Applied Language Learning

VOLUME 12 · NUMBER 1

2001

APPLIED LANGUAGE LEARNING 2001 VOLUME 12 NUMBER 1

Applied Language Learning

Lidia Woytak
Editor

Professional Bulletin 65-01-01

2001 Volume 12 Number 1

From the Editor

Reviewers for *Applied Language Learning*

The individuals listed below served as reviewers of manuscripts submitted to *Applied Language Learning* in 2000 and 2001. We express our gratitude for expert service to:

Kathi Bailey
Monterey Institute of International Studies
Martha S. Bean
San José State University
Stephen Butler
Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center
Christine M. Campbell
Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center
John B. Carroll
University of North Carolina
Marianne Celce-Murcia
University of California, Los Angeles
Ray T. Clifford
Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center
Tracey M. Derwing
University of Alberta, Edmonton
Dan Douglas
Iowa State University
Miriam Eisenstein-Ebsworth
New York University
Donald Fischer
University of New Mexico
Robert C. Gardner
University of Western Ontario
John S. Hedgcock
Monterey Institute of International Studies
Evelyn Hatch
University of California, Los Angeles
Eli Hinkel
Seattle University
Gordon Jackson
Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center
Renee Jourdenais
Monterey Institute of International Studies
Masaki Kobayashi
University of British Coumbia
James F. Lee
University of Indiana
Ronald P. Leow
Georgetown University
Naoko Matsuo
Monterey Institute of International Studies
Murray J. Munro
Simon Fraser University
Denise Murray
San Jose State University
Paul Nation
Victoria University of Wellington
Wilga Rivers
Harvard University
Richard Schmidt
University of Hawaii-Manoa
David J. Shook
Georgia Institute of Technology
Richard Sparks
College of Mount Saint Joseph
Leo Van Lier
Monterey Institute of International Studies
Swathi Vamniavajan
San Jose State University
Maryann Weber
Missouri Southern State College

Applied Language Learning

PB 65-01-01

The mission of Professional Bulletin 65-01, *Applied Language Learning (US ISSN 1041-6791)*, is to provide a forum for the exchange of ideas and information on instructional methods and techniques, curriculum and materials development, assessment of needs within the profession, testing and evaluation, and implications and applications of research from related fields such as linguistics, education, communications, psychology, and the social sciences.

Applied Language Learning, published semiannually by the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center and Presidio of Monterey, presents professional information. The views expressed herein are those of the authors, not the Department of Defense or its elements. The content does not necessarily reflect the official US Army position and does not change or supersede any information in official US Army publications. *Applied Language Learning* reserves the right to edit material.

By Order of the Secretary of the Army:

ERIC K. SHINSEKI
General, United States Army
Chief of Staff

JOEL B. HUDSON
Administrative Assistant to the
Secretary of the Army
0112306

KEVIN M. RICE
Colonel, United States Army
Commander
DLIFLC and POM

Availability

To access *Applied Language Learning* on the Internet type:

http://dli-www.army.mil/pages_/applied/ or http://dli-www.army.mil/

Additionally, you may obtain the journal on microfilm from ERIC Clearinghouse on Language and Linguistics, Center for Applied Linguistics, 1118 22nd Street, NW, Washington, DC 20037.

Bulk rate postage is paid at DLIFLC. The basis of official distribution is one copy per training instructor and one per five military linguists.

Postmaster

Send change-of-address information to:

Applied Language Learning
Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center
Presidio of Monterey, CA 93944-5006

United Parcel Customers

Location is:

Applied Language Learning
Tin Barn
Bldg. 518, Room 7
Presidio of Monterey, CA 93944-5006

Readers

Contact Editor, Dr. Woytak (ATFL-AP-AJ), *Applied Language Learning*
Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center
Presidio of Monterey, CA 93944-5006
E-mail: AJ@pom-emh1.army.mil
Telephone: (831) 242-5638 DSN: 878-5638
Fax: (831) 242-5850

Web Publishing Assistance, Pavel Bielecki (ATZP-IM-KS)

Word-processing and Formatting — ***SPC Jason S. Hagerman, USA***
PVT Fred V. White, USA

Cover Design and Graphics — ***Barney Inada***
PVT Fred V. White, USA

Applied Language Learning

2001 Volume 12 Number 1

Articles

Discussion Forum

Reviews

General Information

Applied Language Learning
2001, Vol. 12, No. 1, pp. 31-44

The Challenges of Classroom-Based SLA Research

Marian J. Rossiter
University of Alberta

This paper outlines challenges that arose in the course of a classroom-based research project, identifies the realities of the second language setting that contributed to these complexities, and examines useful sources of support available to novice investigators. Despite concerted efforts to eliminate potential problems, difficult decisions had to be made during a study of adult learners registered in a full-time English as a second language program in Canada. In this study, three oral communication tasks were administered on 4 occasions over 15 weeks to three groups: a comparison group, a communication strategy instruction group, and an affective strategy instruction group. The author discusses the contextual limitations imposed by intact classes, as well as complexities involved in teacher and student participation, data collection, choice of tasks, data analysis, and ethical considerations. Research manuals (Freeman, 1998; Hatch & Lazaraton, 1991; Johnson, 1992; McDonough & McDonough, 1997; Nunan, 1992; Schachter & Gass, 1996) are examined to determine the attention directed to the types of second language acquisition research issues encountered in this study. Finally, the author proposes additional sources of support to strengthen second language classroom-based research by novice researchers and classroom teachers.

Conducting second language acquisition (SLA) classroom research is, for even the most experienced investigator, a challenging undertaking. For the novice researcher, the potential for encountering problems in a study involving second language classes is much greater. Issues such as research design, data collection, and data analysis are fraught with complexities, and even the best plans may go awry. As Schachter and Gass (1996) note,

> Reports of research projects make it all look so simple….
> There is no indication of the blood, sweat, and tears that
> go into getting permission to undertake the project, that
> go into actual data collection, that go into transcription,
> and so forth. (p. viii)

I will first discuss some of the challenges that I faced in carrying out classroom-oriented research on the effects of affective and communication strategy instruction. Then I will turn to a number of current SLA research resources and examine the extent to which these issues are addressed. Finally, I will suggest additional practical resources for novice researchers designing second language research projects.

Challenges Encountered

The Study

The research reported here focused on aspects of strategic competence, namely, the use of affective and communication strategies to enhance and overcome difficulties in second language communication. I used a non-equivalent control group design to evaluate the effectiveness of direct affective and communication strategy training. The 46 participants were adults registered in 16-week full-time English as a second language (ESL) intermediate proficiency classes in an educational institution in Canada, one of the largest providers in the community. For each treatment group, I designed 12 hours of strategy instruction that were taught by the classroom instructor over a period of four weeks. One class was assigned to a communication strategy condition (e.g., circumlocution), a second to an affective strategy condition (e.g., risk-taking, positive self-talk), and the third class served as a comparison group (no treatment). Three types of communication tasks (picture narrative, object description, abstract design description) were administered four times – once before instruction and at three points after.

This particular study was influenced by contextual limitations, and some of the complications that occurred were unanticipated. The majority of the complexities in the research related to the use of intact classes, teacher and learner participation, data collection factors, the choice of tasks, data analysis, and ethical issues. As McDonough and McDonough (1997) note, "in most educational situations the list of possible confounding variables is so large, with some systematic and some unsystematic ones, that realistic and satisfactory control and counterbalance are nearly impossible" (p. 45). Consequently, it is not surprising that studies of this type often produce non-significant or ungeneneralizable results.

Intact Classes

One of the major constraints in this study was the use of intact classes. Because the institution that I had chosen for my research project had only one class at the designated proficiency level, it was necessary to spread the study over three terms.

One problem with the intact classes related to the wide range of proficiency levels within each class and across classes. Student placement entailed the use of three formal assessment tools, in addition to the Canadian

Language Benchmarks Assessment (Citizenship & Immigration Canada, 1996) that each student had received prior to registration in the program. The in-house Diagnostic Test consisted of 100 multiple-choice grammar questions; a score was derived from subtracting the number of incorrect responses from the number of correct responses provided by each student. A grade 1-12 equivalent reading skill level was obtained from the reading comprehension subtest of the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (MacGinitie, 1978). The Secondary Level English Proficiency (SLEP) test (Educational Testing Service, 1981) listening subtest, consisting of 25 multiple-choice questions, was also administered. The students in this study were considered to have the overall equivalent of Canadian Language Benchmark 7. They were placed in classes that were as homogeneous as possible, on the basis of their individual scores. However, because there was only one class per term at this level of the program, there was a wide range of skill proficiency in each class. For example, some students may have been strong on the listening test, whereas others were very weak. It was problematic for this study that no formal test of speaking skills was administered at placement. Not surprisingly, learners' oral performance on the three experimental tasks varied greatly.

TeacherParticipation

When arrangements were made with the director of the ESL program to undertake this research, it was agreed that, ideally, one teacher should be assigned to all three terms of the study, in order to eliminate at least one confounding variable. A teacher with specialized TESL training and extensive experience in the ESL classroom participated in the study during Term 1. Just before Term 2 began, however, because of a decrease in program enrolment, responsibility for the Benchmark 7 class was given to another teacher who had greater seniority in the program. Fortunately, this instructor agreed to participate in the study and was able to continue into Term 3, so he delivered the instruction for both the communication strategy and affective strategy experimental classes. He was able to complete 9 of the 16 weeks in Term 3 before his scheduled holidays. This provided consistency for a critical component of the study. As trained teachers are not always available in the summer term, a substitute teacher with 1 year of English as a foreign language teaching experience, but no formal English as a second language training, was hired for the remainder of the course. The discrepancy in the qualifications of the two Term 3 teachers was a concern; however, as the role of the substitute in the study was restricted to reinforcing the affective strategy instruction that had been delivered in the first half of the course, it was decided to continue with the research. The first two teachers had volunteered to participate in the study and had demonstrated interest in the project. The third teacher, however, was new to the ESL program, was hired on a short-term contract, and had no long-term commitment to the program or interest in the research. This had a negative impact on the study, as teaching logs were not completed and audio-recording of classroom activities was minimal. It is unclear to what extent he actually reinforced the strategies.

Student Participation

Other factors that influenced this project were the composition and dynamics of the classes. The participants (23 male, 23 female) represented 22 native language backgrounds and ranged in age from 19 to 59 years. The majority were immigrants and refugees; there were also two international students in the comparison group. The participants had spent between one month and 26 years in English-speaking Canada and had varied exposure to native speakers of English outside the classroom.

In the first term, all students in the Benchmark 7 class volunteered to participate in the research. In Term 2, five students did not participate: one had a severe hearing disability, three had been participants in the comparison group in Term 1 and were repeating the course, and one became very anxious during the pre-test and decided to withdraw from the study. This last student repeated the course in Term 3 and discouraged two members of the class from taking part in the study; one other student in Term 3 did not participate because of imminent plans to leave the country. Class dynamics changed in Term 3 when several international students from the Pacific Rim joined the class halfway through the course. Although they did not participate in the study itself, their arrival affected the nature of the class, as did the change of teacher in the course of Term 3.

Finally, student attrition had a negative impact on the study. Although the three classes were, from the beginning, quite small (19-22 students), six students dropped out before the third administration of tasks because of employment or travel opportunities, expiry of student visa, or transfer to another level of the program. Many learners left the institution at the end of Benchmark 7 and were not available to complete the follow-up tasks.

Data Collection

I contacted all students and made an effort to schedule appointments to accommodate their timetables. All task administrations were planned for mid-week. Naturally, because of changes in the class plans (e.g., exams, field trips, debates, administrative matters) or student absences, appointments sometimes had to be re-scheduled. Some students who had limited contact with English on the weekends perceived that they performed poorly on Mondays; others, who shouldered academic, family, or employment responsibilities, noted that fatigue affected their performance on tasks re-scheduled for Fridays.

During the data collection process itself, difficulties related primarily to the equipment and the physical facilities. I relied on tape recorders supplied by my university. I always brought additional equipment as, on several occasions, tape recorders or microphones failed to record clearly or even at all. Although the best setting available was chosen for administering each set of tasks, voices were sometimes drowned by environmental noises from sources such as corridors, traffic, and playgrounds. In a crowded school where a variety of school programs and community services competed for rooms on a daily basis, there was often no quiet space available. Fortunately, I took field notes on students' performances and was later able to use these to transcribe most recordings that would otherwise have been unclear.

Choice of Tasks

The communication tasks that were chosen for this study also affected the outcomes. It became apparent, for example, that the narratives did not provide the same obligation for learners to use communication strategies as did the other two tasks. Students were able to ignore certain pictures or elements of pictures that caused lexical difficulties, thereby eliminating altogether the need to use communication strategies (reminiscent of Schachter's [1974] article on avoidance). The use of multiple tasks mitigated the problem in this study, but the dangers inherent in limiting an investigation to one task became very clear.

Data Analysis

Following transcription of the audio-recordings, the data were coded. Despite examples of types of communication strategies provided by authors of earlier studies, some utterances did not conform to the existing categories; for example, strategies coded as *use of all purpose words* in other taxonomies (Dornyei & Scott, 1997; Willems, 1987) included only nouns (e.g., 'thing', 'what-do-you-call-it'), although my data set showed examples of general all purpose (GAP) verbs (e.g., 'made a picture') being used in the same way (Paradis & Crago, 2000; Rice & Bode, 1993). Modifications were thus made to the category to accommodate these verbs. As other researchers have noted (e.g., Foster, Tonkyn, & Wigglesworth, 2000; Polio & Gass, 1997), however, the ability to make comparisons between related studies is dependent upon the use of similar criteria for coding decisions. Adjustments that had to be made might have affected the comparability of this study to some extent.

Data analysis difficulties arose as a result of the small numbers in each of the classes. In order to determine the success of the strategy instruction, I administered a series of tasks to participants: a pre-test in Week 5 of the course, an immediate posttest in Week 10, a delayed posttest in Week 15, and a follow-up five weeks later (exclusive of holidays). Because of initially small class sizes, exacerbated by attrition over the term, only 16 learners in Term 1 and 15 learners in each of Terms 2 and 3 completed the delayed posttest; even fewer completed the follow-up. Further data loss due to technical difficulties caused inconsistencies in cell numbers that complicated the analysis.

Ethical Considerations

Throughout the study, I was conscious that my presence and the research I was conducting were likely to affect the daily routine of the ESL classroom. Potential negative repercussions included decreased class time and increased homework for the students, interruption of the course curriculum, and additional responsibilities for the teacher. As audio-recording of research tasks could not be satisfactorily done in the classroom, pre-scheduled appointments were made to withdraw students from class. As a result, students often had to leave class in the middle of a high interest activity (e.g., mystery video, animated group discussion); in some cases, their temporary absence prevented them from participating in follow-up activities upon return. Students who preferred not to sacrifice class time to participate in the study gave up their lunch hour or made arrangements to stay at school later so that they could meet after class. This arrangement was inconvenient for them and often for their families, as well. Students were also asked to complete learning journals and motivation graphs in addition to their assigned homework, but, as there was no incentive for them to do so, many did not. For both teacher and learners, the strategy lessons taught represented 12 hours of the prescribed curriculum that had to be condensed or cut. Discussions with the teachers were often carried out over a hurried lunch or during preparation for the next day's class. Because of the good will of the two teachers whom I knew, trusted and respected, I felt that I was received into the class as a welcome guest. When this type of relationship had not had a chance to develop with the third teacher, however, I felt that I might have been perceived as an intrusion. At all stages of the project, I tried to remain cognizant of the accommodations that were being made and sensitive to student and teacher attitudes, without compromising the goals of the research.

Faced with developing constraints related to non-equivalent groups, student and teacher participants, data collection, data analysis, task differences, and ethical considerations, the temptation for many classroom-oriented researchers in my position might be to curtail or even abandon their study. I maintain, however, that what are often perceived as *problems* by researchers are in fact the daily *realities* of the contexts in which most teachers practise. The limitations in these research settings may frustrate investigators and pose possible threats to the reliability and validity of quasi-experimental findings; they are, however, part and parcel of the classroom context. It is conceivable that, as Larsen-Freeman suggests, "[w]hen we are more comfortable with qualitative research, our attitudes will be different and [the problems that exist] will no longer be seen as problems, but rather as interesting and challenging facets of complex situations which we must take into consideration" (Larsen-Freeman, 1996, p. 169). A more constructive alternative, in my view, is that there is a middle ground on the continuum, somewhere between highly-controlled experiments and qualitative studies; this middle ground offers rich opportunities for research in regular classroom environments, with potential for some generalizability. One such possibility may be the use of time-series research designs (Mellow, Reeder, & Forster, 1996), which are infrequent in the SLA research literature to date. These studies incorporate multiple pre-tests over time to determine a participant's normal pattern of development before treatment begins. Time-series designs are advantageous in that they can accommodate small numbers of participants without serious threat to internal or construct validity. Other alternatives remain to be explored. As Lazaraton (2000) asserts, "the next frontier in applied linguistics research should be developing alternatives to parametric statistics for small-scale research studies that involve limited amounts of dependent data" (p. 180). That goal, if achieved, would greatly expand the present parameters of research in the field.

How SLA Research Manuals Address These Issues

Although discussion of the types of problems I have reported above is not common in published reports, several authors have openly reflected on the pitfalls of SLA research. Bailey (1983) outlined the myriad of unexpected problems she experienced during the process of collecting data in a classroom-based study of the communication between teaching assistants and their students. In the same vein, Cumming and Swain (1989) and Swain and Cumming (1989) solicited from SLA researchers anecdotes that covered a wide range of problems — political, technical, and conceptual — in a variety of contexts. In his introduction to *The Pear Stories*, Du Bois (1980) related cultural difficulties he encountered doing research using a film to collect narratives in Guatemala. Some of the complications present in designing and implementing a normed survey instrument for ESL learners were outlined by Reid (1990), based on her own personal experience. Most research accounts, however, provide no evidence of the complexities of the studies and may in fact give readers a false impression of the research process.

Journal articles and research manuals outlining possibilities and techniques applicable to the field are two of the primary resources I consulted when designing my study. A review of six research texts published within the last 10 years (Freeman, 1998; Schachter & Gass, 1996; Hatch & Lazaraton, 1991; Johnson, 1992; McDonough & McDonough, 1997; Nunan, 1992) showed that each was particularly strong in certain areas. Some, however, made only passing mention of the difficulties I experienced in the course of my research, while others offered practical advice on how to deal with them.

Approaches to Research in Second Language Learning (Johnson, 1992) describes correlational, case study, survey, ethnographic, experimental, and multi-method approaches to research, and it presents detailed summaries of such studies conducted in a range of sociocultural and sociopolitical contexts. The author provides definitions, principles, advantages/disadvantages, and techniques characteristic of each methodology. The difficulties I experienced working with intact classes and non-equivalent groups are noted, and useful suggestions for data collection (e.g., audio- and video-recording, designing questionnaires) and analysis (e.g., inter-rater reliability, time sampling) are made. I gleaned many useful insights from this text, although it did not provide the practical, step-by-step procedures for conducting research that I also sought.

Research Methods in Language Learning (Nunan, 1992) also covers a wide range of topics: experiments, ethnography, case study, classroom observation and research, introspection (think-alouds, diaries, retrospection), elicitation techniques, interaction analysis, and program evaluation. Nunan provides definitions and principles of the methods, along with extensive illustrative data from SLA studies.

Of particular interest to me were the tables listing problems, threats to validity and reliability, strengths and weaknesses, and/or practical issues and procedures associated with methods. The text touches on such issues as the use of intact classes, techniques to enhance data collection, task artifacts, and difficulties with interpretation of data. Each chapter contains practical closing questions and tasks that present published data to analyze and/or suggest related journal articles to critique. The final chapter cites problems commonly encountered by researchers, with references to mainstream education research manuals that discuss practical difficulties. In addition, it lists solutions to problems encountered by graduate students at various stages of the research process. One of the recurring solutions is to consult others—supervisors, statisticians, interested students and teacher practitioners—acknowledgement that this research manual alone is unlikely to provide sufficient guidance in all contexts; that advice, however, would be of little assistance to teachers or researchers working in isolation with no access to such support.

Research Methods for English Language Teachers (McDonough & McDonough, 1997) introduces teachers to classroom observation, diaries, experiments, questionnaires and interviews, descriptive statistics, introspection, case studies, and multi-method studies. As well as defining the methods and discussing the underlying principles, advantages, disadvantages, and techniques for each, the authors provides useful references to research texts in mainstream education and to some authentic studies. The strength of this book lies in its description of qualitative research methods. It raises pertinent issues for me concerning experimenter bias, questionnaire design, intact classes, student participation, audio-recordings, reliability, and ethical considerations. Some material seems specifically designed for readers with "research anxiety" (e.g., examples of how research is defined in professions such as journalism and police work, a chapter on "using numbers").

Doing Teacher Research: From Inquiry to Understanding (Freeman, 1998) introduces the teacher-research cycle, illustrated by authentic second language accounts of action research. Activities are included to encourage teachers to reflect on their beliefs and teaching practices and to guide them through the process of action research design and analysis (the latter not exclusively related to language research).

Note is made of some of the issues I confronted: the need for adjusting plans due to time constraints, student absences or attrition, technical difficulties, statistical outliers, and ethical considerations. The appendices are particularly useful, as they list procedures, suggestions, and further references for loop writing, working with videotapes, and collecting numerous types of data. Researchers other than practicing teachers may consider the scope of this text too narrow, but I found the information on data collection techniques very useful in planning my study.

Second Language Classroom Research: Issues and Opportunities (Schachter & Gass, 1996) presents descriptions by external researchers of their experiences planning and conducting classroom research in collaboration with teachers in a variety of settings. The researchers discuss decisions and compromises that had to be made regarding site selection, contextual constraints, selection and collaboration of teachers, student participation, choice of linguistic focus, resources, scheduling, ethics, and reporting. The extensive work required to establish a relationship of trust with students, teachers, and administrators is particularly salient in these accounts and highlights the need for careful planning at all stages of the research process. The focus is restricted but rich in detail; this volume is highly recommended for all researchers initiating collaborative studies in unfamiliar settings.

The Research Manual: Design and Statistics for Applied Linguistics (Hatch & Lazaraton, 1991) is intended to help novice researchers develop an understanding of research design and statistics and to guide them through the research process. The text presents conventional statistical procedures for coding and describing data, comparing groups, and describing relationships in data. Both parametric and non-parametric procedures are included, and extensive reference is made to research in applied linguistics. The authors touch on difficulties I encountered regarding ethics, the use of intact classes, student participation, and data collection. Activities throughout the book reinforce concepts, and reviews of research studies are included to foster the development of critical evaluation skills. This book is very thorough in its treatment, and is aimed chiefly at researchers working within the quantitative paradigm.

The research manuals discussed above are only some of the many useful books that focus on classroom-based second language research. Other texts review research findings on classroom-related issues (e.g., turn-taking, error correction), in addition to addressing problems associated with classroom-based research. Van Lier's (1988) *The Classroom and the Language Learner*, for example, presents methods of ethnographic classroom research, as well as procedures of data collection and transcription. *Second Language Classrooms: Research on Teaching and Learning* (Chaudron, 1988) examines research methods and methodological issues involved in classroom-centred studies. A discussion of principles and procedures for conducting research projects in language classrooms is provided in *Focus on the Language Classroom* (Allwright & Bailey, 1990). *Collaborative Action Research for English Language Teachers* (Burns, 1998) and *Action Research for Language Teachers* (Wallace, 1998) are welcome additions to the field, with their discussion of research methods and techniques for collecting and analyzing data to enhance language teaching and learning. All of these texts are of direct relevance to language classroom researchers.

Discussion

Collectively, the research manuals examined above provide a broad overview of the complexities involved in conducting classroom research, with a considerable amount of overlap in some instances. For instance, Hatch and Lazaraton (1991), Johnson (1992), and Nunan (1992) promote the development of skills needed to understand and evaluate published SLA studies; Freeman (1998), Hatch and Lazaraton (1991), and, to a lesser extent, Nunan (1992) outline detailed procedures for developing new research projects. For a systematic overview of the principles, advantages, and disadvantages of a variety of research methods in applied linguistics, I would recommend Johnson (1992), McDonough and McDonough (1997), Nunan (1992), and Wallace (1998). Texts by Allwright & Bailey (1990), Chaudron (1988), Freeman (1998), Johnson (1992), McDonough and McDonough (1997), Nunan (1992), van Lier (1988), and Wallace (1998) would be of particular interest to teacher-researchers. Schachter and Gass (1996) is essential reading for researchers planning collaboration in classrooms other than their own, and Hatch and Lazaraton (1991) is a key reference for statistical analysis.

Action Research

As a graduate student at a major university, I was fortunate to have had access to a wide range of resources to support my research and to resolve problems that arose. Despite these advantages, I encountered numerous challenges. The authors who promote action research (e.g., Freeman, 1998; McDonough & McDonough, 1997; Nunan, 1992) set very challenging goals for individual practicing teachers, whose resources are vastly different from mine. In reality, most instructors of adult ESL learners in my community work year round in low-paying programs that offer little or no support for research activities. The majority of teachers have minimal time for course preparation and reflection and even less opportunity to read the journals or research manuals to which they might have access. Without a clear understanding of the research process and relevant literature, however, aspiring teacher-researchers chance wasting their time and energy on fruitless endeavors. As the editor of one educational research journal wrote, “As a qualitative researcher myself, I have been saddened to see reports of so many small, superficial, ‘exploratory’ studies on topics that have already been much explored, the territory by now well mapped” (Young, 1998, p. 249).

The average teacher who does have time to keep up with professional reading will most certainly have difficulty evaluating the findings of many published studies without some formal knowledge of statistics. Detailed manuals such as Hatch and Lazaraton (1991) may be overwhelming for many. Those who have some knowledge of measurement and evaluation may have acquired it (as did I, for the most part) in mainstream education programs where large-scale parametric studies are the norm and little attention is devoted to the non-parametric studies that are often more appropriate to second language acquisition research. In my experience, statisticians without a background in SLA are frequently unable to offer sound advice appropriate to the context. Furthermore, as classroom action research proposals implemented by teachers may not be submitted for ethical review, it is entirely possible that a poorly conceived project will prove detrimental to the participants. In sum, few language teachers have the necessary means to plan and conduct quality research. As Crookes (1997) notes,

> Because there is comparatively little SL action research going on… I do not think there are many cases where pedagogical problems faced by S/FL teachers are solved through their own investigations and concomitant use of research publications. (pp. 106-7)

Other Alternatives

Exploratory practice (Allwright & Lenzuen, 1997) is related to action research, but it differs in that it uses existing teaching practices to help teachers and learners *understand* classroom events, rather than academic research methods and novel pedagogical techniques to *solve* classroom problems. The eight steps in exploratory practice (identifying, discussing, formulating an understanding, choosing and adapting procedures for further study, conducting the investigation, interpreting outcomes, and deciding implications) may lead to action research or to collaboration with other teachers or external researchers. Exploratory practice is designed to be relevant, sustainable, collegial, and conducive to professional development.

Collaborative action research can promote beneficial communication with students and with colleagues in a wide range of contexts, and Wallace (1998) endorses it as a means of overcoming the professional isolation in which many teacher researchers find themselves. Burns (1998) points out that collaboration with others to solve problems was the original aim of action research. She promotes research initiated by groups of teachers with common interests, and provides extensive accounts of second-language action researchers working with adult immigrants in Australia.

Interactive collaboration with external SLA researchers can be very beneficial in a variety of ways. This group is more apt to have the time and expertise to undertake the literature review, to write applications for ethics review, to carry out formal analyses, and to disseminate results. Teachers can play a more central role in formulating questions, helping to design the research project, providing instruction, and interpreting findings from the classroom perspective. This approach, which might include both quantitative and qualitative data collection procedures, offers a solid foundation for academic research inquiry. Such collaboration is also likely to enhance the profile of research in the teaching community. I initiated my study as an outside researcher; unfortunately, I know of very few instances in my community in which a teacher has initiated a collaborative research project with an external SLA researcher.

Conclusion

None of the research manuals that I reviewed, for classroom teachers or for external researchers, provides a truly comprehensive treatment of the many complexities of the research process. SLA research texts need to reflect the wide range of realities of the contexts in which our research is conducted. None of the texts discussed in this paper deals with *all* of the difficulties I encountered: non-equivalent classes; lack of teacher commitment; limited numbers of participants; changes in student dynamics; equipment failure and poor recording facilities; insufficient coding guidelines; task inconsistencies, and data analysis constraints. The SLA field has matured to the point where a truly comprehensive research handbook is not only viable but indispensable. Such a manual would ideally cover both the theoretical and practical aspects of research in a variety of SLA contexts. Eventually, I hope, research manuals will also offer suggestions for reconciling the dilemmas that we face in working with the intact classes so prevalent in our field.

In the meanwhile, the best assurance of quality research design, implementation, and analysis for novice classroom-based researchers must include the following: numerous research manuals in both SLA and mainstream education; texts that focus on specific research methods (e.g., surveys, interviews); pertinent published research reports; extensive pilot testing of research; and consultations with colleagues and seasoned researchers, in collaboration, in class, or on-line (e.g., the TESOL Research Interest Section discussion list). Even with the most meticulous preparation, however, constraints such as intact classes cannot always be circumvented. For investigators like me, it may be precisely those concomitant complexities that have made classroom-based research such an exciting challenge.

References

Allwright, D., & Bailey, K. M. (1990). *Focus on the language classroom: An introduction to classroom research for language teachers.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Allwright, D., & Lenzuen, R. (1997). Exploratory practice: Work at the cultural Iglesia, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. *Language Teaching Research, 1,* 73-79.

Bailey, K. M. (1983). Illustrations of Murphy's Law abound in classroom research on language use. *TESOL Newsletter, XVII* (4) 1, 4-5, 22, 31.

Burns, A. (1998). *Collaborative action research for English language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second language classrooms: Research on teaching and learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Citizenship and Immigration Canada. (1996). *Canadian language benchmarks: English as a second language for adults, English as a second language for literacy learners*. Ottawa, ON: Author.

Crookes, G. (1997). SLA and language pedagogy: A socioeducational perspective. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 19,* 93-116.

Cumming, A., & Swain, M. (1989). Anecdotes of accidents: Second language research going awry and telling us why. *Second Language Research, 5*, 74-87.

Dornyei, Z., & Scott, M. L. (1997). Communication strategies in a second language: Definitions and taxonomies. *Language Learning, 47*, 173-210.

Du Bois, J. W. (1980). Introduction: The search for a cultural niche: Showing the pear film in a Mayan community. In W.L. Chafe (Ed.), *The pear stories: Cognitive, cultural, linguistic aspects of narrative production* (pp. 1-7). Norwood, NJ: ABLEX.

Educational Testing Service. (1981). *Secondary level English proficiency test.* Princeton, NJ: Author.

Foster, P., Tonkyn, A., & Wigglesworth, G. (2000). Measuring spoken language: A unit for all reasons. *Applied Linguistics, 21,* 354-375.

Freeman, D. (1998). *Doing teacher research: From inquiry to understanding.* Pacific Grove, CA: Heinle & Heinle.

Hatch, E., & Lazaraton, A. (1991). *Research manual: Design and statistics for applied linguistics*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.

Johnson, D. (1992). *Approaches to research in second language learning*. New York: Longman.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (1996). The changing nature of second language classroom research. In J. Schachter & S. Gass (Eds.), *Second language classroom research: Issues and opportunities* (pp. 157-170). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Lazaraton, A. (2000). Current trends in research methodology and statistics in applied linguistics. *TESOL Quarterly, 34,* 175-181.

MacGinitie, W. H. (1978). *Gates-MacGinitie reading tests* (2nd ed.). Itasca, IL: Riverside Publishing.

McDonough, J., & McDonough, S. (1997). *Research methods for English language teachers*. London: Arnold.

Mellow, J. D., Reeder, K., & Forster, E. (1996). Using time-series research designs to investigate the effects of instruction on SLA. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 18,* 325-350.

Nunan, D. (1992). *Research methods in language learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Paradis, J., & Crago, M. (2000). *Acquisition of the verb lexicon: Do L2 and L1 learners do it differently?* Paper presented at the American Association for Applied Linguistics, Vancouver, BC.

Polio, C., & Gass, S. (1997). Replication and reporting: A commentary. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 19,* 499-508.

Reid, J. (1990). The dirty laundry of ESL survey research. *TESOL Quarterly, 24*, 323-338.
Rice, M. L., & Bode, J.V. (1993). GAPS in the verb lexicons of children with specific language impairment. *First Language, 13,* 113-131.
Schachter, J. (1974). An error in error analysis. *Language Learning, 27*, 205-214.
Schachter, J., & Gass, S. (Eds.) (1996). *Second language classroom research: Issues and opportunities.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
Swain, M., & Cumming, A. (1989). Beyond methodology: Behind research. In J.H. Esling (Ed.), *Multicultural education and policy: ESL in the 1990s* (pp. 88-106). Toronto, ON: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
van Lier, L. (1988). *The classroom and the language learner: Ethnography and second-language classroom research.* London: Longman.
Wallace, M. J. (1998). *Action research for language teachers.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Willems, G. M. (1987). Communication strategies and their significance in foreign language teaching. *System, 15,* 351-364.
Young, B. (1998). Editorial: Moving on, carrying on. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research, XLIV,* 249-250.

Acknowledgments

I gratefully acknowledge the funding that supported this research: a doctoral fellowship from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (#752-99-1207). I thank the administration, teachers, and students at NorQuest College for their cooperation in this study, and Julia Ichikawa for her participation throughout. I am also indebted to Tracey Derwing, Leila Ranta, Marilyn Abbott, and two anonymous reviewers of *Applied Language Learning* for their valuable comments and suggestions.

Author

MARIAN ROSSITER, ABD, Department of Educational Psychology, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada T6G 2G5. *marian.rossiter@ualberta.ca*. Specializations: second language acquisition, classroom-based research, language pedagogy, motivation.

Applied Language Learning
2001, Vol 12, No. 1, pp. 45-54

Second Language Acquisition (SLA) Research Implications for Language Teachers

Melina Porto
National University of La Plata

Second Language Acquisition research does not tell teachers what to teach, and what it says about how to teach they had already figured out.
-Lightbown (1985a, p.182)

The aim of this article is to examine whether instruction can facilitate SLA. Studies investigating the effects of instruction on the rate and ultimate level of attainment of SLA as well as on the route of development of acquisition are considered. The former confirm that tutored acquirers learn faster and reach higher levels of attainment than their naturalistic counterparts. The latter suggest that instruction is powerless to alter the sequence of SLA, except transitorily and in insignificant ways. Although more research is needed, the overall conclusion is that instruction does help.

Some implications for classroom teaching in the area of syllabus design, teaching materials, practice, and input are explored. Considering that acquisition is not linear, it is suggested that a cyclical syllabus may offer teachers the flexibility they need to adapt teaching practices to their unique classroom cultures. Similarly, teaching materials, conceived as illustrations rather than as prescriptions for teaching, are not to be strictly adhered to but can be adjusted to suit the learners' needs. It is also claimed that practice in the form of information-gap and problem-solving activities, by combining linguistic repetition with a non-linguistic purpose, is beneficial. It may lead to the acquisition of formulaic language - pervasive in L1 and SLA and adult language use. Finally, it is suggested that in successful communication, input is graded automatically.

The aim of this article is to examine whether instruction can facilitate SLA. Studies investigating the effects of instruction on the rate and ultimate level of attainment of SLA as well as on the route of development of acquisition are considered. Some implications for language teaching in the area of syllabus design, teaching materials, practice, and input are explored.

Research About Instructed SLA

Research studies about SLA have been classified in different ways. Ellis (1990) divides them into two groups: those which examine the effect of instruction on the rate and ultimate level of attainment of SLA and those which focus on its route of development.

The Effects of Instruction on the Rate and Ultimate Level of Attainment of SLA

Long (1983) establishes sixteen possible types of comparison between instruction, exposure to L2, and second language acquisition. Some of the studies examining these comparisons refer to the absolute effect of instruction whereas others focus on its relative utility. Among the latter, five show that instruction helps (Brière, 1978; Carroll, 1967; Chihara & Oller, 1978; Krashen & Seliger, 1976; Krashen, Jones, Zelinski & Usprich, 1978), two have ambiguous results (Fathman, 1976; Hale and Budar, 1970), and three suggest that instruction does not help (Fathman, 1975; Mason, 1971; Upshur, 1968). In reviewing these studies, Long (1983) claims that the last five could in fact be taken to show the advantages of instruction. On this basis, he concludes that instruction is good for learners of all ages and proficiency levels irrespective of both the type of test used (integrative or discrete-point) and the kind of environment considered (rich or poor for acquisition, that is, with much or little comprehensible input from natural environments).

The Effects of Instruction on the Route of Development of SLA

Research studies fall into two categories: those which involve comparisons between classroom and naturalistic acquisition and those designed as classroom experiments. Comparative studies have examined features such as L2 errors (Felix, 1983; Lightbown, 1983), the sequence of acquisition of grammatical morphemes (Fathman, 1976; Lightbown, 1987; Perkins & Larsen-Freeman, 1975; Pica, 1983; Turner, 1979), and the sequence of development of syntactical structures (Ellis, 1984, 1989; Ewbank, 1989; Pavesi, 1984, 1986; Weinert, 1987). These studies suggest that the effects of instruction are limited. On the whole, they claim that instruction is powerless to influence the route of development of SLA and may even interfere with the process.[1]

Experimental studies are explicitly devised to teach one feature of the language and test whether direct instruction results in its acquisition. Ellis (1990) divides them into three categories: accuracy, sequence of acquisition, and projection studies. Accuracy studies (Ellis,1984; Lightbown et al, 1980; Schumann, 1978a) examine whether instruction improves the accuracy in the performance of the features taught. Sequence of acquisition studies (Pienemann, 1984) test whether instruction can disrupt the sequence of acquisition. Projection studies (Gass, 1979; Zobl, 1985) investigate not only whether instruction of one feature results in its acquisition but also whether it can prompt the acquisition of other features as well. Conclusions from these studies are contradictory. Whereas accuracy studies, taken together, emphasize the limitations of instruction to affect acquisition, both sequence of acquisition studies and projection studies suggest that instruction may have a direct effect on acquisition.

In all, there are grounds for believing that instruction is beneficial when the rate and success of SLA are considered. However, the route of development appears to be impervious to instruction, despite the existence of transitory effects, both beneficial and harmful.

Implications for Language Teachers

Given the extensiveness of the research studies available, it is impossible to deal with all of them here. I have therefore decided to concentrate on studies addressing the effects of instruction on the route of development of SLA. In particular, I will focus on studies which compare tutored and naturalistic learning. Implications for four areas of language teaching, namely syllabus design, teaching materials, practice, and input, will be explored.

Implications for Syllabus Design

As pointed out by Ellis (1990), the studies by Ellis (1984), Fathman (1978), Felix (1981), and Perkins and Larsen-Freeman (1975) warrant the claim that tutored L2 learners develop in the same way as naturalistic learners. Similarly, Makino (1980) and Turner (1979) agree that their overall development is identical and emphasize the fact that the order of morpheme acquisition differs from the order of instruction as stated in the lesson plans of the teachers who participated in the studies as well as from the order found in the textbooks used.[2]

Consequently, it could be argued that the selection and ordering of the items taught in class should reflect the order of acquisition. Since evidence shows that instructional orders differ from acquisition orders, then adjusting the order of instruction to correspond to that of acquisition would facilitate the process of learning. An absolutely linear syllabus would suffice. On the other hand, one could adopt the extreme view that, since the order of morpheme acquisition cannot be dramatically altered by formal instruction, the notion of syllabus design could be abandoned altogether. We would let intuition and nature do the job for us. Widdowson (1979), for example, goes as far as to argue that a syllabus especially designed for the teaching of English as a foreign language would be counterproductive and recommends the use of the syllabuses of other subjects of the curriculum making adjustments where necessary.

Two comments are necessary. First, considering that acquisition is *not* linear, teachers need the flexibility to adapt the syllabus to their unique classroom cultures. In general, a cyclical syllabus avoids a fixed linear ordering. Second, a specific syllabus for the teaching of English as a foreign language may in fact be needed because, by delineating the responsibilities and roles of teachers and learners in the classroom, it offers security to both. All learning is constrained and limited by a syllabus, which could be seen as a frame of reference for both teachers and learners.

Implications for Teaching Materials

While the researchers mentioned so far claim that the developmental path followed by tutored and naturalistic acquirers is basically identical, others believe that formal instruction can temporarily interfere with the natural process. Lightbown (1984) found that young French speakers learning English in Quebec did not produce the typical interlanguage forms observed in the development of the verb *have*. They did not say *I have 10 years old*. The reason was that the input learners received in the classroom did not include the verb *have*. However, a year later, after the verb was introduced in the textbook, they started making this error. The reason is that the sequencing in textbooks may determine the frequency with which a feature appears in the input given to learners. The problem, however, is that the frequency of a form does not determine its acquisition but may instead lead to what Lightbown (1985b) refers to as pseudo-acquisition. What is taught first is not necessarily acquired first because acquisition is not linear: learners may exhibit correct performance on a certain form and later produce deviant ones, in which case they may appear to have reverted to a previous form of interlanguage. What happens is that a new form is not simply added in a linear fashion but rather causes a "restructuring of the whole system" (Lightbown, 1985a, p. 177).

The fact that acquisition is not a linear process constitutes evidence in favor of the shift from structurally ordered to cyclically organized textbooks. This change of focus allows for revision and recycling. Forms and structures do not appear in isolation as does the verb *have* reported in Lightbown's (1984) study above. Learners are given the possibility to contrast different forms and so the restructuring process is facilitated. If the teacher in Lightbown's study had taken the textbook simply as a guide rather than a prescription for teaching, she might have adjusted her teaching of *have* and *be* in some way taking into account the typical areas of difficulty of French speakers learning ESL. Thus teaching materials, conceived as illustrations (Widdowson, 1990), become only instances within a general framework and can therefore be adjusted to suit the individual learner (cf. assuming that teaching materials viewed as prescriptions are effective for all classrooms).

Implications for Practice

In a longitudinal study of French adolescents learning ESL in Quebec, Lightbown (1985b) found that, after intensive practice of the progressive, learners in the 6^{th} grade overused the -ing morpheme, in both obligatory and non-obligatory contexts (pseudo-accuracy in Lightbown's terms). However, non-inflected forms took over in the 7^{th} grade after having been introduced in the textbook.

Pica (1983) studied adult Spanish ESL learners to observe whether the selection of grammatical morphemes varied depending on different conditions of L2 exposure. Three environments were considered: instructed, naturalistic, and mixed. She found that whereas naturalistic learners tended to omit the -ing morpheme in required contexts, tutored and mixed acquirers had a strong tendency to oversupply it in inappropriate contexts. She concludes that "the effects of instruction on second language production are principally in triggering oversuppliance of grammatical morphology" (Pica, 1983, p. 494).

These two studies could be taken as evidence to support the claim that practice and drilling may interfere with the learners' developmental sequence of acquisition. Since intensive practice results in learners overapplying a form in contexts where it is not required, then practice may not be beneficial, as teachers often assume, but counterproductive. It could even be argued that practice has no effect at all. In a case study, Schumann (1978a, b) showed that intensive drilling of a feature resulted in improved performance in the artificial task provided but not in spontaneous speech, which suggests that mindless mechanical drills may have no effect on acquisition. Thus mindless linguistic repetition has limited advantages.

I believe, however, that practice may be beneficial, for it may lead to the acquisition of formulaic language.[3] Recent research in computer analysis of language has revealed a widespread occurrence of lexical patterns in adult language use (Pawley & Syder, 1983). Such stereotyping in language performance applies to both L1 acquisition (Clark, 1993; Peters, 1983) and L2 acquisition as well (Hakuta, 1974; Nattinger & DeCarrico, 1992; Peters, 1983; Vihman, 1982). Practice, I would suggest, may facilitate the acquisition of lexical phrases for two reasons. First, these phrases are very frequent, so practice would guarantee their natural recycling. Second, considering that these formulas are context-bound, have situational meaning associated with them, and have associated functional uses, practice would help learners recall these phrases in similar situations. This recurrent association of form-context-function provided by practice makes lexical phrases highly memorable for learners and easy to pick up as wholes without knowledge of their internal constituents. Practice in the form of information-gap and problem-solving activities, by combining linguistic repetition with a non-linguistic purpose (Widdowson, 1990), helps learners acquire these phrases as units and retrieve them easily without syntactical analysis. Even if practice does not have the desired effect of leading to the acquisition of linguistic rules (Ellis, 1990), it may foster the acquisition of formulae, an efficient device offering learners the possibility to overcome their limited linguistic resources in communicative situations.

Implications for Input

Lightbown's (1985b) and Pica's (1983) findings mentioned above have implications for input as well. An over-organized input may interfere with learning rather than promote it. As stated above, it leads to pseudo-acquisition and pseudo-accuracy since it seems that the overall sequence of development cannot be altered by formal instruction.

It is generally assumed that teachers should grade their talk, syntactically, to make it correspond with the learner's stage of development. Input research (Wesche,1994) shows that baby-talk and foreigner talk are syntactically modified just as teacher talk is. However, the fact that parents and native speakers do not consciously monitor the speech addressed to babies and foreigners respectively suggests that these adjustments occur naturally as a result of negotiation procedures to achieve communication (Ellis, 1981). Assuming that this argument holds for L2 classrooms as well, there may be no need for teachers to grade their input. What is needed, perhaps, is a shift of focus from semantic meaning, in other words, the formal properties of the code, to pragmatic meaning, i.e., how people use language to communicate. When communication is successful, input is graded automatically.

A Final Word

Copious SLA research studies have emerged in the last twenty years. Although findings have undoubtedly shed light on various issues, their interpretation is far from easily accessible. Some teachers may feel overwhelmed and bewildered with such an abundance of research and may lack the time to digest research findings. Considering that 30 students will be expecting a magical display of expertise every Tuesday at 8 am, how can we, teachers, teach and be well-informed at the same time?

A possible solution would be to partially liberate teachers from the pressure to appear rigorous and academic. This does not equate with encouraging them to be ill-informed. It means allowing some room for intuition and improvisation. It also means allowing teachers to judge the effectiveness of their own practices on the basis of their experience as well as research findings. Another possibility would be to encourage teachers to actualize findings, that is, to make them valid for their country, their classrooms, and their unique learners. Critically subjecting findings to evaluation before applying them seems to be crucial.

Many times research supports, rigorously and academically, classroom practices that teachers adopted intuitively long ago. Being knowledgeable of such research may contribute to enhancing self-esteem and assertiveness by lowering the frequent feelings of anxiety and insecurity which arise from the lack of a research-based rationale behind teaching practices. Second language acquisition research protects a tiny essential part of a teacher's most intimate territory: confidence.

Conclusion

The question of whether instruction can facilitate SLA has been examined. Studies investigating the effects of instruction on the rate and ultimate level of attainment of SLA as well as on the route of development of acquisition have been considered. The former provide evidence for the fact that tutored acquirers learn faster and reach higher levels of attainment than their naturalistic counterparts. The latter suggest that instruction is powerless to alter the sequence of SLA, except transitorily and in insignificant ways. Although more research is needed, the overall conclusion is that instruction does help.

Some implications for classroom teaching in the area of syllabus design, teaching materials, practice, and input have been explored. Considering that acquisition is not linear, it has been suggested that a cyclical syllabus may offer teachers the flexibility they need to adapt teaching practices to their unique classroom cultures. Similarly, teaching materials, conceived as illustrations rather than as prescriptions for teaching, are not to be strictly adhered to but can be adjusted to suit the learners' needs. It has also been claimed that practice in the form of information-gap and problem-solving activities, by combining linguistic repetition with a non-linguistic purpose, is beneficial for it may lead to the acquisition of formulaic language - pervasive in L1 and SLA and adult language use. Finally, it has been suggested that when communication is successful, input is graded automatically.

Notes

[1] In reviewing these studies, Ellis (1990) suggests that comparative studies are very difficult to interpret and warns us that in fact results may not be due to the effects of formal instruction as claimed but to the negotiation of meaning and interaction that classrooms allow for.

[2] See Ellis (1990, Chapter 3) for the specification of the order of acquisition of thirteen English grammatical morphemes.

[3] Ellis (1990, p. 166), on the contrary, believes that "if the efficacy of instruction goes no further than formulas, it must indeed be considered limited."

References

Brière, E. (1978). Variables affecting native Mexican children's learning Spanish as a second language. *Language Learning, 28*, 159-174.

Carroll, J. (1967). Foreign language proficiency levels attained by language majors near graduation from college. *Foreign Language Annals, 1*, 131-151.

Chihara, T., & Oller, J. (1978). Attitudes and attained proficiency in EFL: A sociolinguistic study of adult Japanese speakers. *Language Learning, 28*, 55-68.

Clark, E. (1993). *The lexicon in acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ellis, R. (1981). The role of input in language acquisition: Some implications for second language teaching. *Applied Linguistics, 2*, 70-82.

Ellis, R. (1984). Can syntax be taught? A study of the effects of formal instruction on the acquisition of WH questions by children. *Applied Linguistics, 5*, 138-155.

Ellis, R. (1989). Sources of intra-learner variability in language use and their relationship to second language acquisition. In S. Gass, C. Madden, D. Preston, & L. Selinker (Eds.). *Variation in second language acquisition: Psycholinguistic issues.* Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters.

Ellis, R. (1990). *Instructed second language acquisition*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Ewbank, L. (1989). The acquisition of German negation by formal language learners. In B. Van Patten, T. Dvorak, & J. Less (Eds.). *Foreign language learning: A research perspective.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Fathman, A. (1975). The relationship between age and second language productive ability. *Language Learning, 25*, 245-253.

Fathman, A. (1976). Variables affecting the successful learning of English as a second language. *TESOL Quarterly, 10*, 433-441.

Fathman, A. (1978). ESL and EFL learning: similar or dissimilar? In C. Blatchford, & J. Schacter (Eds.). *On TESOL'78: EFL Policies, Programs, Practices.* Washington, DC: TESOL.

Felix, S. (1981). The effect of formal instruction on second language acquisition. *Language Learning, 31*, 87-112.

Gass, S. (1979). Language transfer and universal grammatical relations. *Language Learning, 27*, 327-344.

Hakuta, K. (1974). Prefabricated patterns and the emergence of structure in second language acquisition. *Language Learning*, *24*, 287-97.

Hale, T., & Budar, E. (1970). Are TESOL classes the only answer? *Modern Language Journal, 54*, 487-492.

Krashen, S., Jones, C., Zelinski, C., & Usprich, C. (1978). How important is instruction? *ELT Journal, 32*, 257-261.

Krashen, S., & Seliger, H. (1976). The role of formal and informal linguistic environments in adult second language learning. *International Journal of Psycholinguistics, 3*, 15-21.

Lightbown, P. (1983). Exploring relationships between developmental and instructional sequences in L2 Acquisition. In H. Seliger, & M. Long (Eds.). *Classroom oriented research in second language acquisition.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Lightbown, P. (1984). Input and acquisition in second language classrooms. *TESL Canada Journal, 2*, 55-67.

Lightbown, P. (1985a). Great expectations: Second language acquisition research and classroom teaching. *Applied Linguistics, 6*, 173-89.

Lightbown, P. (1985b). Input and acquisition for second language learners in and out of classrooms. *Applied Linguistics, 6*, 263-273.

Lightbown, P. (1987). Classroom language as input to second language acquisition. In C. Pfaff (Ed.). *First and second language acquisition processes.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Lightbown, P., Spada, N., & Wallace, R. (1980). Some effects of instruction on child and adolescent ESL learners. In R. Scarcella, & S. Krashen (Eds.). *Research in second language acquisition.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Long, M. (1983). Does second language instruction make a difference? A review of the research. *TESOL Quarterly, 17*, 359-382.

Makino, T. (1980). Acquisition order of English morphemes by Japanese secondary school students. *Journal of Hokkaido University of Education, 30*, 101-148.

Mason, C. (1971). The relevance of intensive training in English as a foreign language for university students. *Language Learning, 21*, 197-204.

Nattinger, R., & DeCarrico, J. (1992). *Lexical Phrases and Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pavesi, M. (1984). The acquisition of relative clauses in a formal and in an informal setting: Further evidence in support of the markedness hypothesis. In D. Singleton, & D. Little (Eds.). *Language learning in formal and informal contexts.* Dublin: IRAAL.

Pavesi, M. (1986). Markedness, discourse modes and relative clause formation in a formal and informal context. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 8*, 38-55.

Pawley, A., & Syder, H. (1983). Two puzzles for linguistic theory: nativelike selection and nativelike fluency. In J. Richards, & R. Schmidt (Eds.). *Language and Communication* (pp. 191-226). London: Longman.

Perkins, K., & Larsen-Freeman, D. (1975). The effect of formal language instruction on the order of morpheme acquisition. *Language Learning, 25*, 237-243.

Peters, A. (1983). *The units of language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pica, T. (1983). Adult acquisition of English as a second language under different conditions of exposure. *Language Learning*, *33*, 465-497.

Pienemann, M. (1984). Psychological constraints on the teachability of languages. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 6*, 186-214.

Schumann, J. (1978a). Second language acquisition: the pidginization hypothesis. In E. Hatch (Ed.). *Second language acquisition. A book of readings.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Schumann, J. (1978b). *The Pidginization Process: A model for second language acquisition.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Turner, D. (1979). The effect of instruction on second language learning and second language acquisition. In R. Andersen (Ed.). *The acquisition and use of Spanish as first and second languages.* Washington, DC: TESOL.

Upshur, J. (1968). Four experiments on the relation between foreign language teaching and learning. *Language Learning, 18*, 111-124.

Vihman, M. (1982). Formulas in first and second language acquisition. In L. Obler, & L. Menn (Eds.). *Exceptional language and linguistics* (pp. 261-284). New York: Academic Press.

Weinert, R. (1987). Processes in classroom second language development: The acquisition of negation in German. In R. Ellis (Ed.). *Second language acquisition in context.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Wesche, M. (1994). Input and interaction in second language acquisition. In C. Gallaway, & J. Richards (Eds.). *Input and interaction in language acquisition.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Widdowson, H. (1979). *Explorations in applied linguistics.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Widdowson, H. (1990). *Aspects of language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Zobl, H. (1985). Grammars in search of input and intake. In S. Gass, & C. Maddenh (Eds.). *Input in second language acquisition.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Author

MELINA PORTO, teacher, National University of La Plata in Argentina. Buenos Aires, Argentina, Email: *aporto@netverk.com.ar*. Specializations: SLA, culture in SLA, and learning diaries.

Applied Language Learning
2001, Vol. 12, No. 1, pp. 81-86

Discussion Forum

Language Teaching and Language Policy

Robert B. Kaplan
University of Southern California

Language teaching inevitably implicates a certain amount of language policy; after all, it is necessary for someone to decide what language(s) will be taught, to whom, with what degree of intensity, for how long, by whom, and at what cost. It is also necessary to determine how much learning has taken place and whether what has in fact been learned has any relationship to what was intended by the curriculum. Such decisions are not always made as part of an overt and coordinated policy but, however those decisions are made, language policy is thereby effectively created. Decisions about policy are not only explicit or implicit; they are taken at different levels – i. e., at a macro (e. g., at national or ministerial) level or at a micro level (e. g., in classrooms or in businesses). Thus, language policy issues implicate all those involved in language teaching, as well as others.

In some countries, such decisions are formulated as part of a national language policy; for example, Israel, North Korea, the Republic of China and other polities have articulated national language policies, and the education sector has merely undertaken to do its part in implementing the national policy. Other polities have vested the whole matter in the education sector in the absence of a national language(s) policy (or in the face of a policy so vaguely defined as to have little meaning). Countries like South Korea, Japan, and the United States, among others, are examples. The education sector may not be the wisest place to vest this responsibility, since not everyone goes to school, since not everyone goes to school at the same time, since the education sector tends to be inward-looking and since its responsibilities do not extend into other government sectors (e. g., the civil service, the military, the communications sector, the commercial sector, etc.). Still other countries have neither articulated a national language policy nor formulated a language-in-education policy but rather have simply responded to market pressures, whether such pressures arose from parents on the one hand or from external economic forces on the other. The list of examples in this case would be very long indeed.

Language policy is, in fact, a manifestation of *human* resource development policy, and many polities have chosen not to engage in such policy development or have done so in an ad hoc manner, often with unfortunate results. By way of contrast, nations have frequently undertaken *natural* resource development planning—the building of the Aswan Dam in Egypt, or of the complex Three Gorges dam project currently being undertaken in the people's Republic of China are examples that come readily to mind.

There are vast differences between natural resource development and human resource development. In the former case, completion can be anticipated, benefits can be estimated, costs can be accurately predicted, and at the point of completion there exists a visible, palpable object before which political leaders may pose for photo opportunities. In the latter case, there is no palpable product, the time-line is indeterminate, costs and benefits are extremely difficult to assess, and—most seriously—there is no way to tell whether the project accomplished what was planned, whether the outcome would have occurred without the plan, or whether the outcome is in fact what was initially intended. Additionally, since the time line for completion is indeterminate, changes in political administration during the life (or half-life) of the project may cause radical modulations in intent, spending levels and implementation.

Furthermore, language policies undertaken in any given polity are often conceived and executed exclusively in terms of the perceived political ends specific to that polity, failing to recognize that languages are no respecters of political borders. Thus, any attempt to limit or expand a given language becomes meaningless because a neighboring polity may be doing something quite different; e. g., any attempts in the U.S. to modify in any way the use of Spanish cannot be undertaken without recognizing the immediate proximity of Puerto Rico, of neighboring (Spanish-speaking) Mexico or, for that matter, of the vast (largely Spanish-speaking) continent to the south. Economic policies across the macro-structure, immigration flows, language policies in the neighboring Spanish-speaking polities, and sociocultural practices and attitudes within the indigenous population must be taken into account. Even when a polity which is not immediately contiguous undertakes a different direction, events in a number of polities may be substantially modified; e. g., the enactment of the *Loi Tubon* in metropolitan France has had a direct effect on French in Quebec as well as French in Francophone Africa, in French Polynesia, etc., not to mention French L2 activities in all those polities in which such activities exist. Nor can planners overlook the activities of both other governmental agencies and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) operating in a particular country; e. g., the activities of the English-speaking Union in various non-English speaking polities or the activities of the Alliance Française, or the Goethe Institute, or the Japan Foundation in the context of the promotion of their respective languages in, say, the U. S. Additionally, aid organizations operating in less developed countries (e. g., [Australian Agency for International Development] AUSAID, Overseas Development Agency] ODA, the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, USAID, etc.) often impose language plans (and activities) unrelated to the development projects they support and often unrelated to (or perhaps in serious conflict with) language planning activities in the recipient countries.

Given these several caveats, perhaps some actual activities can be considered by way of example. Since the U.S. is a particularly useful example—one with which most readers of *Applied Language Learning* are likely to be familiar—let us consider a number of issues in that polity. The term *polity* (rather than *nation*) is deliberately chosen because the U. S. is a mega-state; within its political boundaries are Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and American Samoa, each with its own unique language problems and linguistic populations. The U. S. has never had a national Ministry of Education (though it does boast a national Department of Education whose functions are rather different from those of a Ministry); nor has the U. S. so far ever promulgated a national language policy. As a consequence, language policy decisions are made state by state, often without reference to such policies in neighboring states; indeed, language-in-education decisions may be made at the level of individual school districts or even at the level of individual schools (this is certainly the case at the tertiary level). The resulting multilayered practices, rules, regulations, and legislation engender some confusion and some inefficiency.

The U.S. has been profligate with respect to the richness of its language resources. There seems to exist a complex hierarchy of languages; English as first language, of course, is unquestioned (though in fact nearly 25% of the population consists of native speakers of language(s) other than English [LOTEs]). Certain LOTEs have historically enjoyed positions of privilege as constituting part of a superior education—namely, French and German—but the enrollments in academic courses in those languages have been in free-fall for the past half century. Similarly too the situation of classical languages (e.g., Classical Arabic, Classical Greek, Hebrew, Latin, Sanskrit) which—if they are taught at all—tend to be taught either as part of religious education outside the public school system, or well along in the tertiary system.

When languages (modern or classical) are taught in the educational system, the methodology employed dates back to the Middle Ages; the objective of language education was conceived as access to the thought and art of other (often dead) civilizations. Communicative competence has rarely been given any consideration. This view has had the most profound effect on teaching methodologies. Furthermore formal language education undertakes to inculcate a "standard" version of a language; it is insensitive to dialect variation.

Immigrant languages have long been looked upon with disdain, since assimilation of immigrants to English has been perceived as the desired end. Non-standard varieties of English (or of other languages)—often described as *sub-standard*—have been stigmatized. As a consequence, the richness of language resources in the U.S. has been ignored, and the U. S. is widely perceived (and tends to perceive itself) as a monumentally monolingual English-speaking nation. Globalization and modernization, on the other hand, demand a population capable of dealing with the world in many languages; as the old saying goes, one can buy in any language, but one must sell in the language of the customer. The nation's vast linguistic resources are permitted to decay, despite the obvious need to employ them in the national interest. The European Union, on the other hand, urges its members to require biligualism as a prerequisite for entry into tertiary education and trilingualism as a requirement for exit from the educational system. The U.S. is simply not prepared for that level of competition in any global sector.

In the rich tapestry of bilingualism already available in the U.S., possession of bilingual skills is not valued. At the very least, given the polyglot characteristics of U. S. society, bilingualism ought to be valued and rewarded at least in the civil service, in the delivery of social and health services, and in the international business and tourism sectors. While the federal courts have shown some movement in the direction of valuing bilingual ability, the legal system in general has not. The banking sector, while seeking to attract customers from minority communities, has largely ignored the language needs of that population. The health and social services delivery sector has been even more insensitive to the language needs of its clientele. While the connection between, on the one hand, infant mortality rates, substance abuse rates, rates of the spread of AIDS, rates of teen pregnancy, rates of prostitution, rates of arrest, conviction, and incarceration and, on the other hand, language proficiency in the *de facto* national language or in bilingualism has not been clearly established, it seems abundantly clear that improvement in the latter result in some degree of improvement in the former, even in the absence of a clear causal link. Although there is no clear correlation between social ills and language proficiency (nor can it be argues that poor language proficiency *causes* social ills), it seems abundantly clear that attention to language proficiency may have some positive effect on social ills. To some extent, that obvious inter-relationship underlies the visible public attempts to "stamp out illiteracy." The vacuity of that aim is equally apparent; logically, how would it be possible to 'stamp out' the *absence* of something? Quite aside from the logical question, the uses of literacy, the rapidly increasing breadth of literacy (e. g., mathematical literacy, computer literacy, etc.), and its socioeconomic values constitute a question of such complexity that the use of a flawed medical metaphor hardly seems appropriate. It is not possible to 'stamp out' illiteracy as it *was* possible to 'stamp out' small pox, or yellow fever, or polio, or diphtheria. because the objects of the "stamping out" are so categorically different. There is not (nor is there likely to be) a vaccine against illiteracy.

In the recent past, in the U.S., there has been a political movement to declare English the sole official language of the polity by legislation (i. e., through an amendment to the Constitution). This movement flies in the face of global reality. English is not in any sense anywhere endangered; claiming that it is would be like claiming that crab grass is an endangered species. Seeking to enshrine monolingualism in law ignores the global recognition of the political, economic, and social importance of multilingualism. But altruistic arguments for multilingualism aside, the sheer complexity of installing and enforcing monolingualism boggles the mind. Which English would be installed as official—the English of Winston Churchill, or of Lyndon Johnson, or of Jimmy Carter, or of John F. Kennedy, or of George W. Bush? Assuming that it were possible to choose a variety, who would underwrite the creation of the necessary dictionaries and grammars of the selected variety; how would the "standard" be taught to the entire population; and—short of creating a national language academy to maintain the standard and a "language police" to enforce the use of that standard—how could the standard be periodically adjusted to changing needs and how would its use across the length and breadth of the polity be assured? It is even possible that legislated monolingualism would have a damping effect on the important global trade in the teaching of English as a second/foreign language and in the marketing of supporting materials—text books, dictionaries, assessment instruments, etc.

Although there have been those who wished to protect English from unspecified dangers, there has been little or no attention to the teaching of foreign languages. Traditionally, as noted above, French and German have been offered (largely at the tertiary level) as part of a proper education, but students have voted with their feet, assiduously avoiding the pain of foreign language learning. It would seem important not only to capitalize on the language resources already available in a linguistically heterogeneous population, but to facilitate attainment of foreign language proficiency to the total population. Research suggests that language learning is less stressful among the very young. As wide a variety of LOTEs as possible ought to be made available to all learners, from the earliest grades right through postgraduate study. But what is important is the opportunity to learn LOTEs; it is not useful, economically or socially, to enforce LOTE learning across the entire population. Attempts to do so insure high rates of failure, significant waste of resources, and outrageous costs for relatively insignificant results, as well as a necessary "dumbing down" of the standards.

In sum, much of what has been done in the context of language policy in the U.S. in the past half century can be perceived as wrong-headed. Yes, a national language policy is needed, but not as a set of laws carved in stone; rather as a set of guidelines intended to move the polity toward vital multilingualism essential to the social, economic, military, and diplomatic well-being of the polity. Yes, a language-in-education policy is needed, but not as a subtractive policy aimed at producing a highly homogeneous English-speaking population; rather as a system providing the greatest set of options to students within the constraints of budgetary policy. Yes, LOTEs ought to be taught throughout the educational system, but not with the objective of understanding the high literary culture; rather as a system designed to provide communicative competence in as large a segment of the population as possible. Yes, it is necessary to recognize functional bilingualism as a social and economic value, and to reward it in appropriate ways. No, it is not necessary to legislate English as the sole official language of the polity; to do so would be enormously expensive and highly counter-productive.

Let those of us who are professionally engaged in the study and teaching of languages sort out our priorities and work diligently for attainment of a rational national languages policy, a rational language-in-education policy, and a social, political, and economic recognition of what we do in the best interests of this polity.

References

Baetens Beardsmore, H. (1994). Language policy and planning in Western European countries. In W. Grabe*, et al.* (Eds.). *Annual Review o f Applied Linguistics, 14: Language Policy and Planning.* NewYork: Cambridge University Press. 93-110.

Crawford, J. (Ed.) (2000). U. S. *language policy in an age of anxiety*. Clevedon, Avon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Crystal, D. (1997). *English as a global Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gonzalez, R. D., & Melis I. (Eds.). (2001). *Language ideologies: Critical perspectives on the official English movement.* 2 Vols. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Graddol, D. (1997). *The future of English?* London: British Council.

Herriman, M., & Burnaby, B. (Eds.) (1996). *Language policies in English-dominant countries: Six case studies*. Clevedon, Avon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Ho, W.-H. & Ward, C. (Eds.). (2000). *Language in the global context: Implications for the language classroom*. (Anthology Series 41.) Singapore: RELC (SAMEO [Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organization] Regional English language Center).

Kaplan, R. B., & Balfdauf, R. B., Jr. (1997**).** *Language Planning from practice to theory*. Clevedon, Avon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Kenny, B., & Savage, W. (Eds.). (1997). *Language and development: Teachers in a changing world*. London: Longman.

Mühlhäusler, P. (1995). *Linguistic ecology: Language change and linguistic Imperialism in the Pacific region*. London: Routledge.

Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Robins, R. H., & Uhlenbeck, E. M. (Eds.). (1991). *Endangered languages*. Oxford: Berg.

Tollefson, J. W. (1991). *Planning language, planning inequality*. New York: Longman.

van Els, T. J. M. In press. The European Union, its institutions and its languages: Some language political observations. *Current Issues in Language Planning*. *2*, 2.

Wiley, T. G. (1997). *Literacy and language diversity*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics. McHenry, IL: Delta Systems.

Recommended Journals

Current Issues in Language Planning
International Journal of the Sociology of Language
Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development
Language in Society
Language Problems & Language Planning

Invitation

The Readership of *Applied Language Learning* invites you to respond to Professor Robert B. Kaplan's article on language teaching and language policy. Express your views on this timely topic in an essay of 500-1000 words (1-2 double-spaced pages).

Reviews

The Second Time Around: Minimalism and L2 Acquisition. (2000). By Julia Herschensohn. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. Pp. 288.

Reviewed by JOHN HEDGCOCK
Monterey Institute of International Studies

In this meticulous, comprehensive, and well-written book, Julia Herschensohn analyzes the theoretical and empirical connections between Chomsky's (1995) Minimalist Program and selected dimensions of second language acquisition (L2A). The book's eight chapters examine three interrelated issues: (1) the fundamental characteristics that make up "knowledge of language," (2) the process of language acquisition, and (3) parallels and distinctions between primary language acquisition (L1A) and L2A.

Adopting a decidedly nativist, Chomskian perspective, this book is written for a specialist audience well-versed not only in generative linguistics (particularly Principles and Parameters, as well as Minimalism), but also in the Universal Grammar- (UG-) based approach to L2A. Herschensohn provides her readers with a current, logically-organized, and instructive synthesis of key premises of the Minimalist Program; moreover, she lucidly interprets its implications for L1A and L2A by surveying and interpreting relevant empirical research in the UG tradition. This book carefully traces the evolution of generative theory, outlining chief distinctions between Chomsky's (1981) Principles and Parameters model and its more recent instantiation, Minimalism, which assumes a universal syntactic template and treats cross-linguistic variation as a morpholexical phenomenon.

In the first chapter, the author explicates two philosophical precepts, modularity and generative theory, focusing principally on L2 and interlanguage (IL) grammatical form (rather than on the context of linguistic performance). Herschensohn briefly describes non-modular views of language acquisition in which language acquisition depends not on linguistic universals but on more general, data-driven, cognitive processes (e.g., the Competition Model, MacWhinney, 1987, 1997, 1999). The view of language and language acquisition that she articulates, however, is singularly nativist and structure-dependent.

The second chapter assesses empirical research associated with the Critical Period Hypothesis (CPH) (Lenneberg, 1967) and outlines differences between L1A and L2A. Herschensohn challenges the pervasive folk belief that adult L2A inherently results in inferior outcomes when compared to child L1A; she also calls into question an influential strand of psycholinguistic research that supports a critical age or sensitive period for language acquisition (see, for example, Jackendoff, 1994; Johnson & Newport, 1989; Newmeyer, 1996). Whereas she concedes that "there is a critical age after which adults cannot acquire language involuntarily or completely" (pp. 52-53), she steadfastly maintains that "it is clearly possible to acquire an L2 after the Critical Period, and to acquire it well" (p. 53).

Following on the crucial theoretical discussions of the first two chapters, Chapter Three sketches the evolution of Chomsky's model of language, from *Aspects* (Chomsky, 1965) to the present (Chomsky, 1995). Herschensohn aptly observes that, rather than marking an abrupt departure from earlier formulations of generative theory, the Minimalist Program "proposes a grammar pared down to the minimum: the lexicon, the interpretive components PF [phonological form] and LF [logical form], and two operations, Move and Merge that push forward the computation/derivation of syntactic structures" (p. 67). Reiterating the fundamental distinctions between linguistic form (UG constraints) and strategy (UG drive), Herschensohn fully exposes the Constructionist hypothesis, which holds that learners develop L2 grammar by systematically mastering morpholexical constructions; the latter, she argues, serve as scaffolds for the emergence of complete functional categories.

In Chapter Four, specific details of L1A and L2A are analyzed with reference to bootstrapping and the Coalition Model (cf. Hirsh-Pasek & Golinkoff, 1996). Bootstrapping refers to a procedure whereby learners use their syntactic knowledge to decode the meanings of forms (lexemes and morphemes) in the target language input. The Coalition Model holds that learners construct a target grammar "through a coalition of resources," including internal grammatical predisposition, social factors, cognitive strategies, and input cues (p. 86). Through these processes, observes Herschensohn, children and adults acquire functional categories as they move toward "the completion of syntax" in L1A and L2A (p. 7). Based on empirical studies supporting Constructionism, Herschensohn proposes that L2A can be divided into initial, intermediate, and final stages; the latter may entail "near-native acquisition, with virtually complete syntax but residual indeterminacy" in peripheral lexical and morphological knowledge (p. 8).

Chapters Five and Six endeavor to apply Constructionism to the controversial yet inevitable issue of UG access. Summarizing UG-based research on the acquisition of the Null Subject, Verb Raising, and V2 parameters in L2A, Chapter Five examines stages of IL development to determine the extent to which UG constrains the learning of these properties. Unlike the conventional characterization of parameter-setting and re-setting as a switch-flipping operation (cf. Cook & Newson, 1996; White, 1989), Herschensohn's application of Constructionism portrays L2 parameter-resetting as a process in which learners, having fully acquired L1 functional categories, gradually reset L2 morphological features to coincide with the available L2 data.

The key theoretical innovations of the Minimalist Program outlined in Chapter Five provide the background for Chapter Six, where the author stridently argues for UG access and Constructionism in L2A. Summarizing studies involving anaphoric binding, argument structure, semantic mapping onto syntactic structures, and morphological features in functional categories, Herschensohn asserts that successful learners move from initial L1 transfer to feature underspecification in L2. While acknowledging variability and incompleteness among L2 learners, she defends a conclusion favoring both

UG access and Constructionism by citing empirical findings. These outcomes, in her view, show that (1) learners can successfully reset L1 parameters to those instantiated in L2; (2) UG constrains learner IL; (3) learners acquire subtle L2 properties despite poverty of the stimulus, and; (4) learners can attain "L2 final state grammars that are near native" (p. 182).

In Chapter Seven, the distinct roles of UG and cognitive learning strategies are explicated with reference to selected empirical studies of negative feedback (viz., error correction) and explicit instruction in L2A. Herschensohn reviews central L1A-L2A differences, claiming that these distinctions can lead to identification of properties of the L2 that can be treated through intervention (viz., explicit instruction). According to Herschensohn, instructional bootstrapping (priming, organized input, form-focused correction) can compensate for lacunae in learners' morpholexical L2 knowledge, leading to a more complete L2 grammar.

Chapter Eight revisits the book's chief premises, which include the argument that L1A and L2A are, in effect, not that different from each other. Acknowledging that L1A is always "complete," whereas L2A does not result in completeness, Herschensohn maintains that both processes are constrained by UG, with L2A resulting from the construction of L2 grammar based on an L1 template.

The Second Time Around skillfully achieves its explicit goals of characterizing a systematic model unifying Chomsky's theory of language with a theory language acquisition; it likewise portrays key distinctions and similarities between L1A and L2A that might be overlooked by current L2A researchers and theorists. These admirable strengths notwithstanding, several points should be made with respect to this book's very narrow focus. The author's apparent enthusiasm for the Minimalist Program unfortunately eclipses any systematic or satisfying discussion of competing or complementary accounts of L1A or L2A. Researchers informed by models of learning and socialization outside the UG paradigm are likely to evaluate *The Second Time Around* by citing familiar objections to existing UG-based research. For instance, UG and Minimalism are designed primarily as theories of language. Although research in the UG tradition has been undeniably influential in L2A research, we should avoid assuming that the rigor of the Minimalist Program as a theory of language automatically qualifies it as an appropriate or satisfactory theory of second language acquisition or learning. Herschensohn's introduction and analysis of Constructionism provides perhaps one of the most useful insights into how a Minimalist account might inform L2A, especially since Constructionism is potentially congruent with alternative views of L2A (e.g., interactionism, cognitivism, acculturation, sociocultural theory, etc.). Nonetheless, the narrow, nativist perspective promoted in this book still suffers from the reductionism that has historically marked UG. That is, the generative approach- … views the speaker/learner not as an individual with varied characteristics, nor as a social being, but as some kind of idealized receptacle for the UG blueprint. The emphasis is very much … on language as the object of study, rather than on the speaker or learner as a social being (Mitchell & Myles, 1998, p. 69).

With its dominant reliance on the acquisition of syntax, lexis, morphology, and (to a limited extent) phonology, applications of Minimalism to processes of L2A apparently do not yet encompass crucial, dimensions of linguistic competence and performance not mentioned in this book: semantic, pragmatic, and discursive skills. Along similar methodological lines, UG-based research (whether in the Principles and Parameters or Minimalist framework) relies heavily on the grammaticality judgments of adult learners acquiring a Western (usually European) language as L2. Although Herschensohn briefly mentions several of sources that question the validity and reliability of grammaticality judgment instruments, she neglects to question them as reflections of performance and competence. Furthermore, she does not address the limitations of research based largely on the learning of a relatively small number of target languages. Clearly, the author's objective was to synthesize the research relevant to her topic, not to remediate the errors and oversights that pervade the available literature. However, her case for Minimalism might be considerably more persuasive if she were to attenuate her claims and recognize some of the serious methodological flaws that characterize UG-based research.

With regard to Herschensohn's treatment of theory, several assumptions should be examined critically. For example, in Chapter One, she asserts that generative theory can "isolate the area of investigation and provide a falsifiable model that can be tested" (p. 24). Indeed, falsifiability is a crucial criterion for any meaningful theory (cf. Long, 1990; McLaughlin, 1987), yet Herschensohn does not question the extremely confined nature of the "area of investigation" with which she is concerned, namely, linguistic units such as the morpheme, lexeme, phrase, and clause. While easy to isolate, explicit knowledge of these forms and structures alone by no means constitutes communicative competence. With respect to language acquisition, Herschensohn problematically assumes (as do most generative linguists) that a "final state" of L1A and L2A is a given—an empirical reality. Variationist theory and research suggest that a "final state" is, in fact, an idiosyncratic phenomenon, subject to many factors that a nativist, generative theory cannot possibly account for (cf. MacWhinney, 1999; Tarone, 1984, 1988, 1990; Tarone & Liu, 1995). Given the current indeterminacy of what might constitute a putative "final state" for L1 or L2, we should be quite wary of Herschensohn's bold claim that Minimalism and Constructionism provide "for the possibility of L2 final state grammars that are near native" (p. 182).

Despite these reservations, *The Second Time Around* offers an informative and scholarly account of Minimalism and its potential for expanding the UG agenda in L2A research. The comprehensiveness and readability of this excellent book make it a valuable contribution to the literature and an extremely useful tool for researchers and theorists.

References

Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chomsky, N. (1981). *Lectures on Government and Binding.* Dordrecht: Foris.

Chomsky, N. (1995). *The Minimalist Program.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Cook, V. J., & Newson, M. (1996). *Chomsky's Universal Grammar: An introduction (2nd ed.)*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Elman, J. L., Bates, E. A., Johnson, M. H., Karmiloff-Smith, A., Parisi, D., & Plunkett, K. (1996). *Rethinking innateness*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Hirsh-Pasek, K., & Golinkoff, R. M. (1996). *The origins of grammar:Evidence from early language comprehension.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Jackendoff, R. (1994). *Patterns in the mind: Language and human nature*. New York: Basic Books.

Johnson, J., & Newport, E. (1989). *Critical Period effects in secondlanguage learning:* The influence of maturational state on the acquisition of English as a second language*. Cognitive Psychology, 21,* 60-99.

Newmeyer, F. J. (1996). Some incorrect implications of the full-access hypothesis. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 19,* 736-737.

Lenneberg, E. (1967). *Biological foundations of language.* New York: Wiley.

Long, M. (1990). The least a second language acquisition theory needs to explain. *TESOL Quarterly, 24,* 649-666.

MacWhinney, B. (Ed.). (1987). *Mechanisms of language acquisition.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

MacWhinney, B. (1997). Second language acquisition and the Competition Model. In A. M. B. DeGroot & J. F. Kroll (Eds.). *Tutorials in bilingualism: Psycholinguistic perspectives.* **(City, State: Publisher**)

MacWhinney, B. (Ed.). (1999). *The emergence of language.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

McLaughlin, B. (1987). *Theories of second-language learning*. London:Arnold.

Tarone, E. (1984). On the variability of interlanguage systems. In F. R. Eckman, L. H. Bell, & D. Nelson. (Eds.), *Universals of second language acquisition.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Tarone, E. (1988). *Variationism in interlanguage*. London: Arnold.

Tarone, E. (1990). On variation in interlanguage: A response to Gregg. *Applied Linguistics, 11,* 392-400.

Tarone, E., & Liu, G.-Q. (1995). Situational context, variation, and second language acquisition theory. In G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.)*, Principle and practice in applied linguistics (pp. 107-124).* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

White, L. (1989). *Universal Grammar and second language acquisition.* Amsterdam: J. Benjamins.

Insights I and II: A Content-Based Approach to Academic Preparation. (1997). By Donna Brinton, Linda Jensen, Lyn Repath-Martos, Jan Frodesen, and Christine Holten. White Plains, NY: Addison Wesley LongmanVol. I: Pp. xiv + 191. Vol. II: Pp. xiv + 205.

Reviewed by SANG-KEUN SHIN
University of California Los Angeles

This two-volume set is designed to prepare pre-college and college-level ESL students for the language skills required of them at the university. The authors have integrated the academic skills of reading, writing, listening, and speaking with short grammar lessons, all in a content-based approach. A basic premise of the text is that basic interpersonal communicative skills many ESL students bring to the university are not sufficient to deal with the complex demands of academia. Therefore, the goal of these two books is to equip the students with skills in academic English.

Each book consists of four discipline-specific units drawn from the humanities, the physical sciences, social sciences, and life sciences. Specifically, *Insights 1* contains folklore, atmospheric sciences, American history, and anthropology units whereas *Insights II* contains biology, sociology, political science, and astronomy units. These units are broken into three related chapters: Introduction, Exploration, and Expansion. The chapters, as their titles suggest, treat the same topic from a variety of perspectives. The three thematically interwoven chapters in each unit are further subdivided into three sections. The first section, Exploring the Concepts, contains activities which encourage students to apply their background knowledge as they approach the new concepts. The second section of the text, Working with Sources, contains readings and videotaped lecture segments that present the basic issues or concepts. The third section, Integrating Perspective, contains activities, which allow students to apply, analyze, and evaluate the concepts of the unit.

The most significant strength of *Insights I* and *II* is the authenticity of the content materials and the tasks. Each unit contains more than eight reading selections and at least three videotaped lectures. The reading materials are adapted from college texts and other topically-related literary passages. All lecture segments are videotaped in actual university classes, and visual materials such as photos, charts, and graphs are selected from popular sources and academic textbooks. These genuine materials provide students with optimal conditions for building both content and formal schemata for each discipline. The tasks are interactively authentic in that they are appropriate to each discipline and reflect the types of tasks that students encounter in the actual content classes. These features contribute to the simulation of the processes that ESL students actually experience in their university courses.

Additional features adding to the attractiveness of *Insights I* and *II* include Targeting Vocabulary and Targeting Grammar. Vocabulary and grammar exercises presented in an authentic discourse context help students improve the accuracy of their oral and written output. Another nice touch of these two books is a variety of academic strategies which help students expand their range of metacognitive strategies. Unlike many other ESL textbooks, which merely introduce academic strategies, *Insights I* and *II* reinforce them by providing practice in the follow-up tasks.

Insights I and *II* can serve both as a textbook and as a guide to those who want to develop content-based materials. They are not a panacea for every ESL classroom, however. A few limitations should, therefore, be taken into consideration before they are to be used in some ESL classrooms. *Insights I* and *II are* targeted for ESL students who have already attained a fairly high degree of general English proficiency. Thus, many international students who do not have enough basic interpersonal communication skills may find them difficult. Some students may complain that content areas of *Insights I* and *II* do not reflect their interests and academic needs. Thus, it would be necessary to adapt the materials to meet their needs as appropriate.

Given the dearth of the appropriate content-based EAP textbooks, *Insights I* and *II* are a much-needed contribution to this field. I do not hesitate to recommend *Insights I* and *II* because I believe that they have achieved what their titles promised: They provide invaluable insights not only to ESL teachers but to ESL students as well.

General Information

ALL Index

Authors and Articles

Derwing, Tracey M. (1997). *Pronunciation Instruction for "Fossilized" Learners: Can It Help? 8*(2), p. 217.

Douglas, Dan. (1989). *Testing Listening Comprehension. 1*(1), p. 53.

Dunkel, Patricia A. (1992). *The Utility of Objective (Computer) Measures of the Fluency of Speakers of English as a Second Language. 3*(1 & 2), p. 65.

Dupuy, Beatrice. (1993). *Incidental Vocabulary Acquisition in French as a Foreign Language. 4*(1 & 2), p. *55.*

Dupuy, Beatrice. (1997). *Voices from the Classroom: Intermediate-Level French Students Favor Extensive Reading over Grammar and Give Their Reasons*. *8*(2), p. 285.

Dutertre, Ayça. (2000). *A Teacher's Investigation of Her Own Teaching. 11*(1), p. 99.

Ehrman, Madeline. (1998). *The Modern Language Aptitude Test for Predicting Learning Success and Advising Students. 9*(1 & 2), p. 31.

Eisenstein Ebsworth, Miriam. (1997). *What Researchers Say and Practitioners Do: Perspectives on Conscious Grammar Instruction in the ESL Classroom. 8*(2), p. 237.

Ellis, Rod. (1994). *Factors in the Incidental Acquisition of Second Language Vocabulary from Oral Input: A Review Essay. 5*(1), p. 1.

Feyten, Carine M. (1999). *Consciousness Raising and Strategy Use. 10*(1 & 2), p. 15.

Flaitz, Jeffra J. (1999). *Consciousness Raising and Strategy Use. 10*(1 & 2), p.15.

Ganschow, Leonore. (1992). *Factors Relating to Learning a Foreign Language among High- and Low-Risk High School Students with Learning Disabilities. 3*(1 & 2), p. 37.

Gardner, Robert C. (1991). *Second-Language Learning in Adults: Correlates of Proficiency. 2*(1), p. 1.

Garrett, Nina. (1989). *The Role of Grammar in the Development of Communicative Ability. 1*(1), p. 15.

Garrett, Nina. (1991). *Language Pedagogy and Effective Technology Use. 2*(2), p. 1.

Glass, William R. (1997). *The Effects of Lexical and Grammatical Cues on Processing Past Temporal References in Second Language Input. 8*(1), p. 1.

Granschow, Leonore. (1998). *Factors in the Prediction of Achievement and Proficiency in a Foreign Language. 9*(1 & 2), p. 71.

Han, Youngju. (2000). *Grammaticality Judgment Tests: How Reliable and Valid Are They? 11*(1), p.177.

Hedgcock, John. (2000). *Overt and Covert Prestige in the French Language Classroom: When Is It Good to Sound Bad. 11*(1), p. 75.

Hinkel, Eli. (1994). *Pragmatics of Interaction: Expressing Thanks in a Second Language. 5*(1), p. 73.

Hodges, Rosemary. (1995). *Examining the Value of Conversation Partner Programs. 6*(1 & 2), p. 1.

Lefkowitz, Natalie. (2000). *Overt and Covert Prestige in the French Language Classroom: When Is It Good to Sound Bad. 11*(1), p. 75.
Leow, Ronald P. (1997). *The Effects of Input Enhancement and Text Length on Adult L2 Readers' Comprehension and Intake in Second Language Acquisition. 8*(2), p. 151.
LoCastro, Virginia. (1997). *Pedagogical Intervention and Pragmatic Competence Development. 8*(1), p. 75.
Lowe, Jr., Pardee. (1993). *Proficiency and Performance in Language Testing. 4*(1 & 2), p. 19.
Lowe, Jr., Pardee. (1998). *Zero-Based Language Aptitude Test Design: Where's the Focus for the Test? 9*(1 & 2), p. 11.
Lunberry, Clark. (1994). *Deviant English and the Para-Poetic. 5*(1), p. 93.
Markee, Numa. (1994). *Curricular Innovation: Issues and Problems. 5*(2), p. 1.
Matsuo, Naoko. (2000). *Varieties of Conversational Experience: Looking for Learning Opportunities. 11*(2), p.265.
McQuillen,Jeff. (1994). *Reading versus Grammar: What Students Think is Pleasurable and Beneficial for Language Acquisition*. *5*(2), p. 95.
Mecarty, Frances H. (2000). *Lexical and Grammatical Knowledge in Reading and Listening Comprehension by Foreign Language Learners of Spanish. 11*(2), p. 323.
Meunier, Lydie E. (1994). *Computer-Assisted Language Learning in Cooperative Learning. 5*(2), p. 31.
Mollering, Martina. (1995). *Pragmatics in Interlanguage: German Modal Particles. 6*(1 & 2), p. 41.
Moore, Rita. (1997). *A Link Between Reading Proficiency and Native-Like Use of Pausing in Speaking. 8*(1), p. 25.
Mora, Raimundo. (1995). *Silence, Interruptions, and Discourse Domains: The Opportunities to Speak. 6*(1 & 2), p. 27.
Munro, Murray J. (1997). *Pronunciation Instruction for "Fossilized" Learners: Can It Help? 8*(2), p. 217.
Nunan, David. (1993). *From Learning-Centeredness to Learning Centeredness. 4* (1 & 2), p. 1.
Nunan, David. (1995). *Pragmatics in Interlanguage: German Modal Particles. 6*(1 & 2), p. 41.
Olive, Floyd. (1998). *Essay Scores as Instruments for Placement and Advancement in an Intensive English Program. 9*(1 & 2), p. 107.
O'Mara, Francis. (1991). *Measurement and Research Implications of Spolsky's Conditions for Second Language Learning. 2*(1), p. 71.
Orr, Joseph. (2000). *Language Training Opportunities: Today and Tomorrow 2000 Command Language Program Manager Seminar. 11*(2), p. 367.
Otto, Sue K. (1991). *Training in Instructional Technologies: Skills and Methods. 2* (2), p. 15.
Overstreet, Maryann. (1999). *Fostering Pragmatic Awareness. 10*(1 & 2), p. 1.
Oxford, Rebecca L. (1992). *Language Learning Strategies: Crucial Issues of Concept and Definition. 3*(1 & 2), p. 1.
Oxford, Rebecca L. (1993). *Instructional Implications of Gender Differences in*

Language Learning. 11(1), p. 123.
Valentine, Capt. Susan M. (2001). *Russian Language Development and Maintenance at a Distance: Methodology and Technology. 12*(1), p. 1.
Valdman, Albert. (1989). *The Problem of the Target Model in Proficiency-Oriented Foreign Language Instruction. 1*(1), p. 33.
Van Lier, Leo. (1991). *Inside the Classroom: Learning Processes and Teaching Procedures. 2*(1), p. 29.
Vann, Roberta J. (1996). *Introduction: Validity Issues in the Assessment of L2 Learner Strategies. 7*(1 & 2), p. 1.
Vann, Roberta J. (1996). *Using Task Products to Assess Second Language Learning Processes. 7*(1 & 2), p. 61.

Vanniarajan, Swathi. (1997). *An Interactive Model of Vocabulary Acquisition. 8*(2), p. 183.
VanPatten, Bill. (1997). *The Effects of Lexical and Grammatical Cues on Processing Past Temporal References in Second Language Input. 8*(1), p. 1.
van Lier, Leo. (2000). *Varieties of Conversational Experience: Looking for Learning Opportunities.*
Wiebe, Grace. (1997). *Pronunciation Instruction for "Fossilized" Learners: Can it Help? 8*(2), p. 217.
Young, Dolly Jesuita. (1997). *A Gender-Related Analysis of Strategies Used to Process Written Input in the Native Language and a Foreign Language. . 8*(1), p. 43.
Young, Richard. (1995). *Discontinuous Interlanguage Development and Its Implications for Oral Proficiency Rating Scales. 6*(1 & 2), p. 13.
Yule, George. (1999). *Fostering Pragmatic Awareness. 10*(1 & 2), p. 1.

Reviews

Akutsu, S. (1997). *Review: Taylor: Writing and Literacy in Chinese, Korean and Japanese. 8*(1), p. 128.
Barrera Pardo, Dario. (2000). *Leather and James (Eds.): New Sounds 97. 11*(2), p. 351.
Bean, Martha S. (1995). *Review: Cook: Discourse. 6*(1 & 2), p. 89.
Bean, Martha S. (1997). *Review: Eggins and Slade: Analyzing Casual Conversation. 2*(3), p. 23.
Bean, Martha S. (2000). *Review: Schmidt: Language Policy and Identity Politics in the United States. 11*(2), p. 349.
Chu, Kevin W. K. (1998). *Review: Kenny and Savage (Eds.): Language and Development: Teachers in a Changing World. 9*(1 & 2), p. 149.
Dinh-Hoa, Nguyen. (1997). *Review: Vuong and Moore: Colloquial Vietnamese. 8*(2), p. 329.
Gale, Roderic A. (1998). *Review: Gates: The Road Ahead. 9*(1 & 2), p. 154.
Hedgecock, J.S. (1997). *Review: The Current State of Interlanguage: Studies in Honor of William Rutherford. 8*(1), p. 119.

Editorials

Interviews

Woytak, Lidia. (1997). *Linguists in Action: Interview with Colonel Daniel D. Devlin. 8*(2), p. 295.

Woytak, Lidia. (1998). *Interpreter in Action: Interview with Lieutenant Colonel Richard Francona (Retired). 9*(1 & 2), p. 121.

Woytak, Lidia. (2000). *Leading the U.S. Army into the New Millennium: Interview with General Dennis J. Reimer. 11*(1), p. 33.

Calendar of Events*

2001

13-15 September, *Second International Conference on 3rd Language Acquisition and Trilingualism,* Fryske Academy, Leeuwarden-Ljouwert, The Netherlands. Information: Web [http://www.spz.tu-darmstadt.de/projekt_l3/]

14-15 November, *National Association of District Supervisors of Foreign Languages,* Washington, D.C. Information: Loretta Williams, Plano ISD, 150 Sunset, Plano TX 75075; (972) 519-8196, Fax (972) 519-8031, Email [lwillia@pisd.edu].

16-18 November, *American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages,* Washington, D.C. Information: ACTFL, 6 Executive Plaza, Yonkers, NY 10701-6801; (914) 963-8830, Fax (914) 963-1275, Email [actflhq@aol.com], Web [http://www.actfl.org].

16-18 November, *American Association of Teachers of German,* Washington, D.C. Information: AATG, 112 Haddontowne Court #104, Cherry Hill, NJ 08034; (856) 795-5553, Fax (856) 795-9398, Email [aatg@bellatlantic.net], Web [http://www.aatg.org].

16-18 November, *Chinese Language Teachers Association,* Washington, D.C. Information: CLTA, 1200 Academy Street, Kalamazoo, MI 49006; (616) 337-7001, Fax (616) 337-7251, Email [clta@kzoo.edu], Web [http://www.clta.deall.ohio-state.edu].

17 November, *American Association of Teachers of Arabic,* San Francisco. Information: John Eisele, Department of Modern Languages & Literature, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, VA 23187-8795; (757) 221-3145, Email [jceise@facstaff.wm.edu].

17-20 November, *American Association of Teachers of Turkic Languages with Middle East Studies Association,* San Francisco. Information: AATT, 110 Jones Hall, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544-1008; (609) 258-1435, Fax (609) 258-1242, Email [ehgilson@princeton.edu], Web [http://www.princeton.edu/~ehgilson/aatt.html].

27-30 December, *Modern Language Association of America,* New Orleans. Information: MLA, 10 Astor Place, New York, NY 10003-6981; Fax (212) 477-9863, Email [convention@mla.org].

27-30 December, *North American Association of Teachers of Czech,* New Orleans. Information: George Cummins III, German and Russian, Tulane University, New Orleans, LA 70118; (504) 899-7915, Fax (504)865-5276, Email [gcummins@mailhost.tcs.tulane.edu].

27-30 December, *American Association of Teachers of Slavic & E. European Languages and American Council of Teachers of Russian,* New Orleans. Information: AATSEEL, 1933 N. Fountain Park Dr., Tucson, AZ 85715; Fax (520)885-2663, Email [aatseel@compuserve.com], Web [http://clover.slavic.pitt.edu/~aatseel/].

2002

3-6 January, *Linguistic Society of America,* San Francisco. Information: Margaret Reynolds, LSA, 1325 18th St, NW, Suite 211, Washington, DC 20036; (202) 835-1714, Fax (202) 835-1717, Email [lsa@lsadc.org], Web [www.lsadc.org].

*Courtesy of the *Modern Language Journal* (University of Wisconsin)

21-23 March, *Central States Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages,* Kansas City, MO. Information: Diane Ging, PO Box 21531, Columbus, OH 43221-0531; (614) 529-0109, Fax (614) 529-0321, Email [dging@iwaynet.net], Web [http://centralstates.cc/].

6-9 April, *American Association of Applied Linguistics,* Salt Lake City. Information: AAAL, PO Box 21686, Eagan, MN 55121-0686; (612) 953-0805, Fax (612) 431-8404, Email [aaaloffice@aaal.org], Web [http://www.aaal.org].

9-13 April, *Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages,* Salt Lake City, Utah. Information: TESOL, 700 South Washington Street, Suite 200, Alexandria, Virginia 22314; (703) 836-0774, Fax (703) 836-7864, Email [conv@tesol.edu], Web [www.tesol.edu].

2-5 May, *Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages,* New York. Information: Northeast Conference, Dickinson College, PO Box 1773, Carlisle, PA 17013-2896; (717) 245-1977, Fax (717) 245-1976, Email [nectfl@dickinson.edu], Web [www.dickinson.edu/nectfl].

20-21 November, *National Association of District Supervisors of Foreign Languages,* Salt Lake City. Information: Loretta Williams, Plano ISD, 150 Sunset, Plano TX 75075; (972) 519-8196, Fax (972) 519-8031, Email [lwillia@pisd.edu].

22-24 November, *American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages,* Salt Lake City. Information: ACTFL, 6 Executive Plaza, Yonkers, NY 10701-6801; (914) 963-8830, Fax (914) 963-1275, Email [actflhq@aol.com], Web [http://www.actfl.org].

22-24 November, *American Association of Teachers of German,* Salt Lake City. Information: AATG, 112 Haddontowne Court #104, Cherry Hill, NJ 08034; (856) 795-5553, Fax (856) 795-9398, Email [aatg@bellatlantic.net], Web [http://www.aatg.org].

22-24 November, *Chinese Language Teachers Association,* Salt Lake City. Information: CLTA, 1200 Academy Street, Kalamazoo, MI 49006; (616) 337-7001, Fax (616) 337-7251, Email [clta@kzoo.edu], Web [http://www.clta.deall.ohio-state.edu].

23 November, *American Association of Teachers of Arabic,* Washington. Information: John Eisele, Department of Modern Languages & Literature, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, VA 23187-8795; (757) 221-3145, Email [jceise@facstaff.wm.edu].

23-26 November, *American Association of Teachers of Turkic Languages with Middle East Studies Association,* Washington. Information: AATT, 110 Jones Hall, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544-1008; (609) 258-1435, Fax (609) 258-1242, Email [ehgilson@princeton.edu], Web [www.princeton.edu/~ehgilson/aatt.html].

27-30 December, *Modern Language Association of America,* location to be announced. Information: MLA, 10 Astor Place, New York, NY 10003-6981; Fax (212) 477-9863, Email [convention@mla.org].

27-30 December, *North American Association of Teachers of Czech,* location to be announced. Information: George Cummins III, German and Russian, Tulane University, New Orleans, LA 70118; (504) 899-7915, Fax (504)865-5276, Email [gcummins@mailhost.tcs.tulane.edu].

27-30 December, *American Association of Teachers of Slavic & E. European Languages and American Council of Teachers of Russian,* location to be announced. Information: AATSEEL, 1933 N. Fountain Park Dr., Tucson, AZ 85715; Fax (520)885-2663, Email [aatseel@compuserve.com], Web [http://clover.slavic.pitt.edu/~aatseel/].

Information for Contributors

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of *Applied Language Learning* (*ALL*) is to increase and promote professional communication within the Defense Language Program and academic communities on adult language learning for functional purposes.

Submission of Manuscripts

The Editor encourages the submission of research and review manuscripts from such disciplines as: (1) instructional methods and techniques; (2) curriculum and materials development; (3) testing and evaluation; (4) implications and applications of research from related fields such as linguistics, education, communication, psychology, and social sciences; (5) assessment of needs within the profession.

Research Article

Divide your manuscript into the following sections:

- Abstract
- Introduction
- Method
- Results
- Discussion
- Conclusion
- Appendices
- Notes
- References
- Acknowledgments
- Author

Abstract

Identify the purpose of the article, provide an overview of the content, and suggest findings in an abstract of not more than 200 words.

Introduction

In a few paragraphs, state the purpose of the study and relate it to the hypothesis and the experimental design. Point out the theoretical implications of the study and relate them to previous work in the area.

Next, under the subsection *Literature Review,* discuss work that had a direct impact on your study. Cite only research pertinent to a specific issue and avoid references with only tangential or general significance. Emphasize pertinent findings and relevant methodological issues. Provide the logical continuity between previous and present work. Whenever appropriate, treat controversial issues fairly. You may state that certain studies support one conclusion and others challenge or contradict it.

Method

Describe how you conducted the study. Give a brief synopsis of the method. Next develop the subsections pertaining to the *participants,* the *materials,* and the *procedure.*

Participants. Identify the number and type of participants. Specify how they were selected and how many participated in each experiment. Provide major demographic characteristics such as age, sex, geographic location, and institutional affiliation. Identify the number of experiment dropouts and the reasons they did not continue.

Materials. Describe briefly the materials used and their function in the experiment.

Procedure. Describe each step in the conduct of the research. Include the instructions to the participants, the formation of the groups, and the specific experimental manipulations.

Results

First state the results. Next describe them in sufficient detail to justify the findings. Mention all relevant results, including those that run counter to the hypothesis.

Tables and figures. Prepare tables to present exact values. Use tables sparingly. Sometimes you can present data more efficiently in a few sentences than in a table. Avoid developing tables for information already presented in other places. Prepare figures to illustrate key interactions, major interdependencies, and general comparisons. Indicate to the reader what to look for in tables and figures.

Discussion

Express your support or nonsupport for the original hypothesis. Next examine, interpret, and qualify the results and draw inferences from them. Do not repeat old statements: Create new statements that further contribute to your position and to readers understanding of it.

Conclusion

Succinctly describe the contribution of the study to the field. State how it has helped to resolve the original problem. Identify conclusions and theoretical implications that can be drawn from your study.

Appendices

Place detailed information (for example, a table, lists of words, or a sample of a questionnaire) that would be distracting to read in the main body of the article in the appendices.

Notes

Use them for substantive information only, and number them serially throughout the manuscript. They all should be listed on a separate page entitled *Notes*.

References

Submit on a separate page of the manuscript a list of references with the centered heading: *References*. Arrange the entries alphabetically by surname of authors. Review the format for bibliographic entries of references in the following sample:

> Dulay, H., & Burt, M. (1974). Errors and strategies in child second language acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly*, *16* (1), 93-95.
> Harris, D. P. (1969). *Testing English as a second language*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

List all works cited in the manuscripts in *References*, and conversely, cite all works included in *References* in the manuscript. Include in reference citations in the text of the manuscript the name of the author of the work cited, the date of the work, and when quoting, the page numbers on which the materials that you are quoting originally appeared, e.g., (Jones, 1982, pp. 235-238).

Acknowledgments

Identify colleagues who contributed to the study and assisted you in the writing process.

Author

Type the title of the article and the author's name on a separate page to ensure anonymity in the review process. Prepare an autobiographical note indicating: full name, position, department, institution, mailing address, and specialization(s). Example follows:

> JANE C. DOE, Assistant Professor, Foreign Language Education, University of America, 226 N. Madison St., Madison, WI 55306. Specializations: foreign language acquisition, curriculum studies.

Review Article

It should describe, discuss, and evaluate several publications that fall into a topical category in foreign language education. The relative significance of the publications in the context of teaching realms should be pointed out. A review article should be 15 to 20 double-spaced pages.

Review

Submit reviews of textbooks, scholarly works on foreign language education, dictionaries, tests, computer software, video tapes, and other non-print materials. Point out both positive and negative aspects of the work(s) being considered. In the three to five double-spaced pages of the manuscript, give a clear but brief statement of the work's content and a critical assessment of its contribution to the profession. Keep quotations short. Do not send reviews that are merely descriptive.

Manuscripts are accepted for consideration with the understanding that they are original material and are not being considered for publication elsewhere.

Specifications for Manuscripts

All editorial correspondence, including manuscripts for publication should be sent to:

Applied Language Learning
ATFL-AP-AJ
ATTN: Editor (Dr. L. Woytak)
Defense Language Institute
Foreign Language Center
Presidio of Monterey, CA 93944-5006

Manuscripts should be typed on one side only on 8-1/2 x 11 inch paper, double-spaced, with ample margins. Subheads should be used at reasonable intervals. Typescripts should typically run from 10 to 30 pages.

All material submitted for publication should conform to the style of the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (4th Ed., 1994) available from the American Psychological Association, P. O. Box 2710, Hyattsville, MD 20784.

Review Process

Manuscripts will be acknowledged by the editor upon receipt and subsequently sent to at least two reviewers whose area of expertise includes the subject of the manuscript. *Applied Language Learning* uses the blind review system. The names of reviewers will be published in the journal annually.

Specifications for Floppy Disks

Preferably use Windows-based software. Format manuscripts produced on one of the DOS-based or Macintosh systems, as an ASQII file at double density, if possible. Please name the software used. MS Word or text documents preferred.

Copyright

Notes

Periodical Postage
Paid at Monterey, CA
And Additional
Mailing Offices

Applied Language Learning
Defense Language Institute
Foreign Language Center
Presidio of Monterey, CA 93944-5006

PB-65-01-1
United States Army
PIN: 079007-1/N 000
Approved for public release.
Distribution is unlimited.