, including phonic, syllabic, and Freirean methods. In Chapter 4, Marian Clifford and Caroline Kerfoot examine the central role of English literacy in South Africa. They critically examine different theoretical approaches to the teaching of English literacy internationally, concluding with an examination of the ELP and USWE programs in South Africa. In Chapter 5, Jane Castle addresses adult numeracy—numeracy defined as “the mathematical skills needed for active participation in daily life” (p. 218). She explores reasons for the high rate of innumeracy in South Africa and examines numeracy education from a variety of perspectives. She concludes that adult educators need to play a more active role in incorporating numeracy education into ABE curricula. In Chapter 6, Edward French argues that
creating easy reading for adults is “the challenge at the heart of literacy” (p. 239). He examines nonformal, industry, state, and missionary publications in South Africa and provides a number of ideas for easy-reading materials development. In the final chapter, Barbara Hutton analyzes a number of myths about ABE and concludes with a series of questions that might help guide the future provision of ABE in South Africa.

Not only is Adult Basic Education in South Africa a unique and timely contribution to educational theory and practice in South Africa, but it confronts issues that are familiar to adult educators in different parts of the world. It is a valuable addition to the international literature on literacy, TESOL, and numeracy.

BONNY NORTON PEIRCE
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education


This text outlines a model of inquiry to facilitate realistic and adequate training for L2 teachers which utilizes teachers’ own experiences. The four chapters of Part 1, “The Theory and Practice of Language Teaching,” deal with the active teaching situation and consider the problem it presents. Widdowson discusses the practice of “teaching as a research activity” where

the experimental activity [the observation of the relationship of techniques and principles] and the instructional activity [the prompting to learn] are reciprocally enhanced, and the most effective pedagogy is one in which the two act together, each informing and reinforcing the other. (p. 3)

He surveys the adoption of elements of linguistic theory, behaviorist psychology, the threshold level, humanistic learning, and immersion in the L2 class. In Chapter 4, he looks at pedagogic research and teacher education and outlines a useful model of L2 teacher training which would allow teachers to incorporate their own observations and initiative into their teaching practice.

An especially valuable observation made by Widdowson is that

we should not assume that language using behavior is necessarily effective as language learning behavior, or that natural learning potential once released from the inhibiting confinement of teacher control will lead learners to home in on their objectives. One does not solve the complex problems of language pedagogy by simply invoking the concepts of authenticity of language on the one hand, and the autonomy of learners on the other. (pp. 194-195)
Given that L2 teaching theory has been driven by these notions in recent decades, this stand is particularly significant. The text offers an engaging analysis of various issues in teaching, arguing that the nature of language and L2 teaching problems must be reexamined if an effective pedagogical model and corresponding teacher preparation program are to be developed.

Widdowson offers some observations which could provide a basis for classroom research; in Part 2, “Aspects of Language,” he looks at some semantic and pragmatic issues in communication. In Chapter 6, “Grammar, Nonsense, and Learning,” he effectively argues against the notion that a correct employment of the communicative approach to L2 teaching can or should dispense with the teaching of grammar. Grammar, as he illustrates, is part of meaning in most communication contexts. In Part 3, “Aspects of Teaching,” he assesses some of the problems of syllabus design and then outlines, in some detail, a methodology for the teaching of meaning. The final chapter consists of an interesting assessment of the different classroom forces of pupil autonomy and teacher authority, concluding that interfunctional autonomy is not necessarily a solution.

Several chapters of this work are derived from conference presentations and published articles, but they have been reworked to achieve cohesiveness and a system of cross-referencing, and the text reads smoothly as a whole. It serves as an excellent opportunity to refocus our concerns in L2 teaching and target the areas to be considered by L2 researchers and teachers.

VALERIE O’ROURKE
Dublin City University


Research on cooperative learning, especially in K–12 mainstream classrooms, has proliferated in recent years. The articles collected in this volume explain why and how cooperative learning procedures and skills can also be used in second language classrooms for learners of any age or level of language proficiency.

The book is divided into three sections. The first section explores the theoretical foundations of cooperative learning. Chapters in this section define cooperative learning, contrast it with competitive learning, describe the major models, and summarize research results, with an emphasis on benefits to students learning English as a second language. Each chapter includes specific strategies to help students develop social and oral skills through group interaction. The authors argue convincingly that use of
the collaborative group process contributes to successful linguistic, social, and cognitive development.

The second section moves from theory to classroom practice, with a focus on content-based language instruction. Each of the first three chapters in this section deals with cooperative learning in a classroom integrating language learning and content—science, social studies, and mathematics. Sample lessons and activities show the teacher how to structure groups and create or adapt appropriate materials. The last chapter in the second section explains use of the jigsaw procedure in content-based classes.

The third section focuses on the teacher. One chapter reviews research contrasting the style of teacher talk in traditional teacher-fronted classrooms with that in cooperative classes. Another describes the varied roles of the teacher using cooperative learning. The last two chapters will be of particular interest to those who work in teacher education. One chapter describes ways for preservice teachers to experience cooperative learning in their graduate programs so that they will be more likely to implement it in their own teaching. The final chapter gives a model for an in-service workshop on cooperative learning.

This is a very readable book. Numerous tables scattered throughout highlight key ideas. Sample lessons and activities show teachers how to implement cooperative learning techniques in their classrooms. I used several of the activities in the last chapters with my students in a graduate teacher preparation class to convince them of the value of a cooperative curriculum project.

Readers wanting to know more about cooperative learning will find the extensive bibliographies very helpful. In addition to the usual lists of references at the end of each chapter, the book closes with an annotated bibliography on cooperative learning research and methodology in general and a section on works specifically related to students acquiring English. The brevity of this latter list underscores the need for more published research on the use of cooperative learning in TESOL.

This book will be useful as a resource for classroom teachers, curriculum planners, and educators who prepare professionals in language education. I particularly recommend it for teachers who already use group work and communicative activities because it points up the need for teaching group-processing skills rather than just putting students into groups.

MARJORIE TERDAL
Portland State University


The primary intended audience for this book is EFL teachers who have no training in elementary education. The authors set out to help these teachers to adapt their teaching styles "to accommodate the needs and motivations of young learners" (p. vii).
The first two chapters might prove to be the most valuable for EFL teachers who have not taught children. Chapter 1 describes children as learners and language learners. For example, understanding by 5- to 7-year-olds “comes through hands and eyes and ears. The physical world is dominant at all times” (p. 2). Chapter 2 contains important and useful information about class management and atmosphere: desk arrangements, pair and group work, and classroom language.

The next chapters cover the four traditional skills—listening, speaking, reading, and writing, followed by a chapter on topic-based, or thematic, work. The last chapters cover planning and the equipment and supplies necessary for teaching EFL to children.

Overall, Scott and Ytreberg meet the needs of their intended audience. They explain some important ways in which children differ from adults as learners. For instance, they point out that children need more opportunities to play with language, and they are more comfortable than adults with routines. The authors briefly describe a number of activities that focus on one skill. Some of the material covered would be familiar to EFL or ESL teachers of adults, as for example, a progression through five steps in teaching oral language: (a) presentation of new oral language, (b) controlled practice, (c) guided practice, (d) dialogues and role play, and (e) free activities. However, some of the activities described would not be familiar to ESL/EFL teachers of adults, such as children’s songs and chants, or the language experience approach to literacy.

The book might be improved in several ways. Scripts of EFL teachers explaining a picture, doing a cooking or science activity, and so on would give new EFL teachers of children a better idea of how to recycle, simplify, and contextualize the language with children. Second, the chapter on topic-based work could be expanded with examples of children learning content that was appropriate to their age level along with English. In fact, more attention to topic-based, as opposed to skills-based, work would strengthen the book. Third, place of publication should be given for all the references, perhaps with a list of the publishers’ addresses around the world.

I recommend Scott and Ytreberg's book to teacher educators who deal with EFL or ESL in the elementary school, but also suggest two complementary texts. Marcia Brechtel’s (1992) Bringing the Whole Together addresses designing and teaching thematic units for elementary school ESL. Gail Heald-Taylor's (1989) Whole Language Strategies for ESL Students is a practical and eloquent guide that provides many examples of student work and gives suggestions for theme-based work.

REFERENCES


SABRINA PECK
California State University, Northridge
File 1: English for Today and Tomorrow is the second book in a series of four student workbooks designed for intermediate-level secondary school ESOL students. It provides an innovative approach to language learning for adolescents, focusing on the development of reading, writing, speaking, and listening skills. The book is well laid out and visually attractive. Its contemporary style artwork enhances its appeal to adolescents.

This book incorporates individual, pair, and group activities designed around interesting themes such as dreams, solving mysteries, biographies, interviewing, memories, inventions, vacation in space, school, friends, family. The activities often revolve around reading passages, games, puzzles, pictures or questionnaires. Each chapter contains labeled sections (Read, Write, Listen, Share, Think and Decide, Understand, and Remember) indicating the focus of each activity. A section called Notice is used to focus the learner’s attention on a particular structure or other linguistic convention. These activities are presented creatively and humorously with the hope of enhancing students’ motivation through the use of funny stories, drawings, and cartoons, though some of the choices to be responded to are a bit silly.

The authors attempt to accommodate different learning styles and cognitive abilities of students by incorporating a variety of activities: discovery learning, “fun” activities, formal instruction, drill and practice, hypothesis testing, a large number of comprehension skills and strategies, and a variety of opportunities for active production. File 1 also provides communicative formats such as information gap and role-play activities and integrates linguistic functions such as praising, criticizing, and requesting throughout the text.

File 1 attempts to get away from a traditional approach to grammar by avoiding contrived use and encouraging natural use in real situations. A variety of structures are introduced as they are needed in particular themes and situations in each unit. The authors attempt to present authentic material that will trigger “real-life” information from the students’ own world.

Vocabulary is introduced in context, relating to the particular themes of the units; however, students may contribute vocabulary depending upon their own interests and world knowledge. Vocabulary activities are presented in a variety of ways, from structured puzzle-like or fill-in tasks to more creative tasks and decision-making activities where students may choose their own vocabulary items.

File 1 does not follow a standard outline for the 10 chapters. However, each chapter does begin with a short list of what is to be introduced. Each chapter also contains a section called Put it Together, which allows for the consolidation of the different structures, skills, and vocabulary introduced in the chapter by providing the opportunity for creative language
use. A poem or very short story is added towards the end to provide enjoyment. At the end of each chapter is a section called Trivial Files, which is a great addition to the text; it helps to strike a balance between serious reading and enjoyable activities. This one-page section is divided into four parts, each containing five trivia questions in such areas as science, sports, geography, nature, and language.

In the back of the book is a section called Test Yourself, providing questions relating to the grammatical points introduced in each chapter to be used as additional classroom practice, homework, preparation for a test, or as a test. The book ends with a glossary of the terms introduced throughout the text.

Overall, File 1 successfully provides interesting, challenging, and sophisticated materials to develop students’ linguistic proficiency as well as intellectual awareness. It is a well-organized, up-to-date, fun workbook that both students and teacher will enjoy.

SENJ A ANTILLA
San José State University


Good writing texts allow for differences. The Flexible Writer is indeed flexible. Intended primarily for developmental writers in multicultural settings, it is also appropriate for limited English proficient (LEP) learners at intermediate to advanced levels. It can be used in courses which focus on the writing process, traditional rhetoric, personal and expressive writing, academic preparation, multicultural perspectives, or modes of discourse. It is at once a rhetoric, a reader, and a handbook. Most importantly, students and teachers may select from the variety of materials provided those which best suit their needs and approaches to writing.

Part 1, “The Writer,” helps students to become more confident as writers by introducing the various purposes for writing. Practical ideas for managing writing time, tools, space, and habits are offered. Especially useful to second language writers is the discussion of commonly held myths and fears about writing.

The writing process is explored in Part 2. Rich describes writing as beginning with certain needs and achieving results by moving through, in no set order, seven phases. The strategies employed by new and experienced writers are contrasted. Throughout, the relation between each phase and the total process is emphasized, providing a more reasoned analysis of the act of writing than most writing textbooks.

Part 3 centers on purposes for writing. One chapter helps students to focus, use, and develop their senses through writing. Another offers opportunities and strategies for writing to remember. In a third, students consider the meanings of culture, the relationship between language and culture, and issues of ethnicity, gender, and age. They identify and write
about issues of race, class, and religion that are important to them. More academically oriented writing tasks are introduced in two chapters. These include identifying and writing key words, thesis statements, and questions and taking notes and summarizing. A major focus in these chapters is the approach to thinking and writing taken in different disciplines. The final chapter in this section explores the dynamics of language and power. Students distinguish between appeals to emotion, status, and reason; they identify and revise faulty reasoning.

The last part is a handbook. Unlike most handbooks, which are prescriptive in nature, this one's descriptive approach helps students to understand how grammar, punctuation, and spelling affect meaning.

Each chapter begins by listing the opportunities the chapter offers to students. Quotations relevant to the chapter topic follow. The major part of each chapter is given over to discussions followed by explorations, tasks for students to do together or solo, orally or in writing. Most chapters include several student essays; reflection questions are provided to guide reading and discussion. A review brings each chapter to a close.

The Flexible Writer is an excellent choice for students who must move from personal to academic writing, particularly those in multicultural environments.

SYLVIA MULLING
Kean College


Marcella Frank's *Writing as Thinking* is a writing workbook designed for advanced ESOL students in college writing classes, for nonmatriculated ESOL students, or for remedial native speakers. With this text, Frank has given “more attention to the composing process, especially the revision stage” (p. ix) than in her previous book, *Writing from Experience* (1983). This book emphasizes the production of texts using the processes of preparing and polishing texts for readers in academic settings. As the title indicates, it is a workbook that stresses the development of writing and critical thinking skills by engaging the students in reading (and reading in depth) about a given topic or theme. With units centrally planned around a rhetorical structure and a theme, the students can consider a subject in some “breadth and depth” (p. ix). The book uses a guided approach to writing emphasizing the three stages of process writing: prewriting, writing, and revision. There is an instructor's manual, but even the student book offers procedures and suggestions for the teacher at each step in the process, including strategies for overcoming writer’s block. The final project for the book is a major research paper.

Each chapter consists of sections in composition, vocabulary and usage, reading for summary, reading for main ideas, and extra discussion and
writing. The steps of the composition section consist of procedures for prewriting discussions, writing the first draft, and subsequent revisions. After the prewriting discussion and summary writing assignments, the students are given the writing assignment for the chapter. At each stage, the students are challenged to think critically about a topic, weaving personal experiences with newly acquired vocabulary and ideas provoked by the readings. The text assists the students in narrowing thesis statements and providing a guide for outlining and organizing each composition in terms of the rhetorical style of the unit. The vocabulary and usage sections use contextualized vocabulary, parts of speech, and word-form exercises to reinforce the topic and the rhetorical style—a necessary supplement for ESOL students even at the advanced level.

Before the composition is finally drafted, the students read and summarize three readings related to the chapter’s thematic focus. All of these assignments and readings are designed to make the writer more fluent in reading, summarizing, and writing in an academic context. The role of summarizing is an oft neglected one, but the author believes that this develops more active participation between the student and the text. The final compositions are apt to be clearer, more logical, concise, informative and rhetorically effective since the composition has been thoroughly revised, researched, and rewritten.

There is a need to balance the process approach with frequent examples of good writing—explaining the nuts and bolts behind a good product (as well as what is acceptable and what is not acceptable in an academic setting.) By providing this balance, this book is valuable for academically bound students as they ready themselves for the rigors of academic study.

LARRY UDRY
The University of Tennessee at Martin

Foreign Language Research in Cross-Cultural Perspective.
Kees de Bot, Ralph B. Ginsberg, and Claire Kramsch (Eds.).

This edited volume comprises 14 papers from a conference held at Bellagio, Italy, in June 1988. It is concerned with current empirical research in foreign language instruction in the U.S. and Europe. The main goals of the conference were to bring together scholars in the field from both sides of the Atlantic to analyze “differences in perspectives on what should be investigated and what paradigm should prevail” (p. xi) and to encourage empirical research in foreign language pedagogy.

This volume should be of great interest and use to foreign language teachers, researchers, materials writers, and other TESOL professionals. The strength of this book lies in the number and variety of important issues it presents which are relevant to research in foreign language learning and teaching. It is divided into four parts with descriptive titles: “Priori-
ties in the U.S. and in Europe,” “Measurement and Research Design,” “Teaching Environments,” and “Learning Environments.”

The first part is devoted to research priorities in the U.S. and Europe. The first article is a review of current foreign language pedagogy and some of the major research trends in second language acquisition in the U.S. The second article presents an overview of empirical foreign language research in Europe and suggests directions for future research in the field.

In the second part, as its title indicates, articles address aspects of measurement and research design that apply to empirical studies of foreign language learning and teaching. The first article is concerned with the relationship between language teaching methodologies and language learning. The second addresses broad issues related to quantitative approaches to research design. Other articles in this section are concerned with language proficiency testing.

In the third part, the articles deal with a number of issues related to foreign language teaching. The first provides a review of the empirical research that has been conducted on language teaching methodologies. The second attacks problems that researchers encounter when trying to define instructional methodologies, and the third addresses the evaluation of foreign language teaching projects and programs in the broader context of educational evaluation. The fourth is concerned with characterizing the environments in which teaching and learning take place for research purposes.

In the final part, articles focus on the idiosyncrasies of the individual learner and his/her interactions with the learning environment. The first article discusses the internal and external factors which determine effective learning and advocates investigating classroom interaction from the perspective of discourse analysis. The second draws from current work in linguistic theory—Universal Grammar—in an attempt to characterize learning environments that may enhance foreign language learning processes. The third article is concerned with the relationship of language and culture, and examines current efforts to link the teaching of language and culture in the U.S. The final article analyzes implications of artificial intelligence for foreign language learning and teaching.

In addition to presenting a wealth of issues related to foreign language research, each article includes an extensive bibliography. This volume is a valuable resource that could be used in ESOL teacher education programs to provide further insights into foreign language research from a cross-cultural perspective.

TRINIDAD MARGALEF
Indiana University, Bloomington
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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.
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TESOL Quarterly readers are invited to contribute review articles and evaluative or comparative reviews for consideration for publication in the Review or Book Notice sections of the Quarterly. These should be sent to the TESOL Quarterly Review Editor, Heidi Riggenbach, University of Washington, at the address listed in the Information for Contributors section.
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Falas, C. J. (1993). Jointfostering: Adapt-
ing teaching strategies for the multilingual classroom. New York: Merrill.
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<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

* 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.
1600 Cameron Street, Suite 300
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-2731 U.S.A.
Tel. 703-836-0774 • Fax 703-836-7864
Diversity as Resource
Redefining Cultural Literacy
Denise E. Murray, Editor

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.


1992, 326 pp., ISBN 0-939791-42-0, $22.95 (member $19.95)
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