APPLIED LANGUAGE LEARNING 2006 VOLUME 16 NUMBER 2

Applied Language Learning

VOLUME 16 · NUMBER 2

Applied Language Learning

Lidia Woytak
Editor

Volume 16 **Number 2**

Applied Language Learning

PB 65-06-02

The mission of Professional Bulletin 65, *Applied Language Learning (US* ISSN 1041-679X and ISSN 1041-6791 for the online version), 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.

Authentication Number: 0631301

JOYCE E. MORROW
ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT
TO THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY

PETER J. SCHOOMAKER
GENERAL
UNITED STATES ARMY
CHIEF OF STAFF

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

http://www.dliflc.edu/academics/academic_materials/all/index.htm

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
Bldg. 420, Room 122
Presidio of Monterey, CA 93944-5006

Readers
Contact Editor, Dr. Woytak (ATFL-AJ), *Applied Language Learning*
Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center
Presidio of Monterey, CA 93944-5006
E-mail: aj@monterey.army.mil
Telephone: (831) 242-5638 DSN: 768-5638
Fax: (831) 242-5850

Text Processing and Graphics	*CTI2(NAC) Megan Williams*
Computer Consultants	*Vojin Damjanac*
Cover Design	*Barney Inada*
Printing Coordinators	*Tom Colin and Linda Yokogawa*

Applied Language Learning

Volume 16 Number 2

Articles

Reviews

General Information

From the Editor

Reviewers for *Applied Language Learning*

The individuals listed below served as reviewers of manuscripts submitted to *Applied Language Learning* in 2006. We express our gratitude for expert service to:

Christine M. Campbell
Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center
Marianne Celce-Murcia
University of California Los Angeles
Alice Chin
Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center
Andrew Cohen
University of Minnesota
Tracey M. Derwing
University of Alberta Edmonton
Dan Douglas
Iowa State University
Donald Fischer
Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center
Evelyn Hatch
University of California Los Angeles
John S. Hedgcock
Monterey Institute of International Studies
Eli Hinkel
Seattle University
Gordon Jackson
Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center
Renee Jourdenais
Monterey Institute of International Studies
Deborah Lazarus
Educational Consultant
Betty Lou Leaver
Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center
James F. Lee
University of Indiana
Ronald P. Leow
Georgetown University
Paul Nation
Victoria University of Wellington
Rebecca L. Oxford
University of Maryland
Stephen Payne
Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center
Thomas Parry
Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center
Jean Sook Ryu
Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center
David J. Shook
Georgia Institute of Technology
Richard Sparks
College of Mount Saint Joseph
Susan Steele
Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center
Leo Van Lier
Monterey Institute of International Studies
Swathi Vanniarajan
San Jose State University

Defense Language Program
Applied Language Learning
2006, Vol. 16, No. 2, pp. 1-12

The Origins of the Transformation of the Defense Language Program

Harold E. Raugh, Jr.
Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center and Presidio of Monterey

National Security Overview

The horrific events of 11 September 2001, when four hijacked jetliners crashed into and collapsed the twin-towered World Trade Center in New York, slammed into the Pentagon, and nose-dived into a field in rural Pennsylvania (ostensibly on a mission to destroy the U.S. Capitol or the White House), have been indelibly etched into the nation's collective experience and memory as "9/11." These unprecedented terrorist-organized and –executed suicide attacks have had an immeasurably profound political, strategic, military, economic, and cultural impact upon the United States and much of the world. The legacy of the 2,986 fatalities on 9/11, as well as a seeming lack of preparedness, has transformed (at least in the short term) national security policy and world affairs.[1]

The catastrophe of 9/11 shocked the United States and nations around the world. The United States Government, whose lack of preparedness seemed at least a contributing factor to this "second Pearl Harbor," quickly sought to ascertain responsibility for the disaster. The "enemy" was identified as the militant Islamist group Al-Qaeda (Arabic for "the base"), even though its leader, Osama bin Laden, initially denied involvement in the plot. The 9/11 attack seemed to be a culmination and most lethal of numerous Al-Qaeda strikes against American targets and interests.

One of the many earlier incidents in which Al-Qaeda operatives attacked an American target in the Middle East was the assault on the U.S.S. *Cole* (DDG-67) in the port of Aden, Yemen, on 12 October 2000. This attack resulted in the killing of seventeen and wounding of thirty-nine of the ship's crewmembers, in addition to extensive damage to the vessel. Even though this combatant ship was moored for refueling in the port of an Arab country, it appears that force protection measures may have been inadequate.[2] Moreover, there were reportedly no Arab linguists on board the ship, and no Arabic language warning tape on board.[3]

The Department of Defense (DoD) USS Cole Commission was established to identify the reasons for the success of the terrorist attack on the U.S.S. *Cole* and make recommendations to prevent the recurrence of a similar attack in the future. One of the Commission's many findings, made in January 2001, was that, "DoD does not allocate sufficient resources or all-source intelligence analysis and collection in support of combating terrorism."[4] Three recommendations were made to address this concern, one of which stated, "Secretary of Defense reprioritize resources for the development of language skills that support combating terrorism analysis and collection."[5] Short-term actions taken in response included activating military reserve language specialists and hiring contract linguists. In addition, headstart training and testing in Pashto (the national language of Afghanistan), Dari (the Afghan dialect of Persian-Farsi), and Uzbek (a Turkic language spoken mainly in Uzbekistan and other parts of central Asia) were initiated.[6]

Historical Shortage of Military Linguists

The aforementioned USS Cole Mission recommendation was nothing new. The critical lack of foreign language proficiency in U.S. intelligence and law enforcement communities and the military had been recognized and bemoaned for years. Sally Morrison, writing in the December 2001 issue of *Language Link*, notes that the *Baltimore Sun* reported that "vital information regarding the 1993 bombing of the World Trade Center was in hand well before that attack, but it was backlogged among many other items needing translation."[7] After the terrorist bombings of the United States embassies in Kenya and Tanzania in August 1998, Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) agents investigating the attack were reportedly "stumped by a highly unusual local language and never found anyone with proper security clearance who could translate."[8]

Experts at the non-governmental National Foreign Language Center (at the University of Maryland) published a report in August 2000 that called for "increased investment in the language capacity of the US, in order to avert potentially disastrous consequences to our national security."[9] This was one of many attempts to raise public and congressional awareness of the vital role of language training in many aspects of national security. A number of senior U.S Government officials testified as to the important role language plays in intelligence and counter-terrorism operations before the Senate Subcommittee on International Security, Proliferation, and Federal Services, Governmental Affairs Committee, on 14 September 2000. Christopher Mellon, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, Command, Control, Communications, and Intelligence (C3I), highlighted that, "Foreign language skills and area expertise are integral to or directly support every foreign intelligence discipline and are essential factors in national security readiness, information superiority, in coalition peacekeeping or war fighting missions."[10] Even more adamantly, Ellen Laipson, National Intelligence Council, stated that:

> One cannot overstate the centrality of foreign language skills to the core mission of the intelligence community. Foreign languages come into play at virtually all points of the intelligence cycle, from collection to exploitation, to analysis and production. The collection of intelligence depends heavily on language, whether the information is gathered from a human source through a relationship with a field officer or gathered from a technical system.[11]

Avid Alba, Assistant Director in Charge, Investigative Services Division, FBI, confirmed these observations in his testimony: "When you look at the FBI's major initiatives, such as foreign counterintelligence, international terrorism, international drug investigations and multi-national white-collar crime, foreign language ability becomes even more critical. .. . ."[12]

The United States seemingly failed to heed the admonitions of government and military officials and educators to increase the number of trained linguists and their level of proficiency. The 9/11 catastrophe can perhaps be attributed to government complacency, interagency parochialism and infighting, fiscal constraints, dogmatism—and a lack of proficient linguists. The FBI's Language Service Squad, for example – "the front line in the FBI's war on terrorism"[13] —collects all foreign language tips, information, and terrorist threats, including recordings, that endanger national security. Because "they were buried in a backlog of un-translated wiretaps and documents in Arabic," the FBI had missed clues to both the 1993 and 2001 World Trade Center attacks.[14] It is estimated that by the time of 9/11, more than 120,000 hours of pre-9/11 "terrorism-related" recordings had yet to be translated.[15] "The fact that the United States' domestic intelligence agency lacked the language resources to understand the intelligence it was gathering," wrote J.K. Peyton and D.A. Ranard in the *Los Angeles Times*, "probably came as a surprise to most Americans but not to language experts."[16]

Using impeccable hindsight, concerned politicians, national security specialists, and other concerned citizens again lamented the lack of qualified linguists, especially in Arabic and other Middle Eastern languages and dialects. One week after the 9/11 attack, FBI Director Robert Mueller announced the FBI was ". . . actively seeking and recruiting English-speaking individuals with professional-level proficiency in Arabic and Farsi."[17] The House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence emphasized in a 26 September 2001 report that "language is the single greatest need in the intelligence community."[18] Dr. Richard Brecht, director of the National Foreign Language Center, observed that "the events of September 11, and our actions in Afghanistan against terrorism, make clear that we can no longer ignore our linguistic unpreparedness."[19] In summing up the deplorable national shortage of trained linguists, former U.S. Senator Paul Simon declared that, "In every national crisis from the Cold War through Vietnam, Desert Storm, Bosnia and Kosovo, our nation has lamented its foreign language shortfalls. But then the crisis 'goes away,' and we return to business as usual. One of the messages of Sept. 11 is that business as usual is no longer an acceptable option."[20]

One of the initial U.S. military responses to the 9/11 terrorist attacks was to attack Afghanistan on 7 October 2001. This military operation was named "Operation Enduring Freedom" (OEF). "The short-term goals of the military action," according to one source, "included the capture of Osama bin Laden and other al Qaeda leaders, the prevention of further attacks by al Qaeda, the end of Afghanistan's harboring of terrorists, their training camps and infrastructure, and the removal of Mullah Omar and the Taliban Regime. Long-term goals include the end of terrorism, the deterrence of state sponsorship of terrorism, and the reintegration of Afghanistan into the international community."[21] In planning for this operation, U.S. Central Command (USCENTCOM) encountered requirements for linguist and regional expertise on a scale unforeseen, basically unprecedented – and unavailable through normal military channels. An emergency request was made for 1,000 Dari and Pashto linguists and for personnel with South and Central Asian regional expertise.

DLIFLC Response to the Global War on Terrorism

The DoD moved relatively quickly to heed the national clarion call for additional and more effective foreign language training, especially in Arabic and other less commonly taught languages, after the beginning of Operation Enduring Freedom and to help fight the "Global War on Terrorism" (GWOT). The Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC) at the Presidio of Monterey, California, and its subordinate element, Defense Language Institute-Washington (DLI-W), conduct the training and education of the Defense Foreign Language Program (DFLP). Combined, they provide over 85 percent of foreign language education for the federal government, by training uniformed members of all four military services (Army, Air Force, Navy, and Marines) and other DOD agencies.[22] In 2001, there were about 3,500 students (50 percent Army, 26 percent Air Force, 16 percent Navy, and 7 percent Marine Corps) programmed for attendance at the DFLP resident foreign language program in Monterey. The length of resident language training programs, based on language difficulty, ranged from twenty-five to sixty-three weeks, with more than 60 percent of the students attending courses exceeding one year.[23] An additional 500-700 students were programmed for contract foreign language training in less-commonly-taught languages through the DLI-W office.[24] Future plans made in early 2002 included increasing the number of students to receive resident language training to 6,250 over an unspecified period of time.[25]

Leaders at the DLIFLC were also generally quick to respond to the myriad new language-based contingency requirements resulting from 9/11 and the advent of the GWOT. It would no longer be "business as usual" at the DLIFLC. The DLIFLC response focused on four general areas to accomplish immediate, short-term, and long-range requirements and goals:

1. Determining how DLIFLC could best support the "war fighter" by basing language training on specific service language requirements;
2. Organizing and offering contract training for less-commonly-taught language through DLI-W;
3. Establishing a task force at the Presidio of Monterey to meet the long-range needs of OEF in resident language training;
4. Developing testing support for OEF languages.[26]

Within the DLIFLC, major academic, administrative, and logistical coordination to support the OEF effort was conducted mainly by the Assistant Commandant, Chancellor, and Provost. In terms of OEF support, the DLIFLC mission was to "provide the DOD with language education and support for Operation Enduring Freedom," and its purpose was to "provide the DOD a base of linguist talent and language material to respond to short-notice contingency operations especially for less-commonly-taught languages."[27]

External coordination for OEF language support was also conducted with the Office of the Secretary of Defense, C3I (OSD/C3I), the Training Directorate (DAMO-TR), Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Plans (ODCSOPS), Headquarters, Department of the Army (HQ, DA), and the individual service foreign language program managers. Intelligence officials reportedly drew a circle on a world map around the areas where U.S. military forces would need to be deployed to search for Al Qaeda elements and the Taliban, and initially found there were thirteen languages spoken in these areas for which the military had no language training programs, nor were suitable training programs commercially available.[28] DLI-W canvassed its five commercial language schools and the Foreign Service Institute (FSI) to determine if they could teach these less-commonly-taught/low-density OEF languages, beginning initially with Dari, Pashtu, Uzbek, Turkmen, Kazakh, Georgian, Urdu, Hindi, Sudanese, Indonesian, and Tagalong.[29] New Dari and Pashto classes began on 15 October 2001.[30] Other OEF target languages and dialects included Albanian, Amharic, Armenian, Baluchi, Berber, Cebuano, Chechen, Dinka, Ilocano, Javanese, Malay, Punjabi, Somali, Swahili, Tadjuk, Tausug, and Tigrinya.[31] The results of these efforts included the growth of the DLI-W training base by the addition of seventy-seven seats (student allocations) in Dari, Pashto, Urdu, Uzbek, Somali, Tadjuk, Punjabi, and Swahili.[32]

Even though there were significant constraints in terms of funding, qualified faculty, classroom space, and other factors, the DLIFLC quickly added 100 additional unprogrammed seats in Arabic, Persian-Farsi, and Pashto in Fiscal Year 2002 (FY02, from 1 October 2001 to 30 September 2002). Of greater significance, the DLIFLC established the Operation Enduring Freedom Task Force (OEFTF) in January 2002. Its charter was to provide a rapid and flexible response to new contingency language requirements, and to temporarily bridge the gap between the resident language training programs conducted at DLIFLC and the contract programs coordinated by DLI-W.[33] The OEFTF would provide resident instruction in these emerging languages where the military had a recurring requirement to send more than six students. This required hiring and training faculty, developing curricula and proficiency testing, and conducting language training within months. Moreover, in April 2002, the OEFTF began conducting "conversion courses" (e.g., training Persian-Farsi linguists in a related language, such as Dari) in Dari, and in June 2002, began teaching Pashto and Uzbek courses.[34]

The OEF TF provided other substantive support to the Global War on Terrorism. "Language Survival Kits" (LSKs, which contain a list of English words and phrases translated into target foreign languages with native scripts) in Pashto, Uzbek, and Dari were developed by the OEFTF, and thousands were distributed to the Army's 10th Mountain Division, 5th Special Forces Group (Airborne), U.S. Air Force elements, 15th Marine Expeditionary Unit, and service units at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.[35] By about the end of 2003, LSKs had been developed in sixty-two languages, with medical LSKs in Dari, Korean, Kurmanji, and Turkish, and air crew guides in Dari and Georgian having been produced. Through 23 January 2004, over 29,000 LSKs had been developed, produced, and distributed.[36]

Political and Strategic Awareness and Action

As the DLIFLC was providing unprecedented innovative and viable language support to Operation Enduring Freedom, four members of the House-Senate International Education Study Group requested the Government Accounting Office (GAO) review the use of foreign language skills at the U.S. Army, the Department of State, the Department of Commerce's Foreign Commercial Service, and the FBI. Specifically, the GAO "(1) examined the nature and impact of reported foreign language shortages, (2) Determined the strategies that federal agencies use to address these specific shortages, and (3) assessed the efforts of agencies to implement an overall strategic workforce plan to address current and projected shortages."[37] In general terms, this GAO review concluded that

> The four federal agencies covered in our review reported shortages of translators and interpreters as well as shortages of staff, such as diplomats and intelligence specialists, with foreign language skills that are critical to successful job performance. Agency officials stated that these shortfalls have adversely affected agency operations and hindered U.S. military, law enforcement, intelligence, counterterrorism, and diplomatic efforts. Many shortages were in hard-to-learn languages from the Middle East and Asia, although shortages varied greatly depending on the agency, occupation, and language.[38]

The Army, according to this review, experienced some of the most acute shortages in both translators and interpreters. The Army's greatest foreign language needs were for "translators and interpreters, cryptologic linguists, and human intelligence collectors."[39]

The Army, for this survey, provided data on translator positions for six critical languages: Arabic, Korean, Mandarin Chinese, Persian-Farsi, Russian, and Spanish. (Spanish was excluded from this GAO analysis, as it was the only one of the six critical languages for which the Army had a surplus of translators and interpreters.) In Fiscal Year 2001 (FY01, from 1 October 2000 to 30 September 2001), the Army was authorized 329 translator and interpreter positions in these five languages, but filled only 183 of them, resulting in a shortfall of 146 trained linguists, or 44 percent.[40] The Army also had 142 unfilled cryptologic linguist positions in the critical languages of Korean and Mandarin Chinese, representing a 25 percent shortfall. There was also a critical shortage of human intelligence collectors in five of the foreign languages designated as critical, with 108 unfilled positions, or a 13 percent shortfall. The greatest number of unfilled human intelligence positions was in Arabic.[41] The Army noted that "linguist shortfalls affect its readiness to conduct current and anticipated military and other missions. . . . and that it does not have the linguistic capacity to support two concurrent major theaters of war, as planners required."[42]

The GAO report also reviewed the strategies these agencies used to meet their foreign language requirements. While the Army provided language training and incentive pay for foreign language proficiency, the Army career path was not considered attractive and conducive to retaining linguists. In Fiscal Year 2001, for example, "more than 45 percent of cryptologic linguists left the service after completing their initial tour of duty, with up to 2 years spent in basic, foreign language, and intelligence training."[43]

In responding to this draft GAO report, the DOD acknowledged that "sound management of foreign language assets is important to Defense performance, and this topic will be addressed as part of the development of the Human Resource Strategic Plan now being prepared to shape the next issuance of Defense Planning Guidance."[44] Concurrently, the DOD was also reacting to and beginning the tremendous transformation in "the way language and regional expertise is valued, developed and employed within the Department of Defense," required by the shifting global environment, strategy, and priorities dictated by the GWOT, and established in this GAO report.[45] Moreover, the DOD explicitly recognized that, "Post 9/11 military operations reinforce the reality that the Department of Defense needs a significantly improved organic capability in emerging languages and dialects, a greater competence and regional area skills in those languages and dialects, and a surge capability to rapidly expand its language capabilities on short notice."[46]

The Strategic Planning Guidance (SPG) for Fiscal Years 2006-2011 directed the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness (USD[P&R]), Dr. David S.C. Chu) to develop and provide to the Deputy Secretary of Defense (DepSecDef, Dr. Paul Wolfowitz) a comprehensive "roadmap" for achieving the full spectrum of language capabilities necessary to support the 2004 Defense Strategy. The SPG established four goals for language transformation:

1. Create foundational language and cultural expertise in the officer, civilian, and enlisted ranks for both Active and Reserve Components.

2. Create the capacity to surge language and cultural resources beyond these foundational and in-house capabilities.

3. Establish a cadre of language specialists possessing a level 3/3/3 ability (reading/listening/speaking ability).[48]

Numerous meetings and initiatives were undertaken to meet these language transformation goals and to produce what would later become known as the *Defense Language Transformation Roadmap.* In November 2002, the USD (P&R) directed each Military Department (e.g., Department of the Army, Department of the Navy, etc.), Combatant Command (COCOM), and Defense Agency to review its requirements for language professionals (including enlisted soldier, commissioned officer and civilian interpreters, translators, cryptologic linguists, interrogators, and area specialists). This review reportedly "resulted in narrowly-scoped requirements based on current manning authorizations instead of requirements based upon recent operational experience and projected needs."[49] It appears that this review may have been of limited value.

The United States conducted its "preemptive" invasion of Iraq on 19 March 2003. Shortly after this attack began, President George Bush declared to the American people that coalition forces were ostensibly in "the early stages of military operations to disarm Iraq, to free its people and to defend the world from grave danger."[50] After major combat operations were said to have been completed in May 2003, Combined Joint Task Force 7 in Iraq recognized the need for and later requested 6,500 Arabic and Kurdish language and regional experts. This large demand could not be met with uniformed military personnel.

On 11 August 2003, the USD (P&R) tasked Dr. Jerome F. Smith, Jr., a retired U.S. Navy rear admiral who had been appointed the first DoD Chancellor for Education and Professional Development in 1998, to "conduct a review of the operations, plans, funding, governance, and physical plant of the Defense Language Institute (Foreign Language Center), hereafter referred to as DLI."[51] The purpose of this review, according to Smith's appointment memorandum, was "to determine whether the DLI is postured to support the Department's present and future needs for language expertise."[52]

Smith visited the DLIFLC in September 2003, and also made extensive visits to other related military and government offices and agencies in the course of his review. Smith's report, dated 7 November 2003, included his assessment of the DLIFLC's operations, plans, funding, governance, and funding and physical plant. He began his assessment by recognizing that the DLIFLC "is the world's largest foreign language school, making direct comparisons with other language institutions somewhat strained."[53]

In terms of operations, Smith observed that, "First, DLIFLC is configured to be responsive to multiple customers," and that an example of responsiveness of this model was the ability of DLIFLC quickly to ramp up the training in languages important to the global war on terror (GWOT) through contract training administered by the Washington office (DLI-W), while adding an unprogrammed 100 seats (40 in Modern Standard Arabic, 40 in Persian-Farsi, and 20 in Persian-Afghan) and standing up the Operation Enduring Freedom Task Force for training additional students in up to thirty non-traditional, low-enrollment language[s] at the Presidio of Monterey campus.[54]

Under this category, Smith also addressed curriculum development, the role of the instructor in language training, technology in classrooms, and external pressure to increase language skill proficiency. Smith also made a number of "Conclusions and Recommendations" to his study, most of which pertained to the revision of governing directives, realignment of responsibilities with DoD, the establishment of a new high-level advisory committee to replace the no-longer-functioning General Officer Steering Committee (GOSC), and a review of the delegation of the management of the DLIFLC.[55] The Smith study "articulated the needs for qualitative improvement in language skills of graduates and robust support to other Defense Components; i. e., beyond the Intelligence community."[56]

Positive Steps toward Increased Linguist Sufficiency and Proficiency

At the end of 2003, the Department of Defense was conducting additional studies and meetings to prepare the watershed "Defense Language Transformation Roadmap." The DLIFLC, which had responded quickly and flexibly to mission-based language requirements generated in the wake of 9/11, continued its initiatives to develop curriculum for and teach less-commonly-taught languages, increase the number of Arabic language students, inculcate an even greater sense of cultural awareness, and enhance the proficiency of all military linguists to continue to effectively support the Global War on Terror.

Notes

[1] This article is extracted from the author's forthcoming "Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center and Presidio of Monterey: Command History (RCS CSHIS-6[R4]) - 1 January 1996-31 December 2003." He is grateful to Dr. Stephen Payne, Senior Vice Chancellor, DLIFLC, for his comments and recommendations for improving an earlier draft of this piece.

[2] Congress, House, Committee on Armed Services, *The Attack on the U.S.S. Cole*, 106th Cong., 2nd sess., 2000. Available [Online]: <http://commdocs.house.gov/committees/security/has299000.000/has299000_0.HTM> [2 December 2005].

[3] "USS Cole Bombing," unnumbered slide, in Mr. Glen Nordin, Asst. Director Intel Policy (Language), Briefing, "OSD/C31 Policy Update," 5 March 2002, in Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center, *Annual Program Review, 2002: DLI Linguist Support to Operation Enduring Freedom* (Presidio of Monterey, CA: Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center, 2002), 17 (top).

[4] *DoD USS Cole Commission Report, Executive Summary*, 9 January 2001. Available [Online]: <http://www.defeselink.mil/pubs/cole20010109.html> [5 December 2005].

[5] Ibid.

[6] "Remaining USS Cole Recommendations," unnumbered slide, Nordin Briefing, 5 March 2002, in DLIFLC, *Annual Program Review, 2002*, 15 (bottom).

[7] Sally Morrison, "9/11 Brings U.S. Defense Language Needs Into Focus," *Language Link* (December 2001). Available [Online]: <http://www.cal.org/resources/langlink/deccurrent2.html> [23 November 2005].

[8] D. Fesperman and G. Gibson, "Evidence is Plentiful, But Translators Aren't," *Baltimore Sun*, 20 September 2001, quoted in Morrison.

[9] National Foreign Language Center, University of Maryland, "War on Terrorism: House Committee says 'Language is Single Greatest Limitation' in Intelligence," NFLC Press Release, 10 October 2001. Available [Online]: <http://www.nflc.org/PRESSARCHIVE/languagelimitation.asp> [5 December 2005].

[10] Mellon, quoted in "Language and National Security," National Foreign Language Center at University of Maryland, 2004. Available [Online]: <http://www.nflc.org/security/terrorism.asp> [23 November 2005].

[11] Laipson, quoted in "Language and National Security."

[12] Alba, quoted in "Language and National Security."

[13] Paul Sperry, "Celebrating 9/11 at the FBI," FrontPageMagazine.com, 11 February 2004. Available [Online]: <http://frontpagemag.com/Articles/Printable.asp?ID=12138> [5 December 2005].

[14] Ibid.

[15] Lee Smith, "The Language Gap: Why Middle Eastern Linguists are Hard to Find, Even Though the Government has been Funding the Field," *Slate*, 4 October 2004. Available [Online]: <http://slate.msn.com/toolbar.aspx?action=print&id=21076625> [5 December 2005]. A further indictment of the FBI's shortage of Arabic linguists, faulty prioritization of requirements, and possible failure to disrupt or prevent the 1993 World Trade Center bombing is contained in this passage:

> As a band of trained terrorists plotted to blow up the World Trade Center, clues to the devastation ahead lay under the nose of law enforcement officials.
>
> The F.B.I. held videotapes, manuals and notebooks on bomb making that had been seized from Ahmad Ajaj, a Palestinian serving time in federal prison for passport fraud. There were phone calls the prison had taped, in which Mr. Ajaj guardedly told another terrorist how to build the bomb.
>
> There was one problem: they were in Arabic. Nobody who understood Arabic listened to them until after the explosion at the Trade Center on Feb. 26, 1993, which killed six people and injured more than a thousand.

Diana Schemo, "Washington Cites Shortage of Linguists for Key Security Jobs," *New York Times*, 16 April 2000, p. A1.

[16] J.K. Peyton and D.A. Ranard, "We Can't Squander Language Skills," *Los Angeles Times*, 5 November 2001, quoted in Morrison.

[17] Robert Mueller, 17 September 2001, quoted in the *Los Angles Times*, 18 September 2001, p. A9, quoted in "Background Information: Language and National Security Briefing, January 16, 2002," National Foreign Language Center at University of Maryland, 2004. Available [Online]: <http://www.nflc.org/security/background.asp> [23 November 2005].

[18] National Foreign Language Center, "War on Terrorism."

[19] Brecht, quoted in Ibid.

[20] Senator Paul Simon, "Beef Up the Country's Foreign Language Skills," *Washington Post*, 23 October 2001, p. A23.

[21] "Operation Enduring Freedom – Afghanistan," GlobalSecurity.org, n.d. Available [Online]: <http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/ops/enduring-freedom.htm> [6 December 2005].

[22] "Defense Foreign Language Program," slide 2, in Briefing, Army, "Defense Foreign Language Program," n.d. (c. January 2002).

[23] Category I languages, the easiest for native English speakers to learn, include French, Italian, Spanish, and Portuguese. Category I basic language training courses are twenty-five weeks long. The most difficult language category for native English speakers is Category IV and includes Arabic, Chinese, and Korean. Category IV basic language training courses are sixty-three weeks long.

[24] "Defense Foreign Language Program," slide 2, in Briefing, Army, "Defense Foreign Language Program."

[25] "Defense Foreign Language Program," slide 8, in Ibid.

[26] Information Paper, Subject: DLI Support for Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF), n.d., in DLIFLC, *Annual Program Review, 2002*, 132.

[27] This and the previous quote are from "OEF Support," unnumbered slide, in LTC Pat O'Rourke, DCSOPS, DLIFLC, Briefing, "DLI's Strategic Vision," 5 March 2002, in DLIFLC, *Annual Program Review, 2002*, 22 (top).

[28] Attachment, "Annual Command History-Emerging Language[s] Task Force 2004," to e-mail message from Capt. Angi Carsten, Associate Dean, Emerging Languages Task Force, DLIFLC, to Command Historian, DLIFLC and POM, Subject: Command History: Emerging Languages Task Force, 17 December 2004. The Operation Enduring Freedom Task Force was renamed the Global War on Terrorism Task Force (GWOTTF) in October 2003, and was later renamed the Emerging Languages Task Force (ELTF).

[29] "OEF Support," unnumbered slide, in O'Rourke Briefing, 5 March 2002, in DLIFLC, *Annual Program Review, 2002*, 22 (bottom).

[30] Information Paper, Subject: DLI Support for Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF), n.d.

[31] "OEF Languages," unnumbered slide, in Dr. Mahmood Taba-Tabai, Director, OEF Task Force, DLIFLC, and Maj.. Margie Valentin, Deputy Director, DLI-W, Briefing "DLIFLC Support for operation Enduring Freedom (OEF)," 5 March 2002, in DLIFLC, *Annual Program Review, 2002*, 40 (bottom).

[32] "OEF Support," unnumbered slide, in O'Rourke Briefing, 5 March 2002, in DLIFLC, *Annual Program Review, 2002*, 23 (top).

[33] "DLI Responds to 9/11 with Language Task Force," slide 3, in Captain Angi Carsten, Associate Dean, Emerging Languages Task Force, Briefing, "Emerging Languages Task Force," n.d. (25 February 2005).

[34] "OEF Support," unnumbered slide, in O'Rourke Briefing, 5 March 2002, in DLIFLC, *Annual Program Review, 2002*, 23 (bottom).

[35] "The OEF TF continued with this mission until September 2003, when responsibility for the development of LSKs was transferred to the Curriculum Development Division.

[36] Information Paper, Subject: Language Survival Kits (LSKs)/Curriculum Development (CD), n.d., in Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center, *Annual Program Review, March 2-3, 2004* (Presidio of Monterey, CA: Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center, 2004), IP-24.

[37] United States General Accounting Office, *Foreign Languages: Human Capital Approach Needed to Correct Staffing and Proficiency Shortfalls* (GAO-02-375, 31 January 2002), 1-2.

[38] Ibid., 2.

[39] Ibid., 6.

[40] Ibid., 7.

[41] Ibid., 8-9.

[42] Ibid., 14-15.

[43] Ibid., 17.

[44] Ibid., 37.

[45] "Goal," slide 2, in (Ms..) Gail H. McGunn, Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Plans), Briefing, "Defense Language Program: Defense Language Transformation - Update for USD(1) Deputies Meeting," 17 May 2004.

[46] Department of Defense, *Defense Language Transformation Roadmap* (January 2005), 1.

[47] Foreign language proficiency levels used to assess an individual's ability to speak, read, listen, and write in another language are based on a scale from 0 to 5, with 5 being the most proficient. Established by the federal Interagency Language Roundtable, these proficiency levels are:

Proficiency level	Language capability requirement
0 - None	No practical capability in the language.
1 - Elementary	Sufficient capability to satisfy basic survival needs and minimum courtesy and travel requirements.
2 - Limited working	Sufficient capability to meet routine social demands and limited job requirements. Can deal with concrete topics in past, present, and future tense.
3 - General professional	Able to use the language with sufficient ability to participate in most formal and informal discussions on practical, social, and professional topics. Can conceptualize and hypothesize.

4 - Advanced professional	Able to use the language fluently and accurately on all levels normally pertinent to professional needs. Has range of language skills necessary for persuasion, negotiation, and counseling.
5 - Functionally native	Able to use the language at a functional level equivalent to a highly articulate, well-educated native speaker.

A plus sign (+) designation may be added to the linguist's assessment when proficiency exceeds on base skill level but does not fully meet the criteria for the next base level. DoD expects that more than one year of training is required to bring a new speaker of a Category IV language (such as Arabic) to the "2" level. In addition, research has shown that a level-3 speaker is up to four times more proficient and productive as a speaker at level 2. GAO-02-375, 5-6.

[48] This paragraph has been extracted from *Defense Language Transformation Roadmap*, 1.

[49] Ibid.

[50] Bush, quoted in "Operation Iraqi Freedom," GlobalSecurity.org, n.d. Available [Online]: <http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/ops/iraqi-freedom.htm> [13 December 2005].

[51] Memorandum, Under Secretary of Defense, Personnel and Readiness, Subject: Defense Language Institute - Review Questions, 11 August 2003.

[52] Ibid.

[53] Dr. Jerome F. Smith, Jr., Chancellor for Education and Professional Development, Defense Human Resources Activity, "Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center: A Report for the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness," 7 November 2003, 1.

[54] This and the preceding quote are from Smith, 3.

[55] Smith, 14.

[56] *Defense Language Transformation Roadmap*, 2. In September 2003, the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Plans (DUSD (Plans)) commissioned a study by Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC) that would research in detail five language functions: language management within the COCOMS; management of Foreign Area Officers (FAOs) within the services; development of foreign language and regional knowledge in the officer corps; management of language personnel; and requirements determination processes for assessing language needs.

Author

HAROLD E. RAUGH, JR., Ph.D., served as the Command Historian, DLIFLC and POM, from 2002 to March 2006. He is now Command Historian, U.S. Army V Corps, Heidelberg, Germany. Dr. Raugh is scheduled to resume his position at the DLI in 2009.

Applied Language Learning
2006, Vol. 16, No 1, pp. 17-42

Sound Effects: Social Pressure and Identity Negotiation in the Spanish Language Classroom

Natalie Lefkowitz
Central Washington University

John S. Hedgcock
Monterey Institute of International Studies

This study explores how social pressure and identity construction patterns interact with the oral performance of secondary and post-secondary learners of Spanish as a foreign language. Data derive from 268 questionnaires probing students' perceptions of Spanish, Spanish speakers, their peers, and their instructors. Ethnographic interviews eliciting learners' observations of their own and their classmates' pronunciation behaviors likewise contributed to the database. The majority of participants expressed a predictable desire to reproduce the pedagogical pronunciation standard. However, for a minority of participants, being viewed as capable of "good" pronunciation while deliberately subverting desired speech norms was even more appealing. Intentional mispronunciation is a revealing behavior that may reflect a desire among some learners for peer solidarity. These learners may have discovered that duplicating the instructor's "model" pronunciation can confer less social status than sounding "tough," "cool," or "macho." Rejecting "standard" pronunciation is perhaps more prestigious than reproducing it. Our analyses suggest a need to devise sensitive methods for eliciting participants' perceptions of the various social factions operating in the FL classroom milieu.

Foreign language (FL) educators often express concern about their students' less-than-optimal oral skills, particularly in the area of pronunciation. Mainstream second language acquisition (SLA) research has traditionally examined pronunciation difficulties by focusing on articulatory, phonological, psycholinguistic, and pedagogical factors (Bent & Bradlow, 2003; Coppieters, 1987; Derwing & Rossiter, 2002b; Ioup & Weinberger, 1987; Leather, 1999; Levis, 1999; Major, 1998, 2001; Moyer, 1999; Pennington, 1996; Salaberry & Lopez-Ortega, 1998; Selinker, 1992; Suter, 1976). Psycholinguistically-oriented FL research, for example, typically examines cognitive tendencies and predispositions such as field independence, which are often hypothesized to influence the development of proficient FL pronunciation (Elliott, 1995; Taylor, 1993).

In complementary fashion, approaches adopting a sociologically-oriented perspective frequently consider the roles of motivational, affective, and attitudinal factors in facilitating or inhibiting the development of FL skills, including speech (MacIntyre, Clément, Dörnyei, & Noels, 1998; Noels, 2001; Sisón, 1991; Smit, 2002). Such research has for some time considered how sociological variables (e.g., socioeconomic status, class, gender, peer pressure, social prestige, and so on) and psycho-affective factors (e.g., learner beliefs and perceptions) interact with the emergence of FL oral skills (Champagne-Muzar, Schneiderman, & Bourdages, 1993; Derwing & Rossiter, 2002a; Wode, 1995, 1996, 1997). Researchers and educators are concerned not only with *how* classroom learners develop oral skills, but also with *what* students learn (e.g., what "standard" or variety they eventually appropriate as their own), and increasingly with dimensions of *where* they learn (i.e., the FL classroom environment, its social-semiotic and psychoaffective influences, and learners' responses to this unique social milieu) (Major, 2001; Valdés & Geoffrion-Vinci, 1998; van Dam, 2002).

FL Pronunciation and Identity Negotiation in the Heteroglossic FL Classroom

As research on L2 learning and teaching has increasingly situated language learning processes in their sociocultural contexts, the lens has widened so that our view of L2 development now encompasses not only sociopsychological variables, but also the complex conditions in which learning, socialization, and acculturation unfold (Block, 2003; Halliday & Hasan, 1985; van Lier, 2002, 2004). Constructs emerging as central to language socialization include inter- and intra-group theories of social identity (Berry, 1980; Spolsky, 1996; Tajfel, 1981, 1982), which have focused attention on the processes of identity construction and negotiation (Morgan, 1997; Norton, 2000; Norton Peirce, 1995; Pavlenko, 2004; Pavlenko & Blackledge, 2004). As Miller (2004) observed, "there is an increasing awareness that language use is a form of self-representation, which implicates social identities, the values attached to particular written and spoken texts, and, therefore, the links between discourse and power in any social context." Language learners in classroom settings and elsewhere must therefore "achieve self-representation in the dominant discourse" (p. 291) and eventually appropriate the requisite symbolic capital of the target collective (Bourdieu, 1991).

Pedagogical Norms, Normative Countercurrents, and Interregisters

Symbolic capital includes mastery of the dominant speech variety of the target culture and its community of speakers. In FL classrooms, these speech models are frequently restricted to pedagogical norms, which — for a range of ideological and practical reasons — typically coincide with prestige varieties, such as Mandarin Chinese, British English, Parisian or "standard" French, Castilian Spanish, and so forth (Magnan & Walz, 2002; Moreno Fernández, 2000; Valdman, 1961, 1967, 1976, 1989, 2002). In the case of Spanish language instruction in the North American setting, the pedagogical norm may be equivalent to "the native speaker standard against which both language learners and bilingual students are compared," or "the so-called 'educated native speaker norm' that is primarily characteristic of upper-middle-class, well-educated, adult speakers" (Valdés & Geoffrion-Vinci, 1998, p. 494).

Because the aims of FL education have increasingly focused on "metacognition and on intellectual mediation between languages and cultures" (Magnan & Walz, 2002,

p. 35), a singular, stable pedagogical norm or target code synonymous with idealized, “native” speech is no longer presupposed (Spolsky, 2002). Like any speech variety, the language produced in a FL classroom may instantiate the pedagogical norm as prescribed by the textbook and reinforced by the instructor, as well as numerous interlanguages that emerge among individual learners (Major, 2002). Language classrooms thus present inherently heteroglossic discursive situations that are host to one or more restricted codes (Bakhtin, 1973). A “language of intimacy” between familiar interlocutors (Wardhaugh, 2005), a restricted code may originate under heteroglossic conditions in the developing speech of an individual learner or in the collective verbal behavior of small constituencies of learners (Bernstein, 1961). While coexisting with the normative, elaborated code of the pedagogical norm, a restricted code may evolve somewhat autonomously from the input provided through instruction, perhaps even escaping the notice of the instructor and some learners. As it diverges in form and purpose from the pedagogical norm, a restricted code may confer power on its users, depending on their social status (Bernstein, 1973; Wardhaugh, 2005).

A restricted code may nonetheless deviate from the pedagogical norm by instantiating a broader (or at least different) range of registers, including vernacular styles that do not coincide with the official, elaborated code (cf. McWhorter, 2003). In their study of oral texts produced by bilingual Chicano speakers in university courses, Valdés and Geoffrion-Vinci (1998) introduced the nuanced term “interregister” to describe a developing register reflecting “precise ways of speaking for particular domains” (p. 494). Analogous to an interlanguage, an interregister represents a variety that “approximates but is not identical to the target register” (p. 494). Concluding that both bilingual and monolingual students use developing academic interregisters, the authors claim that we can scrutinize interregisters to map their linguistic features and to characterize “learners’ views of the target registers in question.” Such research, they argue, would considerably enhance our understanding “of both the successful and the unsuccessful acquisition of ease and fluency in ‘non-dominant’ languages and language varieties or registers in different sociolinguistic contexts” (Valdés & Geoffrion-Vinci, 1998, p. 494).

Interregisters, Situated Identities, Learner Perceptions, and Affiliation Patterns

Research on interregisters, restricted codes, and comparable subordinate varieties casts light not only on their formal properties, but also on the complex processes through which individuals appropriate these varieties to assume social roles and negotiate their positions in the discursive sphere of the FL classroom. Gee’s (2005) approach to discourse analysis is helpful in illuminating the sociocultural processes associated with the emergence, spread, and legitimation of interregisters in a variety of contexts. Interregisters and restricted codes share numerous similarities with “social languages,” which Gee (2005) describes in terms of how individuals “use different varieties of language to enact and recognize different identities in different settings” (p. 20). By observing, imitating, and ultimately appropriating these social languages through participation in a Discourse (e.g., a FL classroom community), each of us shapes unique socially situated identities to deploy in a range of settings (Goffman, 1959).

Socially situated identities express “the ‘kind of person’ one is seeking to be and enact here-and-now” in the unfolding of socially situated activities (Gee, 2005, p. 22). Moreover, “the choice of language” in a given speech event “will contribute to the message being given about the role and identity" of the individual (Watkins-Goffman, 2001, p. 14). An individual's composite identity is inherently multiple, simultaneously entailing a core identity and an array of socially situated identities that manifest variably according to context and need. One's core identity may reflect a relatively fixed or stable sense of self that underlies the multiplicity of one's shifting situated identities. Identity, therefore, also entails "how a person understands his or her relationship to the world, how that relationship is constructed across time and space, and how the person understands possibilities for the future" (Norton, 2000, p. 5).

In FL instruction, teachers and learners may view themselves and others predominantly (if not exclusively) in core terms, in the sense that their verbal behavior is expected to converge on the pedagogical norm — and typically does. In other words, the dominant social language of the classroom may be the elaborated, idealized code exemplified in the official curriculum (Dittmar, Spolsky, & Walters, 1997; Gee, 2004; Kramsch, 2002; Magnan & Walz, 2002). Even in classrooms where oral discourse may be tightly controlled and characterized by prestige features, non-target-like social languages are likely to emerge, as are learners' socioculturally situated identities, which are "mutually constructed in language" and co-constructed with others who are engaged in the communication process (Gee, 2005, p. 138).

Exploring the dynamic interactions between language learners and the social environment of the FL classroom necessitates building on formal analyses of social languages, interregisters, and restricted codes. We can understand these complex interactions more fully by scrutinizing learners' perceptions of themselves, their instructors, their peers, the pedagogical norm, and the elaborated and restricted codes operating in the classroom. Although self-reported perceptions must be interpreted with caution and a healthy skepticism, learners' views of themselves and the socio-affective dimensions of the learning environment are nonetheless crucial to understanding any classroom ecology. The L2 classroom milieu is no less an ecological system than any other setting in which human interaction takes place and identities are negotiated (cf. van Dam, 2002; van Lier, 2004; Zuengler & Cole, 2005). In the classroom environment, learners' perceptions of themselves, their peers, and their instructors interact reflexively with their speech behaviors and performance — and ultimately with identity construction (Eckert, 2000; Gee, 2005; Kinginger, 2004; Rampton, 1995, 1996; Tarone & Swain, 1995).

We have discovered in our own research that L2 learners' accounts of their peers' and their own behaviors may contradict observable performance (Lefkowitz & Hedgcock, 1999, 2002). We would maintain that learners' perceptions and beliefs about speech production, language socialization, and the relationships that emerge in classroom communities represent a significant layer of meaning that should not be overlooked, despite the complexity and occasional contradictoriness of these perceptions. A chief reason for systematically considering learner perceptions is that they can reveal currents and countercurrents in the social-semiotic affiliation patterns that take shape in classroom micro-cultures. Learner perceptions can also shed light on how heteroglossic speech performance functions reflexively as an index of sociocultural allegiances and identification patterns.

In particular, our prior work has revealed that FL learners' emergent target language codes may diverge from the pedagogical norm or prestige "standard" more than classroom teachers may think, leading to subtle yet influential forms of linguistic variation that may align with the sociocultural status of influential group members (Kramsch, 2002; Lippi-Green, 1997; Spolsky, 2002; Valdman, 1976, 1989, 2002). Kroch (1978), for example, proposed that dominant, high-status social factions may distinguish themselves from lower-status groups through language. Referring to the case of Mexican speakers of Spanish, Valdés and Geoffrion-Vinci (1998) hypothesized that "speakers of prestige varieties are engaged in a process in which they work consciously and unconsciously to distance themselves from their non-elite conationals" (p. 475). In contrast, members of non-elite groups, such as first-generation college students, "must work consciously to acquire ways of speaking that characterize the groups to which they aspire to belong" (p. 476). In their study of university-level Chicano students studying Spanish in classroom settings, they discovered that developing desirable speech patterns in order to affiliate with a higher-status group is nonetheless subject to social constraints. Comparing their findings to the conclusions of Le Page and Tabouret-Keller (1985), Valdés and Geoffrion-Vinci (1998) concluded that

> [I]ndividuals can behave according to the patterns used by groups with which they desire to identify only to the extent that: (a) they can identify the groups; (b) they have adequate access to the groups and the ability to analyze the groups' behavior; (c) they have a sufficiently powerful motivation to join the groups, which is either reinforced or reversed by the groups themselves; and (d) they have the ability to modify their own behavior. (p. 495)

Aspects of this ability to modify one's linguistic behavior include converging on a high-prestige variety or dialect (perhaps the prototypical trend expected by learners and teachers) and also downwardly converging on a lower-status variety or dialect. Individuals may manifest downward convergence by departing from their positions as members of high-status, target-language-proficient factions through linguistic strategies such as the deliberate subversion of desired speech norms and even intentional mispronunciation. Monolingual and bilingual individuals, as well as L2 learners, can move back and forth along a language/register continuum at any time in order to fulfill the social-semiotic demands of a speech event or the social environment (Halliday, 1985; Rampton, 1995; Silva-Corvalán, 1991; Tarone & Liu, 1995). In his study of the ethnic, economic, educational, and professional barriers to transcending social class, for example, Lubrano (2004) examined the dual identities constructed by individuals who "straddle" non-intersecting discourse communities. One interviewee who continually shuttled between his identity as a corporate lawyer and his working class social milieu described his success in mastering two distinct linguistic codes: "I had been immersed in both environments for so long. You just learn to speak to people in the idioms of the particular cultural environment" (Lubrano, 2004, p. 204). Parallel processes can be observed in L2 classroom settings among bilinguals and language learners who may wish to marshal their linguistic skills and strategies to align or distance themselves from mainstream practices and the pedagogical norms associated with them (Buscholtz, 1999).

The Study

We have been interested in the crosscurrents of classroom speech codes for some time, and our prior investigations have revealed that, in the classroom setting, students' self-perceptions and appraisals of their peers' and teachers' performance may reflexively influence their beliefs about the target language and their own speech behaviors (Hedgcock & Lefkowitz, 2000; Lefkowitz & Hedgcock, 1998, 1999, 2002). The present study, data driven and informed largely by our observations as teachers and teacher educators, endeavors to understand social factors such as peer pressure and affiliation patterns in the classroom. The findings presented here focus on students' self-professed attitudes toward their instructors and peers, their self-perceptions as novice Spanish speakers, and the complex ways in which students portrayed their identity construction processes as reflected in classroom speech behaviors.

Method

Research Questions

Based on our observations of persistent error patterns in Spanish classrooms and a series of ethnographic interviews probing students' beliefs about features of desirable and undesirable pronunciation (Lefkowitz & Hedgcock, 1999, 2002), we formulated the following research questions (RQs) to guide the exploration of our survey of learner attitudes, perceptions, and expectations:

1. What social values do learners associate with Spanish and speaking it accurately?
2. To what extent do learners report an awareness of their own and others‘ pronunciation accuracy in Spanish?
3. What social influences reportedly undermine learners' efforts to produce oral language that reflects or departs from a pedagogical standard?
4. How do self-reported learner attitudes, perceptions, and beliefs about classroom identities differ according to educational setting?
5. How do self-reported learner attitudes, perceptions, and beliefs differ along gender lines?

Participants

Our sample includes 90 U.S. high school learners (40 male, 50 female) and 178 university students (52 male, 122 female) enrolled in first-, second-, and third-year Spanish courses. All 268 participants reported English as their mother tongue and were between 15 and 24 years of age. The sample consisted of 174 female and 94 male students. Data were collected at secondary schools in the Western United States and at major universities in the Western and Midwestern United States.

Materials

Primary data for this study are drawn from participants' responses to a 46-item questionnaire, which we developed and piloted specifically to detect students' perceptions of — and explicit beliefs about — spoken Spanish and the social, affective, and educational obstacles to achieving native-like pronunciation. Table 1 presents selected Likert-scale items, which we worded to probe possible interactions between teacher-student and peer relationships on the one hand and their reported pronunciation behaviors on the other.

Procedures and Analyses

Research leading to this study entailed pronunciation error data collected in regular classroom sessions, in addition to ethnographic interviews with a subset of learners from university cohorts (Hedgcock & Lefkowitz, 2000; Lefkowitz & Hedgcock, 1998, 1999, 2002). Those exploratory findings led us to focus on the social-semiotic, affective, and educational variables embedded in the 34 learner behavior descriptors and belief statements. Our earlier inquiries into the sources of persistent error forms and nonstandard pronunciation suggested a need to account for sociocultural factors such as institutional context and gender (Hedgcock & Lefkowitz, 2000; Lefkowitz & Hedgcock, 2002). We therefore performed means tests of our 34 survey items. Table 2 reports the results of tests that yielded statistically significant differences between the high school and university groups; Table 3 shows results indicating significant gender differences.

Results and Discussion

Table 1 displays descriptive statistics, including frequencies, means, and standard deviations for each survey item, based on the entire sample of questionnaires. Table 2 reports 11 variables where means between high school and university cohorts differed at a statistically significant level ($p \leq 0.05$). Table 3 reflects the outcomes of a comparison of means between the male and female cohorts, showing significant differences on six variables ($p \leq 0.05$).

RQ 1. With respect to our first research question regarding the values that learners associated with Spanish and accurate pronunciation, we can see from item 14 in Table 1 that over 87% of our secondary and post-secondary learners expressed a fondness for the sound of Spanish. Not surprisingly, most explicitly aspired to speak Spanish well — at least as well as their skilled peers and even as well as their teachers, as responses to items 12-17 indicate. Likewise, a majority of participants expressed a predictable desire to reproduce the pedagogical pronunciation standard upheld not only by their instructors but also by their peers (Magnan & Walz, 2002; Valdés & Geoffrion-Vinci, 1998). A striking trend is that an overwhelming 92% of participants felt that their Spanish teachers provided "excellent" models of pronunciation. Teachers might therefore exercise considerably more influence in setting the pedagogical standard for pronunciation than they realize (item 17) (cf. Auger & Valdman, 1999; Noels, 2001; Romaine, 1982; Valdman, 1976; Wolfram, Adger, & Christian, 1999).

RQ 2. Findings that speak to our second research question concerning learners' awareness of pronunciation accuracy, suggest contradictions and differences among subgroups. For example, learners rarely described themselves as skilled Spanish speakers, a trend suggesting that participants did not fully identify themselves as "legitimate" users of the language. Responses to items 8 and 9 in Table 1 show that only about 20% of the students expressed agreement or strong agreement with favorable statements about their own Spanish pronunciation skills. However, congruent with our earlier studies (Hedgcock & Lefkowitz, 2000; Lefkowitz & Hedgcock, 1998, 1999, 2002), learners often rated themselves as good judges of standard and nonstandard pronunciation. Item 10 in Table 1 shows that 75% of the students agreed that they could "recognize the difference between native-like and nonnative ('accented') pronunciation in Spanish." 65% stated that they "cringe" when they hear their classmates produce anglicized, accented speech (item 11);

73% reported that they notice when their classmates speak Spanish poorly (item 12). As a whole, respondents expressed confidence in their ability to notice and evaluate non-standard speech in Spanish, a finding that hints at the emergence of linguistic intuitions reflecting progress toward proficiency and legitimacy as users of the language.

RQ 3. Students' confidence in their perceptive skills contrasts with their professed attitudes concerning their oral skills and pronunciation, when we consider our third research question, which focuses on the social currents influencing learners' production. Contrary to our predictions, over 56% of the students claimed that pleasing their peers was *not* important to them, as we see in item 20. When we carefully examine responses to related statements, we can see that the social strain of speaking Spanish under peer scrutiny is perhaps more influential than respondents overtly admitted in their responses. For instance, analyses of items 23-26 show that a majority of students expressed discomfort about speaking Spanish among non-intimates, hinting strongly that performance anxiety inhibited their oral production. In response to item 32, nearly 70% of respondents reported feeling more comfortable speaking Spanish among less-skilled counterparts than among more highly skilled peers; a slightly lower proportion stated that they felt most comfortable speaking Spanish when alone (item 37). These outcomes led us to speculate that, not unexpectedly, performance anxiety is pervasive in our sample (cf. Horwitz & Young, 1991; McCroskey & Richmond, 1991; Sisón, 1991). Such apprehension over oral performance suggests potentially strong inhibitions about constructing a Spanish-speaking identity. A factor that might contribute to this reticence relates to a frequently overlooked obstacle to FL oral skills development: Learners may have little or no contact with Spanish outside the classroom. Responses to items 21 and 33-36 show that relatively high proportions of respondents reported having *no experience* speaking Spanish in a variety of contexts.

RQ 4. Our fourth research question highlights variables that discriminate between high school and college-level learners. As Table 2 indicates, we discovered a number of distinctions in terms of students' beliefs about pronunciation accuracy. Generally speaking, the university students expressed more confidence in their perceptive and productive abilities than did their high school counterparts. As we can see in the means comparisons for item 12, for example, university learners claimed a higher level of awareness of nonstandard pronunciation than did the high school group; college-age students also reportedly attached greater importance to achieving "excellent pronunciation in Spanish," as item 13 indicates. This distinction is perhaps attributable to the university students' probable wider latitude in the selection of a FL to study.

Likewise, results for items 24, 26, and 28 suggest that university students were measurably less self-conscious about speaking Spanish in the classroom among their peers; they also reported feeling more comfortable when speaking the language among equally skilled students, as results for items 31 and 32 show. Item 14 responses similarly show that the university group also expressed a significantly more positive attitude toward Spanish than did the high school learners, reporting that they "like the sound of Spanish" much more frequently than did the high school respondents. Globally, comparisons predictably demonstrate that learner confidence increases with age, length of FL study, and educational experience. As learners achieve greater FL experience and skill, they may more readily appreciate and identify with the target language discourse community as represented in the prestige speech standard of the classroom. Worth noting is that, if we pool comparisons presented in Table 2, the university-level group's responses reflect a much less pronounced concern for speaking Spanish with their instructors and among peers who are unknown to them, who are more skilled speakers, or who are members of the opposite sex. The high school group, on the other hand, appeared to be noticeably more inhibited by circumstances where they had to interact with classmates who were different in some way, suggesting a lesser willingness to converge with peers whom they perceived as unlike them (cf. Valdés & Geoffrion-Vinci, 1998).

RQ 5. Our final research question produced results that coincided with attested trends in how perceptions of language use and skill vary with gender. Comparisons shown in Table 3 correspond with variables that point to socioculturally-determined distinctions between female and male language learners. For example, results for item 14 affirm that female students reported a markedly more positive attitude toward the "sound of Spanish" than did the male students. Along similar lines, female respondents were significantly less likely to report not sounding native-like in Spanish than male students, hinting that duplicating the pedagogical standard is more important for female learners than for male students.

Comparisons for items 21, 30, and 35 similarly point toward a markedly higher degree of professed self-confidence among the male students than among the female students. For instance, in item 21, male learners expressed a measurably higher degree of confidence in their oral abilities in Spanish than did female respondents. Whether this finding reflects genuine self-assurance or bravado is a question that our survey cannot address; nonetheless, the self-perceptions of our male respondents conformed to a consistent trend. Comparisons for item 30 likewise indicate that male students felt more comfortable speaking Spanish among less skilled students; meanwhile, female learners' comfort levels were compromised by their greater empathy and lower degree of competitiveness.

We also speculate that male respondents were simply less willing to admit feeling uncomfortable in the first place. In line with these findings, female students reported feeling more reticent about speaking Spanish in the presence of male students than did male students who spoke Spanish in the presence of female learners, as we see in the results for item 35. Findings related to item 39 are also congruent: Female students more often reported that their Spanish sounded better when they could read from a text, perhaps in an effort to conform more closely to the pedagogical norm — in contrast to male students, who expressed a greater degree of comfort when speaking under less controlled circumstances.

Discussion and Summary

Our analysis largely confirms conventional assumptions regarding secondary and college-level students' overt aspirations as learners of Spanish: Minor age and gender differences notwithstanding, our respondents expressed a favorable attitude toward their target language, as well as motivation to achieve accurate pronunciation skills. Participants also confirmed the central role of the teacher in providing a pronunciation target or normative "standard" to emulate. In terms of how respondents perceived their own and others' pronunciation skills, however, we discovered several disparate impressions. On the one hand, they generally portrayed themselves as lacking in pronunciation accuracy and insecure about their oral proficiency. This pattern might reflect a perception among learners that they were peripheral or marginal participants in their Spanish-speaking classroom communities — not yet skilled enough to "pull off" or even fake the expected speech norms and discursive patterns (Gee, 2005).

Somewhat paradoxically, participants at the same time expressed an impressively high level of confidence in their ability to identify features of "standard" or "correct" Spanish. Students' self-described ability to recognize target-like speech production is congruent with predictable mismatches between learners' perceived aural comprehension and oral production skills. Moreover, this recognition of speech forms that signify (or fail to signify) "good" speech and legitimate affiliation with mainstream social constituencies may function as an index of learners' increasing awareness of performative expectations governing membership in the dominant classroom Discourse. As Gee (2005) proposed, the key to

> Discourses is 'recognition.' If you put language, action, interaction, values, beliefs, symbols, objects, tools, and places together in such a way that others *recognize* you as a particular type of who (identity) engaged in a particular type of what (activity), here-and-now, then you have pulled off a Discourse. (p. 27)

Taking part in a Discourse may require not only being recognized as a member, but also recognizing others as legitimate or illegitimate members, even if one is still a novice.

As the title of this article indicates, we have endeavored to isolate socio-affective factors such as social pressure that might promote or inhibit the acquisition of native-like oral communication skills and the construction of identities. We found intriguing discontinuities between participants' denials of being influenced by peer pressure and the extent to which they, in fact, reported feeling inhibited by speaking Spanish in various classroom situations. Although our evidence on this point is unfortunately anecdotal, we suspect that teachers may underestimate the pervasiveness of social pressure and performance anxiety at multiple levels of instruction, particularly where L2 speech performance is concerned. Describing the anxieties of ESL learners in an Australian secondary school, Miller (2004) pointed out that

> [I]n education contexts, speaking audibly and without anxiety in another language is an enormous challenge for all but the most extrovert and intrepid students . . . Reticence in speaking, particularly in the early stages, is a natural and very common phenomenon and may manifest itself as silence, minimal responses or extreme soft-spokenness . . . (p. 295-296)

Our findings appear to corroborate Miller's insights, although we speculate that the sources of peer pressure and anxiety may shift somewhat from the secondary to the college setting (Eckert, 2000; Horwitz & Young, 1991; MacIntyre, Clément, Dörnyei, & Noels,1998; McCroskey & Richmond, 1991; Sisón, 1991). Our exploration of gender differences revealed more confidence and competitiveness among the male students than among the female students, although we are reluctant to take these self-reports at face value (Romaine, 1999).

Table 1. *Selected Questionnaire Responses: Frequencies by Percentage and Means (N= 268)*

1=Strongly disagree 2=Disagree 3=Somewhat disagree 4=Somewhat agree 5=Agree 6=Strongly agree NR=Not reported or no experience

Descriptor	NR	1	2	*3*	4	*5*	*6*	*M*	*SD*
7. I feel that I am making progress in developing pronunciation skills in Spanish.	.7	2.2	3.4	6.7	29.5	41.8	15.7	4.53	1.09
8. Given the length of my Spanish study, I feel that I currently have excellent pronunciation skills.	.4	7.8	17.2	18.3	35.4	16.4	4.5	3.49	1.29
9. Compared to my classmates, my pronunciation in Spanish is reasonably native-like.	1.9	6.3	14.2	19.8	37.3	14.9	5.6	3.58	1.26
10. I can accurately recognize the difference between native-like and nonnative ("accented") pronunciation in Spanish.	1.1	3.4	8.2	11.6	30.2	30.2	15.3	4.23	3.70
11. I sometimes cringe when my classmates sound very nonnative-like when they speak Spanish and/or when they make little effort to sound Spanish.	4.5	13.4	15.7	10.4	17.9	22.4	15.7	3.70	1.69
12. I really don't notice when my classmates produce native-like speech in Spanish.	5.6	29.1	28.0	16.0	11.9	6.3	3.0	2.44	1.38
13. It is very important for me to develop excellent pronunciation in Spanish so that I can sound like a native speaker.	2.6	4.1	5.6	7.8	26.9	26.1	26.9	4.50	1.35
14. I like the sound of Spanish when it is spoken by native speakers and by nonnative speakers with good pronunciation.	1.5	3.0	2.2	5.6	12.3	34.3	41.0	4.99	1.21
15. Occasionally, I deliberately avoid sounding like a native speaker of Spanish.	14.2	34.7	21.3	6.3	13.1	6.7	3.7	2.38	1.53

Table 1. *Selected Questionnaire Responses: Frequencies by Percentage and Means (N= 268)*

1=Strongly disagree 2=Disagree 3=Somewhat disagree 4=Somewhat agree 5=Agree 6=Strongly agree NR=Not reported or no experience

Descriptor	NR	1	2	*3*	4	*5*	*6*	*M*	*SD*
16. Good pronunciation is valued and encouraged in my Spanish class.	1.9	1.1	3.4	8.2	21.3	36.2	28.0	4.75	1.13
17. I believe my Spanish instructor's production provides me with an excellent model of native/native-like pronunciation.	.7	.4	.7	6.0	16.0	33.2	42.9	5.11	0.98
18. It is important for me to please my instructor when I speak in Spanish.	.7	1.9	4.5	9.0	32.1	31.7	20.1	4.49	1.16
19. Sometimes I feel uncomfortable trying to sound like a native speaker of Spanish in the presence of my instructor.	4.9	16.8	14.6	13.1	21.6	21.3	7.8	3.42	1.60
20. It is important for me to please my peers when I speak in Spanish.	3.0	19.8	20.9	15.7	23.1	12.3	5.2	3.03	1.51
21. My pronunciation in Spanish sounds best in the presence of native speakers of Spanish.	20.5	14.6	15.7	16.8	17.5	10.4	4.5	3.09	1.48
22. My pronunciation in Spanish sounds best in the presence of my instructor.	4.1	6.3	12.7	29.1	30.6	13.1	4.1	3.45	1.20
23. My pronunciation in Spanish sounds best in the presence of peers/classmates whom I know very well (i.e., friends and acquaintances).	3.4	4.5	12.3	20.5	26.5	21.3	11.6	3.85	1.35
24. Sometimes I feel uncomfortable trying to sound like a native speaker of Spanish in the presence of peers/classmates whom I know very well (i.e., friends and acquaintances).	4.5	15.3	28.4	16.4	21.3	10.4	3.7	2.94	1.40

Table 1. *Selected Questionnaire Responses: Frequencies by Percentage and Means (N= 268)*

1=Strongly disagree 2=Disagree 3=Somewhat disagree 4=Somewhat agree 5=Agree 6=Strongly agree NR=Not reported or no experience

Descriptor	NR	1	2	*3*	4	*5*	*6*	*M*	*SD*
25. My pronunciation in Spanish sounds best in the presence of peers/classmates whom I do not know very well.	5.2	16.0	27.6	26.5	16.8	6.3	1.5	2.73	1.22
26. Sometimes I feel uncomfortable trying to sound like a native speaker of Spanish in the presence of classmates I do not know very well.	5.6	12.3	23.1	15.3	26.1	11.9	5.6	3.2	1.43
27. My pronunciation in Spanish sounds best in the presence of both my instructor and my peers.	3.7	7.8	12.7	26.9	34.3	11.6	3.0	3.40	1.19
28. Sometimes I feel uncomfortable trying to sound like a native speaker of Spanish in the presence of both my instructor and my peers.	3.4	14.2	18.7	21.6	23.5	14.6	4.1	3.19	1.14
29. My pronunciation in Spanish sounds best in the presence of peers/classmates whose pronunciation and oral skills are better than mine.	4.9	11.9	19.8	21.6	26.1	10.8	4.9	3.20	1.37
30. Sometimes I feel uncomfortable trying to sound like a native speaker of Spanish in the presence of peers/classmates whose pronunciation and oral skills are better than mine.	2.6	9.7	18.7	15.3	29..1	16.8	7.8	3.49	1.44
31. My pronunciation in Spanish sounds best in the presence of peers/classmates whose pronunciation and oral skills are not quite as good as mine.	4.5	7.8	14.2	17.9	27.2	22.0	6.3	3.63	1.37
32. Sometimes I feel uncomfortable trying to sound like a native speaker of Spanish in the presence of peers/classmates whose pronunciation and oral skills are not quite as good as mine.	3.7	18.7	27.6	23.1	17.5	7.1	2.2	2.72	1.30

Table 1. *Selected Questionnaire Responses: Frequencies by Percentage and Means (N= 268)*

1=Strongly disagree 2=Disagree 3=Somewhat disagree 4=Somewhat agree 5=Agree 6=Strongly agree NR=Not reported or no experience

Descriptor	NR	1	2	*3*	4	*5*	*6*	*M*	*SD*
33. My pronunciation in Spanish sounds best in the presence of members of the same sex.	18.3	17.5	19.4	22.0	16.4	4.5	1.9	2.71	1.28
34. Sometimes I feel uncomfortable trying to sound like a native speaker of Spanish in the presence of members of the same sex.	16.8	22.0	28.4	20.1	9.3	2.2	1.1	2.34	1.14
35. My pronunciation in Spanish sounds best in the presence of members of the opposite sex.	18.7	20.1	23.9	21.6	10.8	2.2	2.6	2.49	1.25
36. Sometimes I feel uncomfortable trying to sound like a native speaker of Spanish in the presence of members of the opposite sex.	15.3	23.1	26.1	16.4	12.3	4.5	2.2	2.48	1.31
37. My pronunciation in Spanish sounds best when I am alone.	4.5	7.1	11.6	12.3	22.8	20.5	21.3	4.07	1.55
38. My pronunciation in Spanish sounds best when I am repeating after the teacher with the whole class.	3.4	3.4	6.7	11.6	23.9	31.7	19.4	4.37	1.31
39. My pronunciation in Spanish sounds best when I am reading from the textbook or a worksheet.	4.1	4.5	11.6	19.8	28.0	23.1	9.0	3.84	1.31
40. My pronunciation in Spanish sounds best when I am engaged in conversation with peers.	4.5	7.5	13.4	24.6	29.9	13.1	7.1	3.51	1.31

Table 2. *Comparison of Means by Setting (High School vs. University)*

Variable	HS *M* (SD) *N*=90	University *M* (SD) *N*=178	SS Between Groups Within Groups Total	*df* Between Groups Within Groups Total	MS Between Groups Within Groups	*F*	*p*
12. I really don't notice when my classmates produce native-like speech in Spanish.	2.84 (1.55)	2.23 (1.24)	21.398 459.021 480.419	1 251 252	21.398 1.829	11.701	.001
13. It is very important for me to develop excellent pronunciation in Spanish so that I can sound like a native speaker.	4.09 (1.46)	4.71 (1.24)	22.011 451.238 473.249	1 259 260	22.011 1.742	12.634	.000
14. I like the sound of Spanish when it is spoken by native speakers and by nonnative speakers with good pronunciation.	4.54 (1.38)	5.22 (1.04)	27.105 357.861 384.966	1 262 263	27.105 1.366	19.844	.000
16. Good pronunciation is valued and encouraged in my Spanish class.	4.95 (.96)	4.65 (1.19)	5.380 327.555 332.935	1 261 262	5.380 1.255	4.287	.039
24. Sometimes I feel uncomfortable trying to sound like a native speaker of Spanish in the presence of peers/classmates whom I know very well (i.e., friends and acquaintances).	3.18 (1.50)	2.81 (1.33)	7.752 490.369 498.121	1 254 255	7.752 1.931	4.015	.046
26. Sometimes I feel uncomfortable trying to sound like a native speaker of Spanish in the presence of classmates I *do not* know very well.	3.45 (1.38)	3.07 (1.45)	8.070 508.650 516.719	1 251 252	8.070 2.026	3.982	.047

Table 2. *Comparison of Means by Setting (High School vs. University)*

Variable	HS *M* (SD) *N*=90	University *M* (SD) *N*=178	SS Between Groups Within Groups Total	*df* Between Groups Within Groups Total	MS Between Groups Within Groups	*F*	*p*
28. Sometimes I feel uncomfortable trying to sound like a native speaker of Spanish in the presence of both my instructor and my peers.	3.61 (1.34)	2.96 (1.40)	24.080 487.024 511.104	1 257 258	24.080 1.895	12.707	.000
31. My pronunciation in Spanish sounds best in the presence of peers/classmates whose pronunciation and oral skills are *not quite as good as* mine.	4.07 (1.36)	3.40 (1.33)	26.125 455.359 481.484	1 254 255	26.125 1.793	14.573	.000
32. Sometimes I feel uncomfortable trying to sound like a native speaker of Spanish in the presence of peers/classmates whose pronunciation and oral skills are *not quite as good as* mine.	2.94 (1.37)	2.61 (1.25)	6.369 425.092 431.461	1 256 257	6.369 1.661	3.835	.051
33. My pronunciation in Spanish sounds best in the presence of members of the *same sex*.	3.10 (1.32)	2.49 (1.21)	18.943 339.934 358.877	1 217 218	18.943 1.567	12.092	.001
39. My pronunciation in Spanish sounds best when I am reading from the textbook or a worksheet.	3.56 (1.25)	3.98 (1.31)	10.110 426.349 436.459	1 255 256	10.110 1.672	6.047	.015

Table 3. *Comparison of Means by Sex*

Variable	Female M (SD) *N*=174	Male M (SD) *N*=94	SS Between Groups Within Groups Total	df Between Groups Within Groups Total	MS Between Groups Within Groups	F	p
14. I like the sound of Spanish when it is spoken by native speakers and by nonnative speakers with good pronunciation.	5.21 (1.01)	4.33 (1.48)	27.267 357.699 384.966	2 261 263	13.634 1.370	9.948	.000
15. Occasionally, I deliberately avoid sounding like a native speaker of Spanish.	2.17 (1.36)	2.79 (1.76)	20.279 518.051 538.330	2 227 229	10.140 2.282	4.443	.013
21. My pronunciation in Spanish sounds best in the presence of native speakers of Spanish.	2.90 (1.35)	3.45 (1.64)	15.368 447.937 463.305	2 210 212	7.684 2.133	3.602	.029
30. Sometimes I feel uncomfortable trying to sound like a native speaker of Spanish in the presence of peers/classmates whose pronunciation and oral skills are better than mine.	3.66 (1.36)	3.17 (1.49)	14.023 523.218 537.241	2 258 260	7.012 2.028	3.457	.033
35. My pronunciation in Spanish sounds best in the presence of members of the opposite sex.	2.37 (1.00)	2.77 (1.57)	14.815 324.425 339.240	2 215 217	7.407 1.509	4.909	.008
39. My pronunciation in Spanish sounds best when I am reading from the textbook or a worksheet.	3.86 (1.21)	3.72 (1.45)	12.267 424.193 436.459	2 254 256	6.133 1.670	3.673	.027

Table 4. *Comparison of Means by Sex: HS Participants*

Variable	Female M (SD) *N*=174	Male M (SD) *N*=94	SS Between Groups Within Groups Total	df Between Groups Within Groups Total	MS Between Groups Within Groups	F	P
15. Occasionally, I deliberately avoid sounding like a native speaker of Spanish.	2.20 (1.37)	3.20(1.75)	20.588 195.600 216.188	1 83 84	20.588 2.357	8.736	.004

When we initially began data collection, we looked for evidence of covert, or subversive, prestige — the rejection or subversion of the pedagogical "standard" of pronunciation (Cameron, 1995; Labov, 2001; MacNeil & Cran, 2005). In some of our earlier work (e.g., Lefkowitz & Hedgcock, 1998, 1999, 2002), we found that rejecting "standard" or "received" pronunciation could be more prestigious than reproducing it for a substrate of learners, even though efforts to replicate the high-prestige pedagogical norm continued to dominate (cf. Eckert, 1989, 2000; MacNeil & Cran, 2005; Rampton, 1995; Savignon, 1997; Tarone & Swain, 1995). In a study of "nerd girls," Buscholtz (1999) framed tensions between those aspiring to a "standard" and those aspiring to a non-mainstream code in terms of positive and negative identity. Individuals' efforts to construct their social identities actively by appropriating behavioral patterns that overtly supported intragroup cohesion and convergence on mainstream speech norms reflected positive identity practices. In contrast, negative identity practices and linguistic patterns were adopted by "nerd girls" who wished to distance themselves from a mainstream identity that they had rejected.

Buscholtz's (1999) findings parallel those of earlier researchers. Eckert (1989), for example, identified high school students whose speech imitated that of adults as "Jocks"; "Burnouts," meanwhile, were those students who resisted adult authority and whose speech patterns (e.g., vowel shifts) were decidedly non-mainstream. Eckert discovered that female students in the Burnout constituency were in the vanguard of linguistic change (cf. Labov, 2001; Rampton, 1996) and that the most advanced and linguistically flexible speakers in the school were the so-called "Brokers," who transmitted information between the two largely non-intersecting constituencies. To use Lubrano's (2004) metaphor, Brokers "straddled" the Jock and Burnout Discourses, negotiating the social-semiotic boundaries between these primary constituencies by successfully engaging in verbal activity recognized as legitimate by members of both groups. This line of inquiry supports the premise that, just as linguistic codes within a Discourse or social cohort are multiple and variable, the social identities aligned with these linguistic codes are subject to diachronic and synchronic shifts (Eckert, 2000). Although an individual's agency in constructing or reconstructing his or her socially situated identity may be constrained,

> [T]he individual creates for himself the patterns of his linguistic behavior so as to resemble those of the group or groups with which from time to time he wishes to be identified, or so as to be unlike those from whom he wishes to be distinguished. (LePage & Tabouret-Keller, 1985, p. 181)

Despite the sometimes limited L2 repertoires of FL learners, we would posit that multiple, competing linguistic codes and Discourses can emerge in the FL classroom as they do in less formally structured environments where monolingual and bilingual individuals interact (Rampton, 1995; Watkins-Goffman, 2001). The formal features and social practices that index this layered variation in FL classrooms may be quite subtle, of course. Subversive prestige and negative identity practices can be extremely difficult to verify, as our survey results clearly show. In response to our question about deliberately underperforming in the classroom (item 15), only 14% of the students admitted to engaging in this behavior; 62% indicated that they disapproved of underperformance. Our prior findings nevertheless suggest that, at least for a minority of participants, being viewed as capable of "good" pronunciation while deliberately subverting desired speech norms was more appealing than adhering to the pedagogical standard. One such student offered this insight:

> In high school I [tried to sound cool], yeah . . . [Laughter] . . . They would- . . . all the cool people and even the people that got good grades said things . . . the way that they wanted to say it. That sounded like a cool high schooler . . . Um, there might be a little bit of it at first year level [in university level Spanish courses]. (Lefkowitz & Hedgcock, 2002, p. 227)

Another learner acknowledged subverting his teacher as the result of peer pressure:

> I remember . . . even myself . . . uh . . . like maybe saying it with the XXX thing? We had a really weird Spanish teacher, though, you know .. . and she'd get really upset . . . e- after a repeated, mistake was made? So it got to the point almost . . . where . . . we each had our certain mistake . . . that we would do wrong and we'd do it on purpose just to piss her off. (Lefkowitz & Hedgcock, 2002, p. 227)

A clear implication for future inquiry into this covert prestige paradox (Lefkowitz & Hedgcock, 2002) is that research should perhaps more intentionally aim to capture the linguistic and socioaffective cross-currents that might not initially be apparent to the observer or classroom teacher. In terms of our own future research, we would like to concentrate more mindfully on identifying that 14% of our sample for whom deliberate underperformance is a familiar behavior. A further direction to pursue involves parallels between FL learners' non-standard codes and the inter-registers known to emerge among bilingual/heritage speakers of Spanish (Valdés & Geoffrion-Vinci, 1998). Among Spanish-English bilingual populations in the U.S., group membership, identity, and solidarity are sometimes maintained through the active selection of nonstandard (covert, subversive) vernacular varieties of Spanish that emerge as a result of social and cultural pressure to conform to — and resist — externally imposed "standards" (Merino, Trueba, & Samaniego, 1993; Rodriguez, 1983; Silva-Corvalán, 1994).

Although it is difficult and perhaps premature to draw educational implications from our sometimes contradictory findings, we would propose several general recommendations to assist classroom FL teachers in the planning and delivery of L2 instruction, particularly instruction aimed at promoting L2 oral skills. An admittedly obvious insight from our results is that the speech performance of novice L2 learners may be subject not only to their motivational profiles, but also to highly nuanced yet influential social currents and cross-currents at work in the classroom setting. These currents and cross-currents may be undetectable unless teachers are aware of the potential emergence of multiple speech codes among segments of their student populations.

In addition to developing a more profound awareness of the layers of linguistic variation in students' evolving L2 skill base and the socio-affective factors influencing oral performance, FL teachers can benefit from understanding their students' attitudes toward L2 varieties, including vernaculars. Although we would not necessarily recommend departing from the pedagogical norm or "standard" selected for the beginning stages of FL instruction, we would suggest that teachers consider acquainting students with fundamental sociolinguistic concepts such as register variation, perhaps even through cross-linguistic comparisons with familiar mother tongue registers, situations, discourse communities, and identities. Critical exploration of how registers and interregisters facilitate or inhibit access to Discourses might not only heighten learners' awareness of variation in the FL (Valdés & Geoffrion-Vinci, 1998), but also provide them with a more diverse repertoire of skills and strategies for appropriating preferred codes and the privileges associated with them (Harmon & Wilson, 2006).

For teachers and learners alike, a key aspect of promoting L2 oral proficiency, including pronunciation accuracy, entails *perception* as well as *production* skills (Wode, 1995). Speech production and perception are interdependent: "Adult language learners do not invent their L2 pronunciation in a vacuum with no input; rather, their pronunciation is in part the result of how they perceive the L2, which is often in terms of the L1 perceptual system" (Major, 2002, p. 52). Results of our study demonstrate that, whereas a number of beginning and intermediate Spanish learners evinced a fairly high level of sensitivity to the distribution of overtly and covertly prestigious L2 speech norms, a larger number reported or exhibited a performative mismatch between their productive and perceptive abilities. In other words, members of this latter group tended to overestimate the accuracy of their perceptions of "good" pronunciation and accent variation. Moreover, interview participants appeared not to recognize the audible shortcomings of their own L2 speech production. Thus, despite overtly expressing an awareness of target-like ("good") phonemic and phonetic form, many of our participants produced speech that was decidedly non-target-like. This finding would imply that FL instruction should perhaps feature phonemic and phonetic awareness-raising more prominently and systematically as a means of enhancing and accelerating students' oral production, in line with recent SLA research on *noticing the gap* (Schmidt & Frota, 1986) and *reactive focus-on-form* (Ellis, 2002; Long, 1991), processes in which learners "must notice, then process the target... structure in purely communicative input" (Hinkel & Fotos, 2002, p. 5).

A strategy for raising phonemic awareness would entail presenting learners with multiple speech samples produced by mother-tongue FL speakers, accomplished FL learners, and learners themselves; with the teacher's guidance, students might then compare the samples as a means of distinguishing speakers, accents, and features, attending purposefully to how their speech matches or fails to match the target. Although teachers and students generally understand that a chief aim of developing L2 communicative competence is to "sound good," FL instruction does not sufficiently or systematically train learners to perceive the subtle but significant segmental and suprasegmental properties that mark the continuum from "sounding bad" to "sounding good" relative to the pedagogical norm(s) featured in the curriculum. We speculate that such training might equip students with a heightened awareness of what it means to "sound good" — in contrast to "sounding bad" while simultaneously thinking that one "sounds good." Enhanced speech perception practice might likewise result in more highly developed sociolinguistic competence, as students would have opportunities to learn *when, where, with whom, how,* and *why* to deploy a richer range of standard or non-standard L2 registers.

References

Auger, J., & Valdman, A. (1999). Letting French students hear the diverse voices of Francophony. *Modern Language Journal, 83,* 403-412.

Bakhtin, M. (1973). *Marxism and the philosophy of language* (L. Matejka & I. R. Tituknik, Trans.). New York: Seminar Press. (Original work published 1929)

Bent, T., & Bradlow, A. (2003). The interlanguage speech intelligibility benefit. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 114,* 1600-1610.

Bernstein, B. (1961). Social structure, language, and learning. *Educational Research, 3,* 163-176.

Bernstein, B. (Ed.). (1973). *Class, codes and control: Applied studies towards a sociology of language.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Berry, J. (1980). Acculturation as varieties of adaptation. In A. Padilla (Ed.), *Acculturation: Theory, models, and some new findings* (pp. 9-25). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Block, D. (2003). *The social turn in second language acquisition.* Washington: Georgetown University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power.* Oxford: Polity Press.

Buscholtz, M. (1999). Why be normal? Language and identity practices in a community of nerd girls. *Language in Society, 28,* 203-223.

Cameron, D. (1995). *Verbal hygiene.* London: Routledge.

Champagne-Muzar, C., Schneiderman, E. I., & Bourdages, J. S. (1993). Second language accent: The role of the pedagogical environment. *International Review of Applied Linguistics, 31,* 143-160.

Coppieters, R. (1987). Competence differences between native and non-native speakers. *Language, 63,* 544-573.

Derwing, T., & Rossiter, M. (2002a). ESL learners' perceptions of their pronunciation needs and strategies. *System, 30,* 155-166.

Derwing, T., & Rossiter, M. (2002b). The effects of pronunciation instruction on the accuracy, fluency, and complexity of L2 accented speech. *Applied Language Learning, 13,* 1-17.

Dittmar, N., Spolsky, B., & Walters, J. (1997). Grammaticalization and social convergence in SLA. In R. Hickey & S. Puppel (Eds.), *Language history and language modelling: Festschrift Fisiak.* Berlin: de Gruyter.

Eckert, P. (1989). *Jocks and burnouts: Social categories and identity in the high school.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Eckert, P. (2000). *Linguistic variation as social practice.* Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Elliott, R. A. (1995). Foreign language phonology: Field independence, attitude, and the success of formal instruction in Spanish pronunciation. *Modern Language Journal, 79,* 530-542.

Ellis, R. (2002) The place of grammar instruction in the second/foreign language curriculum. In E. Hinkel & S. Fotos (Eds.), *New perspectives on grammar teaching in second language classrooms* (pp. 17-34). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Gee, J. P. (2004). *Situated language and learning: A critique of traditional schooling.* London: Routledge.

Gee, J. P. (2005). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.

Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life.* New York: Doubleday.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1985). *Spoken and written language.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1985). *Language, context, and text: Aspects of language in a social-semiotic perspective.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Harmon, M. R., & Wilson, M. J. (2006). *Beyond grammar: Language, power, and the classroom.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Hedgcock, J., & Lefkowitz, N. (2000). Overt and covert prestige in the French classroom: When is it good to sound bad? *Applied Language Learning, 11,* 75-97.

Hinkel, E., & Fotos, S. (2002). From theory to practice: A teacher's view. In E. Hinkel & S. Fotos (Eds.), *New perspectives on grammar teaching in second language classrooms* (pp. 1-12). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Horwitz, E., & Young, D. (1991). *Language anxiety: From theory and research to classroom implications.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Ioup, G., & Weinberger, S (1987). *Interlanguage phonology: The acquisition of a second language sound system.* New York: Newbury House.

Kinginger, C. (2004). Alice doesn't live here anymore: Foreign language learning and identity reconstruction. In A. Pavlenko & A. Blackledge (Eds.), *Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts* (pp. 219-242). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Kramsch, C. (2002). Standard, norm, and variability in language learning: A view from foreign language research. In S. Gass, K. Bardovi-Harlig, S. S. Magnan, & J. Walz (Eds.), *Pedagogical norms for second and foreign language learning and teaching* (pp. 59-79). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kroch, A. A. (1978). Toward a theory of social dialect variation. *Language in Society, 7,* 17-36.

Labov, W. (2001). *Principles of linguistic change: Social factors*, *2*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Leather, J. (Ed.). (1999). *Phonological issues in language learning.* Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Lefkowitz, N., & Hedgcock, J. (1998, March). Covert prestige in the FL classroom: When it's good to sound bad. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association for Applied Linguistics, Seattle, WA.

Lefkowitz, N., & Hedgcock, J. (1999, March). Sounding off: What FL learners say about social prestige, peer and teacher (dis)approval, and their oral performance. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association for Applied Linguistics, Stamford, CT.

Lefkowitz, N., & Hedgcock, J. (2002). Influences of social prestige, peer pressure, and teacher (dis)approval on FL oral performance. *Language Teaching Research, 6,* 223-244.

Le Page, R. B., & Tabouret-Keller, A. (1985). *Acts of identity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Levis, J. M. (1999). Intonation in theory and practice, revisited. *TESOL Quarterly, 33,* 37-64.

Lippi-Green, R. (1997). *English with an accent: Language ideology and discrimination in the United States.* New York: Routledge.

Long, M. (1991). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In K. De Bot, D. Coste, R. Ginsberg, & C. Kramsch (Eds.), *Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspective* (pp. 39-52). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Lubrano, A. (2004). *Limbo: Blue-collar roots, white-collar dreams.* New York: John Wiley & Sons.

MacIntyre, P. D., Clément, R., Dörnyei, Z., & Noels, K. A. (1998). Conceptualizing willingness to communicate in a L2: A situational model of L2 confidence and affiliation. *Modern Language Journal, 82,* 545-562.

MacNeil, R., & Cran, W. (2005). *Do you speak American?* New York: Doubleday.

Magnan, S. S., & Walz, J. (2002). Pedagogical norms: Development of the concept and illustrations from French. In S. Gass, K. Bardovi-Harlig, S. S. Magnan, & J. Walz (Eds.), *Pedagogical norms for second and foreign language learning and teaching* (pp. 15-40). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Major, R. (Guest Ed.). (1998). *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 20* (2) [Special issue on interlanguage phonology and phonetics].

Major, R. (2001). *Foreign accent: The ontogeny and phylogeny of second language phonology.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (1991). Willingness to communicate: A cognitive view. In M. Booth-Butterfield (Ed.), *Communication, cognition, and anxiety* (pp. 19-37). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

McWhorter, J. (2003). *Doing our own thing: The degradation of language and music, and why we should, like, care.* New York: Gotham.

Merino, B. N., Trueba, H. T., & Samaniego, F. A. (Eds.). (1993). *Language and culture in learning: Teaching Spanish to native speakers of Spanish.* London: Falmer.

Miller, J. (2004). Identity and language use: The politics of speaking ESL in schools. In A. Pavlenko & A. Blackledge (Eds.), *Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts* (pp. 290-315). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Moreno Fernández, F. (2000). 12. *¿Qué español enseñar?* Madrid: Arco Libros.

Morgan, B. (1997). Identity and intonation: Linking dynamic processes in an ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly, 31,* 431-450.

Moyer, A. (1999). Ultimate attainment in L2 phonology. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 21,* 81-108.

Noels, K. A. (2001). Learning Spanish as a second language: Learners' orientations and perceptions of their teachers' communication style. *Language Learning, 51,* 107-144.

Norton Peirce, B. (1995). Social identity, investment, and language learning. *TESOL Quarterly, 29,* 9-31.

Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity, and educational change.* Essex, England: Pearson.

Pavlenko, A. (2004). "The making of an American": Negotiation of identities at the turn of the twentieth century. In A. Pavlenko & A. Blackledge (Eds.), *Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts* (pp. 34-67). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Pavlenko, A., & Blackledge, A. (2004). Introduction: New theoretical approaches to the study of negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts. In A. Pavlenko & A. Blackledge (Eds.), *Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts* (pp. 1-33). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Pennington, M. (1996). *Phonology in English language teaching: An international approach.* London: Longman.

Rampton, B. (1995). *Crossing: Language and ethnicity among adolescents.* London: Longman.

Rampton, B. (1996). Youth, race and resistance: a sociolinguistic perspective. *Linguistics and Education*, *8,* 159-73.

Rodriguez, R. (1983). *Hunger of memory: The education of Richard Rodriguez.* New York: Bantam.

Romaine, S. (1982). What is a speech community? In S. Romaine (Ed.), *Sociolinguistic variation in speech communities* (pp. 13-24). London: Edward Arnold.

Romaine, S. (1999). *Communicating gender.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Salaberry, M. R., & Lopez-Ortega, N. (1998). Accurate L2 production across language tasks: Focus on form, focus on meaning, and communicative control. *Modern Language Journal, 82,* 514-532.

Savignon, S. (1997). *Communicative competence: Theory and classroom practice* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Schmidt, R., & Frota, S. (1986). Developing basic conversational ability in a second language: A case study of an adult learner. In R. Day (Ed.), *Talking to learn: Conversation in a second language* (pp. 237-326). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Selinker, L. (1992). *Rediscovering interlanguage.* New York: Longman.

Silva-Corvalán, C. (1991). Spanish language attrition in a contact situation with English. In H. W. Seliger & R. M. Vago (Eds.), *First language attrition* (pp. 151-171). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Silva-Corvalán, C. (1994). *Language contact and change: Spanish in Los Angeles.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Sisón, M. P. A. (1991). The relationship of college student attitudes, motivation, and anxiety to second language achievement: A test of Gardner's model. Los Angeles: University of Southern California PhD. dissertation.

Smit, U. (2002). The interaction of motivation and achievement in advanced EFL pronunciation learners. *International Review of Applied Linguistics, 40,* 89-116.

Spolsky, B. (1996). Hebrew and Israeli identity. In Y. Suleiman (Ed.), *Language and identity in the Middle East and North Africa* (pp. 181-191). London: Curzon Press.

Spolsky, B. (2002). Norms, native speakers, and reversing language shift. In S. Gass, K. Bardovi-Harlig, S. S. Magnan, & J. Walz (Eds.), *Pedagogical norms for second and foreign language learning and teaching* (pp. 41-58). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Suter, R. W. (1976). Predictors of pronunciation accuracy in second language learning. *Language Learning, 26,* 233-253.

Tajfel, H. (1981). *Human groups and social categories.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Tajfel, H. (1982). *Social identity in intergroup relations.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

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: Studies in honour of H. G. Widdowson* (pp. 125-145). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Tarone, E., & Swain, M. (1995). A sociolinguistic perspective on second language use in immersion classrooms. *Modern Language Journal, 79,* 166-78.

Taylor, D. S. (1993). Intonation and accent in English: What teachers need to know. *International Review of Applied Linguistics, 31,* 1-21.

Valdés, G., & M. Geoffrion-Vinci (1998). Chicano Spanish: The problem of the "underdeveloped" code in bilingual repertoires. *Modern Language Journal, 82,* 473-501.

Valdman, A. (1961). *Applied linguistics: French — A guide for teachers.* Boston: D. C. Heath.

Valdman, A. (1967). Norme pédagogique: Les structures interrogatives du français. *IRAL International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 5,* 3-1.

Valdman, A. (1976). Variation linguistique et norme pédagogique dans l'enseignement du français langue étrangère. *Bulletin de la Fédération Internationale des Professeurs de Français, 12-13,* 52-64.

Valdman, A. (1989). The elaboration of pedagogical norms. In S. Gass, C. Madden, D. Preston, & L. Selinker (Eds.), *Variation in second language acquisition: Discourse and pragmatics* (pp. 15-34). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Valdman, A. (2002). The acquisition of sociostylistic and sociopragmatic variation by instructed second language learners: The elaboration of pedagogical norms. In C. Blyth (Ed.), *The sociolinguistics of foreign language classrooms: Contributions of the native, near-native, and the non-native speaker.* Boston: Heinle.

van Dam, J. (2002). Ritual, face, and play in a first English lesson: Bootstrapping a classroom culture. In C. Kramsch (Ed.), *Language acquisition and language socialization* (pp. 237-265). London: Continuum.

van Lier, L. (2002). An ecological-semiotic perspective on language and linguistics. In C. Kramsch (Ed.), *Language acquisition and language socialization* (pp. 140-164). London: Continuum.

van Lier, L. (2004). *The ecology and semiotics of language learning. A sociocultural perspective.* Norwell, MA: Kluwer Academic.

Wardhaugh, R. (2005). *An introduction to sociolinguistics* (5th ed.). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Watkins-Goffman, L. (2001). *Lives in two languages: An exploration of identity and culture.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Wode, H. (1995). Speech perception, language acquisition, and linguistics: Some mutual implications. In W. Strange (Ed.), *Speech perception and linguistic experience: Issues in cross-linguistic research* (pp. 322-347). Timonium, MD: Yourk Press.

Wode, H. (1996). Speech perception and L2 phonological acquisition. In P. Jordens & J. Lalleman (Eds.), *Investigating second language acquisition* (pp. 321-353). Berlin: Mouton.

Wode, H. (1997). Perception and production in learning to talk. In S. J. Hannahs & M. Young-Scholten (Eds.), *Focus on phonological acquisition* (pp. 17-46). Amsterdam: J. Benjamins.

Wolfram, W., Adger, C. T., & Christian, D. (1999). *Dialects in schools and communities.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Zuengler, J., & Cole, K. (2005). Language socialization and second language learning. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 301-316). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Author

JOHN S. HEDGCOCK, Professor, TESOL/TFL, Monterey Institute of International Studies, 460 Pierce Street, Monterey CA 93940 USA.
e-mail: john.hedgcock@miis.edu. Specializations: applied linguistics, L2 literacy education, composition studies, pedagogical grammar, teacher education.

NATALIE LEFKOWITZ, Professor, Department of Foreign Languages, Central Washington University, Ellensburg WA 98926-7552 USA. e-mail: nataliel@cwu.edu. Specializations: Romance languages, foreign language education, second language acquisition, methodology, sociolinguistics.

Applied Language Learning
2006, Vol. 16, No. 2, pp. 39-64

A Comprehensive Pedagogical Framework to Develop Pragmatics in the Foreign Language Classroom: The 6Rs Approach

Alicia Martínez-Flor
Esther Usó-Juan
Universitat Jaume 1, Castellón (Spain)

To prepare learners for successful communication is nowadays one of the main goals of teaching practices of lecturers of English as a Second (ESL) or Foreign (EFL) language in the University setting. Consequently, language teaching needs to focus not only on linguistic or strategic aspects of the target language, but also on the development of the learner's pragmatic competence, which refers to the ability of employing target-language linguistic resources in an appropriate way for a particular context. Given this necessity, instruction in pragmatics has recently motivated a lot of research (Rose & Kasper, 2001; Bardovi-Harlig & Mahan-Taylor, 2003; Martínez-Flor, Usó-Juan & Fernández-Guerra, 2003; Alcón & Martínez-Flor, 2005). Additionally, this need is stronger in the foreign language setting, since the opportunities to be in contact with authentic language use outside the classroom are very limited (Rose, 1999). In an attempt to contribute to this area of research, in this paper we present a comprehensive pedagogical framework, called the 6Rs Approach, aimed at providing EFL lecturers with a pedagogical tool that may help them to integrate pragmatics in their teaching syllabi. This guiding framework, which has been elaborated on previous approaches and techniques from the field of interlanguage pragmatics (ILP), focuses on requests and suggestions as two speech acts that may intrinsically threaten the hearer's face and, therefore, need to be performed in an appropriate way for their successful completion.

The development of learners' communicative competence in a second or foreign language has been one of the main concerns of language teaching professionals in the field of second language acquisition (SLA) over the last two decades (Celce-Murcia, Dörnyei and Thurrell, 1995; Kasper & Rose, 2002). In order to make learners become communicatively competent in another language it has been claimed that not only their grammatical or strategic knowledge in the target language need to be developed, but also their pragmatic competence. This competence refers to the ability to employ different linguistic resources in an appropriate way for a given context (Kasper, 1997, 2001). However, the opportunities learners may have to acquire their pragmatic competence may vary depending on the setting where they are learning the target language (Bardovi-Harlig, 2001). In a second language setting, for instance, learners have rich exposure to the target language outside the classroom and a lot of opportunities to use it for real-life purposes. Therefore, their pragmatic ability can be easily acquired, since learners may get involved in situations where they are required to interpret utterances in context or interact with different participants in different environments. In contrast, learners in a foreign language context lack the opportunities to get involved in authentic situations outside the classroom context (Rose, 1999). For this reason, teaching pragmatic competence in instructed settings, and particularly in the EFL classroom, has been regarded as necessary to facilitate EFL learners' pragmatic developmental process (Rose & Kasper, 2001; Bardovi-Harlig & Mahan-Taylor, 2003; Martínez-Flor et al., 2003; Alcón & Martínez-Flor, 2005).

Bearing this assumption in mind, the aim of this paper is to present a comprehensive pedagogical framework designed to foster learners' pragmatic competence in the EFL classroom. More specifically, it has been elaborated for learners engaged in the University degree of Tourism in an attempt to widen the specific contexts where pragmatic intervention may be beneficial. We have chosen the two directive speech acts of requests and suggestions as a means to teach learners' pragmatic competence for two reasons. First, both requests and suggestions are directive speech acts which intrinsically threaten the hearer's face and, therefore, they call for considerable cultural and linguistic expertise on the part of the learners. Moreover, by focusing on two speech acts at the same time as the basis of a lesson, learners may discover the importance of context when deciding the function of a given utterance, since, as indicated by Rose (1999), this aspect is a vital component of pragmatics. Second, both speech acts are likely to arise very often in interactional exchanges in the field of tourism and, therefore, learners from this discipline have to be provided with the necessary pragmatic knowledge to enable them to use them appropriately in their future jobs.

Thus, in order to provide a detailed theoretical background which serves as the basis for our suggested pedagogical framework, we will first pay attention to pragmatic competence within the models of communicative competence. Second, we will describe the speech acts examined within such a framework (i.e., requests and suggestions). Third, we will revise different models and proposals for teaching pragmatics in the classroom context. Finally, our approach will be presented and concluding remarks and suggestions for further research will be highlighted.

Pragmatic Competence as Part of the Communicative Competence Construct

The term *communicative competence* was coined by Hymes (1972), who developed a theory of communicative competence in which language was not studied as a system in isolation but rather as part of actual daily communication. Consequently, in contrast to Chomsky's (1965) model of linguistic competence, which was characterized as a static concept based on grammatical rules and related to individuals, communicative competence was considered to be a dynamic social concept based on the negotiation of meaning between two or more speakers. Given the importance of developing this competence among foreign language learners, different scholars have attempted to define the specific components of the construct of communicative competence in order to establish a base for their teaching practices.

The first model was proposed by Canale and Swain (1980) and further developed by Canale (1983). These authors identified four main competencies: *grammatical* (i.e., knowledge of lexical, morphological, semantic and syntactic rules of the language system); *sociolinguistic* (i.e., the knowledge of the sociocultural rules of use in a given context); *strategic* (i.e., the knowledge of how to use verbal and non-verbal communication strategies to avoid breakdowns in communication) and, finally, *discourse* (i.e., the knowledge of achieving coherence and cohesion in a spoken or written text).

Although this model has been the basis for the implementation of the construct of communicative competence in language teaching approaches, it received criticism on the basis that it did not take into consideration the importance of the pragmatic component. Thus, the two models that regarded pragmatic competence as one of their key components were developed by Bachman (1990) and Celce-Murcia et al. (1995). Bachman (1990) was in fact the first researcher to explicitly divide language knowledge into organizational and pragmatic competence. According to this author, *organizational competence* implies the control of the formal structure of language in order to produce or recognise grammatically correct sentences, whereas *pragmatic competence* is concerned with two significant aspects of communicative language use: the relationships between linguistic signs and referents, on the one hand, and the language users and context of communication, on the other. Thus, pragmatic competence is subdivided into two subcomponents, namely elocutionary competence (i.e., knowledge of the pragmatic conventions for performing acceptable language functions) and sociolinguistic competence (i.e., knowledge of the sociolinguistic conventions for performing language functions appropriately in a given context).

We believe then, in line with Bachman (1990), that the inclusion of this pragmatic component within the construct of communicative competence is essential, since it enables users not only to employ language to express a wide range of functions (that is, focusing on pragmalinguistic aspects of the target language) but also to perform these language functions in ways that are appropriate to the context in which they are produced (that is, considering sociopragmatic issues). In fact, the politeness theory developed by Brown and Levinson (1987) focuses on the importance of considering how sociopragmatic variables, such as social distance, power or rank of imposition, affect the appropriate choice of particular linguistic realizations. Moreover, the model proposed by Celce-Murcia et al. (1995) also considered pragmatic competence as one of the main constituents. Apart from including the linguistic, sociocultural, strategic, and discourse components, the authors paid special attention to pragmatic competence, or as they called it *actional competence*, since it involves the understanding of the speakers' communicative intent by performing and interpreting speech act sets. Consequently, these two models are relevant to our approach, since both of them highlight the importance of pragmatic competence as one of the essential components of communicative competence.

Pragmatic Feature Examined: A Focus on Speech Acts

One of the most widely examined aspects in pragmatic interventional studies involves the comprehension and production of speech acts, which have been defined as routinized utterances that speakers use to perform different functions, such as requesting, complimenting, complaining, refusing, suggesting, and so forth (Olhstain & Cohen, 1991). Among these, in this paper we are focusing on the group of directive (Searle, 1976) or exhortative (Haverkate, 1984) speech acts, and more specifically on requests and suggestions.

According to Searle (1976), *directives* imply that the speaker's attitude and intention when performing an utterance must be taken as a reason for the hearer's action. Moreover, one relevant feature affecting directives in opposition to other speech acts refers to the necessary interaction between the speaker and the hearer in order to have the speech act realized (Thomas, 1995). For this reason, the interlocutors' presence and response to speakers' intentions is fully required, since the action will only be fulfilled after the hearer's acceptance of the speaker's intentions.

Apart from these considerations, it is also important to mention that there are different speech acts within the group of directives. In fact, Schmidt and Richards (1980) state that the class of directives includes speech acts such as requests, commands and suggestions, the main goal of which is to get the hearer to do something, although the force of the attempt can differ from one speech act to another. To this respect, Haverkate (1984) distinguishes between impositive and non-impositive directives. The former group includes most threatening acts, such as requesting, pleading and ordering, whereas non-impositive directives refer to suggestions and instructions. The main difference between these two groups involves the fact that the benefits obtained by carrying out an impositive speech act are exclusively for the speaker, whereas the objective of non-impositive speech acts is to benefit the hearers.

On the one hand, *requests* may be classified as impositive speech acts, since they consist of acts in which the speaker wants the hearer to perform an action that is going to benefit the speaker. On the other hand, *suggestions* are regarded as non-impositive speech acts in which the speaker's intention is to make the hearer perform an action that is going to benefit the hearer. When dealing with suggestions, it is also important to point out that we have regarded this speech act as a broader act that includes that of advice. This has been done considering that inclusive-we suggestions can imply benefits for both speaker and hearer, whereas a piece of advice is in the sole interest of the hearer (Edmonson & House, 1981). However, for the purposes of the pedagogical approach proposed, we will only deal with *non-inclusive we* suggestions (Koester, 2002), since we are interested in the fact that the hearer's action will exclusively benefit him/herself. The distinction between these two directive speech acts, therefore, is particularly important when elaborating our approach, since learners need to be aware of the fact that although both of them are face-threatening acts, a request or a suggestion should be made depending on the speaker's intention and the situational variables implied in the interactional exchange.

At this point, we would like to point out that in our pedagogical approach we do not deal with the peripheral modification devices (i.e., mitigation items) used to soften or intensify the threatening effect of the request or suggestion on the hearer. This decision has been taken on the basis of Z. Eslami-Rasekh, A. Eslami-Rasekh and Fatahi's (2004) suggestions about incorporating first the pragmalinguistic forms employed to make a speech act, and then gradually introducing the mitigating devices that accompany that speech act. For this reason, the main concern underlying the framework we present in this paper refers to the fact that learners should first become aware of those sociopragmatic factors that affect the appropriate choice of a given request or suggestion pragmalinguistic form. After that, a focus on the peripheral modification devices should be incorporated into the approach.

Proposals for Teaching Pragmatics in Instructed Settings

Within a foreign language setting, the integration of pragmatic competence is necessary, since exposure to authentic pragmatic input and chances to use it are very limited. Consequently, in order to deal with these drawbacks and considering the benefits that learners may obtain by receiving instruction on particular pragmatic aspects, several researchers have already proposed different techniques and activities to teach pragmatic competence in these settings (Olshtain & Cohen, 1991; Rose, 1994, 1997, 1999, 2001; Bardovi-Harlig, 1996; Kasper, 1997; Clennell, 1999; Judd, 1999; Bardovi-Harlig & Mahan-Taylor, 2003).

Olshtain and Cohen (1991) were the first authors to propose a framework with different steps for teaching speech acts. According to these authors, learners first need to be exposed to the most typical realization strategies of the particular speech act under study. After this presentation, they should be explained the factors that are involved in selecting one specific form rather than another, and finally they should be provided with opportunities to practice the use of the speech act. They should also be given the opportunity to express the differences noted between their mother tongue and the target language. Some of their suggested pedagogical practices have also been addressed by Judd (1999) in a framework that also involves several steps. According to this author, it is important to first relate the content of what is to be taught with learners' actual needs and then to expose them to the speech act that is the object of instruction. After that, learners should develop those skills that enable them to recognise the speech pattern within actual language use, and finally put all that knowledge into practice, first in controlled productive activities and later in free integrated activities.

Apart from these approaches, several techniques in the form of specific tasks have also been proposed for raising learners' awareness about different speech acts. These include the use of transcripts of naturally occurring conversations (Koester, 2002); the use of video (Rose, 1997, 2001; Grant & Starks, 2001; Washburn, 2001); what Bardovi-Harlig (1996) has termed *the culture puzzle* and *the classroom guest*; or the design of *the pragmatic consciousness-raising* technique proposed by Rose (1994, 1999). This technique, in particular, is based on an inductive approach in which learners first collect data in their mother tongue and, after becoming familiarized with the strategies employed for the specific speech act, then compare them with the target language. Similarly, Clennell (1999) and Crandall and Basturkmen (2004) also propose this type of data-collection activities to actively engage learners in tasks that may promote their pragmatic awareness. Moreover, learners need to be provided not only with consciousness-raising activities but also with opportunities for communicative practice (Kasper, 1997). Thus, among the tasks designed to involve learners in pragmatic production, those of role-play, simulation and drama have been most frequently recommended for use (Rose, 1994; Trosborg, 1995; Koester, 2002; Bardovi-Harlig & Mahan-Taylor, 2003; among many others).

As can be observed from this review of pedagogical approaches and techniques suggested by different scholars, a range of activities may be adopted in our teaching practices and adapted for our particular group of students. Specifically, it is desirable to integrate pragmatics into particular teaching syllabi by designing tailor-made lessons that include pragmatic aspects that are going to meet learners' needs, depending on the course they are attending in the University setting. Yates (2004), as an example, presents a sample of a lesson designed to help learners learn how to behave in a pragmatically appropriate way in workplace situations. Consequently, the goal of this paper is to present a comprehensive pedagogical framework to develop learners' pragmatic competence in the foreign language context and in the particular discipline of Tourism. To this end, we have designed an approach which includes a variety of tailor-made activities based on the speech acts of requesting and suggesting in order to gradually make learners pay attention to the importance of the contextual and sociopragmatic factors that affect which of the two speech acts has to be made and how.

Developing Pragmatics in the Foreign Language Classroom: The 6RS Approach

Our approach consists of six main central steps that we consider essential in any second language (L2) lesson in pragmatics. The name of each step starts with an R, which is why we have called it the *6Rs Approach*. Additionally, by numbering the steps from one to six, it also reminds us that the steps included in this pedagogical framework are to be applied to teaching sequentially (see Table 1).

Table 1. *Steps in the 6Rs Approach*

Pedagogical Framework	
Step 1:	**R**esearching
Step 2:	**R**eflecting
Step 3:	**R**eceiving
Step 4:	**R**easoning
Step 5:	**R**ehearsing
Step 6:	**R**evising
6Rs Approach	

Step 1. Researching Phase

To get started, lecturers should provide learners with a brief introduction about the nature of pragmatic competence. To do so, Rose (1999) suggests explaining to learners that there are two central elements of pragmatics to consider: pragmalinguistics and sociopragmatics. On the one hand, pragmalinguistics refers to the grammatical side of pragmatics and addresses the resources for conveying particular communicative acts. On the other hand, sociopragmatics refers to those social factors that qualify a linguistic act as being appropriate. According to Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness theory, there are three central social variables that qualify a linguistic form as being appropriate, namely those of i) social distance, i.e., the degree of familiarity between interlocutors; ii) power, i.e., the relative power of the speaker with reference to the speaker; and iii) degree of imposition, i.e., the type of imposition the speaker is forcing upon someone. At this stage, learners should be explicitly instructed on the nature of these two elements of pragmatics and on how the sociopragmatic ones determine the appropriateness of the linguistic forms selected by the speakers (see Appendix A for the information that may be discussed with the learners).

Once the concept of pragmatics has been introduced in class, the lecturer explains to the learners they are going to focus on the theory of speech acts (Austin, 1962) as a specific area within pragmatics, and particularly on the directive speech acts of requests and suggestions (Searle, 1976). Then, they are given a basic explanation of what these two speech acts imply (i.e., the fact that both constitute an attempt to get someone to perform an action for the benefit of the speaker, in the case of requests or for the benefit of the hearer, in the case of suggestions) as well as differences between them (i.e., the fact that requests may be classified as impositive speech acts and suggestions as non-impositive acts).

After this explanation, learners are asked to become *researchers* and collect naturally occurring requests and suggestions in their mother tongue (L1) (Rose, 1999). In order to do so, they are given a data-collection worksheet which includes the three sociopragmatic factors presented at the beginning of the lesson, i.e., social distance, power and imposition (see Table 2). Learners are told to write down information about at least five requests and five suggestions they hear or make in different contexts.

Table 2. L1 *Data-collection Worksheet*

L1 Data-collection Worksheet
Step 1. Add a given request/suggestion: …..
Step 2. Think about: 1. speakers' age and gender: ………………....................................... 2. role-relationship between the speaker and the addressee: .... 3. speakers' occupation: ………………………..………..…......... 4. speaker's intention: ..……..………..
Step 3. Provide a suitable context: ……….…………..............................

The purpose of this first step is twofold: i) to develop learners' understanding of why pragmatics and language teaching should go hand in hand; and ii) to develop learners' sensitivity to the speech acts of requesting and suggesting that they carry out naturally in their normal daily life (Olshtain & Cohen, 1991). Additionally, it is a way of arousing learners' interest in the topic to be taught.

Step 2. Reflecting Phase

In this second step, learners work on their own data as the starting point for the analysis and *reflect* on the two speech acts examined by answering basic awareness-raising questions posed by the lecturer. The questions deal with both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic issues (see Table 3).

Table 3. *Awareness-raising Questions Worksheet*

Awareness-raising Questions Worksheet
Pragmalinguistic questions: - How many forms (i.e., head acts) did you find for each speech act? - Could you organise these head acts according to different types? - Did you find a higher variety of different forms for requests or for suggestions? - Have you found any differences between these two speech acts? If so, which?
Sociopragmatic questions: - Which different request/suggestion forms have you found depending on the degree of familiarity that exists between the speakers? - Which different request/suggestion forms have you found depending on the speaker's power over the hearer? - Which different forms have you found depending on the degree of imposition involved in the particular speech act (i.e., request/suggestion)? - Are factors such as age or gender important when selecting a particular request/suggestion form?

Learners are given the above worksheet and asked to analyze their own L1 samples by answering the awareness-raising questions. After this individual analysis, they are encouraged to compare their data with their partners in order to gain access to a wider sample and to get them think further about how requests and suggestions are made in their L1 and how sociolinguistic factors affect the appropriate selection of strategies for both speech acts. Furthermore, by analyzing a large sample of situations, learners can discover that there is no direct correspondence between a linguistic form and a particular function, since in many cases an utterance that appears to be a suggestion is a request or vice-versa, and so context is vital to be able to interpret the speaker's intention. In fact, this multifunctionality of utterances has been regarded as an essential component of pragmatic competence (Thomas, 1995; Rose, 1999).

The purpose of this second step, then, is also twofold: i) to make learners aware of the important role that social factors play when selecting a particular strategy; and ii) to be aware of the fact that a given utterance can have many functions depending on the speaker's intention.

Step 3. Receiving Phase

Having reflected on their L1 data, learners *receive* explicit instruction on the pragmalinguistic forms employed for making requests and suggestions in English as the L2. We believe that Trosborg's (1995) proposed taxonomy for requests and Martínez-Flor's (2005) taxonomy for suggestions suit our purposes concerning the provision of the appropriate strategies for performing both speech acts, since they have been elaborated on previous research in the field of ILP (see Appendix B).

These two taxonomies fall into the three main categories of direct, conventionally indirect and indirect linguistic realizations. Direct forms for requests and suggestions include performatives, imperatives and expressions implying obligation; conventionally indirect forms are those routinized expressions denoting polite behavior which may be either speaker or hearer-oriented for requests and hearer-based for suggestions; and, finally, indirect forms or hints imply opaque language use.

Once learners have been presented with all these forms, they are asked to compare them with those found out in their L1 and discuss whether they had already distributed the L1 forms for both speech acts in a similar way. This comparison is essential to make learners notice the similarities and differences between both languages. Regarding similarities, learners may come to realize that strategies can be distributed along an increasing scale of directness in both languages, whereas some differences learners can find out involve the fact that their L1 strategies may not always be exactly transferable to those employed in English as an L2. In fact, research has showed that L1 pragmalinguistic competence may affect the production of different pragmatic features in L2 when negative pragmatic transfer occurs (Kasper, 1992; House & Kasper, 1987; Maeshiba et al., 1996, among others). Consequently, learners need to be aware of this fact in order to avoid possible misunderstandings in the L2.

The purpose of this third step is to exclusively instruct learners in all possible linguistic forms for the speech acts of requesting and suggesting so as to further widen the scope of strategies presented in textbooks. Research in the field has demonstrated that this sort of material does not represent real language use (Crandall & Basturkmen, 2004), since many of the course books just give the conventionally indirect forms as alternatives without being ranked in any way (Salazar & Usó, 2001, 2002). These typical conventionally indirect forms are those of ability (i.e., *can you …?, could you …?* in the case of requests, and *you can …, you should …* in the case of suggestions). However, having learners' being exclusively exposed to these particular pragmalinguistic forms restricts them from employing other expressions used in real life exchanges. Once learners know all these speech act realization strategies, we then focus on the sociopragmatic factors that affect their appropriateness of use.

Step 4. Reasoning Phase

At this stage, learners are involved in three different types of awareness-raising activities (Kasper, 1997; Bardovi-Harlig & Mahan-Taylor, 2003) that make them *reason* and understand how the form that a speech act takes may depend on the three sociopragmatic factors discussed in Step 1 (i.e., social distance, power, and imposition) as well as the speaker's intention and the setting. Each awareness-raising task, in turn, has a different purpose. The first task aims to widen the scope of request/suggestion strategies offered to the learners in textbooks. For this purpose, learners are asked to read a language situation and four requests/three suggestions which are presented according to a scale of increasing directness (see Example 1 for a situation depicting a suitable context for a request and Example 2 for a suggestion). Students then have to rank the suggested answers from the most appropriate (4, for requests; 3 for suggestions) to the least appropriate (1) in each situation.

Example 1
Situation: You are the duty manager at the Inn Hotel. A regular client staying in the Inn Hotel phones you to ask you whether you could do something about the service in the hotel and explains to you that he ordered breakfast from Room Service half an hour ago, but his breakfast still hasn't come. The client is in a hurry because he has an important meeting at nine o'clock and the time is 8.15. You call Room Service to deal with the situation yourself. You say:

Possible answers (ranging from indirect to direct):

a. *Are you short-staffed in the kitchen this morning?* […...]
b. *Could you send breakfast to room 223?* [……]
c. *I would like you to send breakfast to room 223 right away.* […....]
d. *Send breakfast to room 223 immediately, and fast…!* [……]

Example 2
Situation: You are a receptionist in a luxury hotel. A businessman comes as a guest. He is extremely tired as there has been a delay in his flight, he then had a three-hour drive by car. All he wants to do is to find the room he reserved, and have a nice shower and a rest. After checking in he realizes that he has left his hand luggage in the car which is in the hotel car park. You say:

Possible answers (ranging from indirect to direct):

a. *There is a bell boy in the hotel. Don't worry.* [……]
b. *Why don't you go to your room? The bell boy will bring it to your room.* […....]
c. *I suggest that you tell the bell boy to collect it.* [……]

The second task aims at eliciting learners' metapragmatic discourse. To get that aim, learners read a language situation in which a possible request (see Example 3) or suggestion (see Example 4) has already been provided. After reading these situations, they are asked to rate which they believe is the level of suitability of the request/suggestion and give the reason why they provided that particular rating.

Example 3
Situation: You work in a travel agency. You have just answered the phone and need to note down some specific details about a tour that a client is asking you for. You do not have a pen at hand and need to borrow one from a co-worker (and close friend). You say:
Request: Would you mind if I borrow your pen?
Rating:
completely appropriate 5–4–3–2–1 very unsatisfactory
Reason: …………………………………… ……………...

Example 4
Situation: You are a car rental clerk. A couple with a two-year-old child wants to rent a car with a baby seat for three days. All cars are insured through the rental contract. However, this standard contract does not cover the damage you may cause to the rented car. This damage is covered by the Collision Damage Waiver (CDW) option at a very low extra fee. The policy of the company is to offer the baby seat for free if clients take full insurance. You say:
Suggestion: I recommend the CDW option, so you can have the baby seat for free.
Rating:
completely appropriate 5–4–3–2–1 very unsatisfactory
Reason: ….……………………………….………….............

The third awareness-raising task makes learners pay conscious attention to the importance of context when choosing an appropriate request/suggestion form as well as when deciding the function of a given utterance. With that aim in mind, the lecturer provides learners with a list of mixed requests and suggestions collected from naturally-occurring interactions among English native speakers (Yates, 2003). Then learners are asked to elicit the most appropriate context by considering the three sociopragmatic factors explained in Step 2 and to state the function of the utterance by taking that context into account (see Table 4). Once the context has been provided and the function of the utterance decided, the lecturer should explain the actual context in which all utterances were found to the learners and discuss whether learners' answers are likely to be appropriate or not and why.

Table 4. *Path to a Suitable Context for a Given Request/suggestion Form*

Worksheet: **Path to a Suitable Context for a Given Request/suggestion Form**
Step 1. Add the given utterance: ....
Step 2. Think about: 1. role-relationship between the speaker and the addressee: ..... 2. speakers' occupation: ……………………………............. 3. speaker's intention: ………………………………............ 4. setting: ………………………………………………........
Step 3. Provide a suitable context taking into account the sociopragmatic factors described in step 2: ....
Step 4. Is the utterance a request or a suggestion? …....................

Throughout the process of completing these three awareness-raising tasks, a comparison with learners' L1 should be encouraged by the lecturer. By means of this comparison, learners may discover whether the sociopragmatic factors of social distance, power and imposition are weighted differently in their L1 and L2 cultures.

All three activities provided in this phase are merely examples of the type of practice that can be carried out with the learners to increasingly raise their pragmatic awareness. The important thing to remember is that learners need to be exposed to a variety of contrasting situations with differing sociolinguistic features in order to become more aware of how differing situations affect the linguistic pattern that a request or suggestion can take (Judd, 1999).

Step 5. Rehearsing Phase

Having become familiar with the linguistic manifestations for conveying the speech acts of requesting and suggesting in English as L2, together with their sociopragmatic features, learners are ready to *rehearse* all that knowledge in production activities. The decision to include this phase at this stage of the approach was made on the basis of Kasper's (1997) suggestions to engage learners in communicative practice after being involved in awareness-raising activities. Therefore, at this step, learners are provided with two different types of production activities: controlled and free (Judd, 1999). We believe it is a good idea to start off with controlled activities to first guide learners in the completion of the task and then let them experience with free activities. Moreover, we would like to add the importance of dealing with two different modes of production activities: oral and written.

Controlled Oral and Written Production Tasks

An example of a controlled oral production task involves the use of the video or digital video (DVD). The lecturer selects two different scenes from a film in which characters are interacting in two situations either depicting a suitable context for a request or a suggestion. In the moment the speech acts are elicited, the video scene is paused and learners are required to complete a video worksheet to help them in thinking about the request/suggestion realization form that is likely to take place between the interlocutors (see Table 5). Regarding the selection of the film itself, it is advisable to choose films which address cultural values in order to facilitate the development of learners' intercultural competence as a basic component to foster L2 learners' full communicative competence (Byram, 1997; Cortazzi & Jin, 1999; Meier, 2003).

Table 5. *Video Worksheet*

Video Worksheet			
Step 1. Circle the option you think it is appropriate:			
1. Speakers' social distance:	close	distant	very distant
2. Speakers' power:	S* > H**	S = H	S < H
3. Speaker's imposition:	low	mild	high
Step 2. Provide the context where the characters are interacting:			
Step 3. Provide additional aspects regarding their non-verbal behavior (tone of voice, body language, attitudinal behavior, facial expressions, and so on):			

Note: * S=Speaker; **H=Hearer

Having reflected on the two particular situations watched in the video scenes, learners are asked to work in pairs and act out as a role-play how they think the two conversations are likely to follow. For the purposes of engaging learners in an observation task, the whole class is divided into two groups: group 1 and group 2. Learners in group 1 are assigned to continue the scene in which a request is required and those in group 2 to continue the scene in which a suggestion is required. After that, a volunteer pair from each group performs their dialogue in front of the class. During this performance, the rest of the learners are asked to complete an observation worksheet to judge the appropriateness of the speech acts elicited (see Table 6).

Table 6. *Class Observation Worksheet*

Class Observation Worksheet
Step 1. Focus on pragmalinguistic features - Which linguistic form has been employed to make the request/ suggestion?
Step 2. Focus on sociopragmatic features - If the same role-play was performed: Compare this particular realization form with yours and think which one is more appropriate for the given situation. - If the same role-play was not performed: Think whether the request/suggestion elicited is appropriate for the situation.
Step 3. Focus on the goals of both speech acts - What are the differences between making each speech act in terms of who receives the benefits of the action?

After each learner has worked on this sheet individually, the two video scenes are played again from the beginning to the end. Thus, learners can watch the whole scene paying attention to which speech act, either a request or a suggestion, has been employed in the film and compare it with the one they have produced. This comparison is followed by a general class discussion.

The advantage of activities such as this one, in which the video or DVD is the basis of a lesson in pragmatics, is that learners are provided with opportunities to observe and analyze pragmatic language use within natural discourse (Rose, 1997, 2001; Washburn, 2001). Moreover, learners are provided with authentic data as well as non-verbal elements absent in the recorded material presented in many textbooks (Henessey, 1995; Canning-Wilson, 2000). Furthermore, the design of activities before and after having employed the video may provide learners with the three conditions for SLA, namely those of input, output and feedback.

Additionally, if class time allows, an interesting follow-up activity may require learners to perform the same role-play again but this time the situational variables (i.e., social distance, power and imposition) should be diametrically opposed to the ones watched in the film and already acted out. The purpose of this follow-up activity is to gradually enable learners to practise the use of the speech acts of requesting and suggesting in different situations and with a variety of interlocutors (Judd, 1999).

Focusing now on the written mode, an example of a controlled production task involves sending emails. In this activity, learners are asked to read the contextual information of two contrasting settings that vary in terms of the sociopragmatic factors involved in them. The first setting implies sending an email to a friend (close social distance and equal power) and the speech act to be made involves a low degree of imposition (see Example 5). In contrast, the second setting presents the opposite sociopragmatic factors, that is, it implies sending an email to a person of higher social distance and power (i.e., a hotel manager) and the speech act to be made involves a high degree of imposition (see Example 6).

Example 5

Contextual Information	You send an email to a friend who works in a **Travel Agency**

Request
Situation: It is Wednesday and you are travelling to London on Friday at 9.00 in the morning to visit a friend who is studying there. Your friend is picking you up at the airport and needs to know the arrival timetable of your flight. You look at your flight ticket to try to find that information but it doesn't say. You send an email to the Travel Agent, a close friend of yours, who made the flight reservation to get that information.

To: pantini@travelagency.es
Subject: (subject code) + (students' first name)

Suggestion
Situation: Last week you just popped in to see a friend who works in a small Travel Agency and you realized that the shop window was in a complete mess, i.e., notices were not updated and the package tours offered were not appealing. You send an email to the Travel Agent, a close friend of yours, giving her ideas about how to make the shop window more attractive to clients.

To: pantini@travelagency.es
Subject: (subject code) + (students' first name)

Example 6

Contextual Information	You send an email to the hotel manager of a luxury **hotel** where you stayed last weekend

Request
Situation: Last week you stayed in a luxury hotel in Edinburgh and the room you stayed in was very nicely decorated. In particular you liked a picture that had been painted by an artist who has already died. After coming back from your holidays you have visited different decoration shops looking for a picture with a similar style, but you have not found any. You send an email to the Manager Director of the hotel telling him about your intention to buy the picture and, therefore, asking him for information about the possible price of the picture and conditions.

To: rucolo@edimhotel.uk
Subject: (subject code) + (students' first name)

Suggestion
Situation: Last week you stayed in a luxury hotel in Edinburgh and you enjoyed the stay very much. The hotel facilities in rooms were very good, the hotel was extremely tidy and pleasant, and there was a wide variety of food to choose from in the restaurant. However, each time you rang reception asking for something, you had to wait more than three rings before the phone was picked up. After coming back from your holidays you think about how much you liked the hotel, apart from this inconvenience. You send an email to the Hotel Manager giving him ideas about how to improve this and other hotel services.

To: rucolo@edimhotel.uk
Subject: (subject code) + (students' first name)

For each setting, learners are presented with two different situations that elicit either a request or a suggestion. Learners are not given this information, so they are first asked to think which speech act they should provide in each situation and then send the email. It is also important to mention that in order to make this task as authentic as possible, two different email addresses are created so that learners send their emails to two different addressees (i.e., to a friend in Example 5, and to a hotel manager in Example 6). Thus, the advantage of this activity is that learners' pragmatic production is elicited in a more realistic way since sending emails is nowadays a routine part of their everyday lives (Mach & Ridder, 2003; Biesenbach-Lucas, 2005).

The overall purpose of these oral and written controlled activities is to engage learners in a series of contrasting situations with differing situational variables that may affect the appropriate choice of the forms that the speech acts of request and suggestion can take. As learners become more aware of this fact, the lecturer's guidance in those aspects should be avoided so as to allow them to experience with free activities.

Free Oral and Written Production Tasks

Following Judd (1999), free production tasks are those in which the lecturer sets up activities that are close to real-life and do not require much instruction, so that occasions for generating the speech act under study will naturally arise. This type of tasks serves to observe whether learners have, in fact, acquired the pragmatic knowledge to appropriately use the speech act under study. For this to happen, Judd (1999) suggests scenarios like students' pretending to be at a business meeting, at a social get-together or in the class. We fully agree with Judd (1999) that the final aim of an instructional approach on speech acts is to get learners to use the speech acts appropriately when embedded within natural conversations. However, we believe that the scenarios he suggests are still artificial and, in this sense, we suggest devising activities that come even closer to real language use. We think that, for the elaboration of these activities, it is important to take into account the context in which the language learning class takes places, that is, whether it is an ESL or an EFL context.

In an ESL context, the English language is used for at least some of the students' day-to day activities and, therefore, opportunities for language practice are greater. In this sense, students are able to perform face-to-face communicative activities such as the one presented in Example 7.

> Example 7
> Conduct a customer survey in a busy rail way station / bus station / airport to find out why people travel and more details about their journeys. If you obtain explicit permission from all participants, record the conversation, transcribe it and hand this in to your lecturer. For transcribing the conversation use the standard code provided by the lecturer.

This sort of task involves learners in authentic face-to-face situations where they can interact with native speakers of English and notice the real use of the speech acts in specific situations. However, similar opportunities are scarce in an EFL environment where English is not commonly spoken. For this reason, it is necessary to create the possibility of engaging EFL learners in situations that are as real as possible. A suitable option nowadays is the use of new technologies, such as computer networks. This kind of resource is known as Computer-Mediated Communication (CMC), and it can be regarded as a type of activity close to real-life. The exchange of information in CMC can be synchronous (i.e., real time) or asynchronous (i.e., at different times). For the purposes of designing free activities for EFL contexts, we suggest the use of CMC synchronous communication, since it comes closer to daily life communication than asynchronous interaction and learners' contributions may be more spontaneous. In order to implement the use of CMC communication in the EFL classroom, lecturers have to first establish a contact with other lecturers from English-speaking countries who are also interested in developing a CMC project with their learners (see the studies conducted by Belz, 2002; Belz & Kinginger, 2002, 2003; Kinginger, 2000). Having established the contact, learners are then explained how to contact the English-speaking learners and they are assigned the task to be done (see Example 8).

> Example 8
> For a period of a month you are going to establish communication with other English-speaking students (*full details about the other learners need to be provided*). You have to get to know your new friends and address topics you have in common. After this one-month period you will give the lecturer a hard copy of all conversations you have maintained with your English-speaking partners.

The purpose of these free activities is to engage learners in a series of communicative practices where a natural use of the speech acts can take place. Moreover, the underlying assumption under this *rehearsing* step is to promote learners' pragmatic competence by engaging them in a kind of activities which allow them increasing experience in close to real-life situations. Similarly, given the fact that learners have the opportunity to interact with learners from other cultural communities, an added purpose in this phase is to help learners develop their intercultural competence as an important element that will foster their full communicative competence.

Step 6. Revising Phase

Finally, lecturers have to *revise* the outcome of the free activities assigned in Step 5 and provide feedback related to their participation on either the face-to-face learners' conversations with native speakers of English (in an ESL environment) or the learners' participations in CMC with native English learners (in the EFL environment). In ESL settings, the lecturer's feedback is based on the transcriptions of the recorded conversations, whereas learners' hard copies of their synchronous conversations with the English-speaking learners are the basis for lecturer's revision in the EFL context. In our opinion, such feedback on learners' participation and further discussion about all aspects covered during the whole approach is necessary to help learners gain a full mastery of the use and appropriate behavior of the speech acts of requesting and suggesting in the L2.

Concluding Remarks and Future Research

The 6Rs Approach we have presented in this paper consists of a comprehensive pedagogical framework designed to develop learners' pragmatic competence in the EFL classroom. It aims at providing language lecturers with a pedagogical tool that may help them to incorporate pragmatics in their teaching practice to allow learners' full communicative success. Thus, by integrating such an approach within the EFL curricula, learners may be provided with the three necessary conditions for the acquisition of their pragmatic ability in the target language (i.e., exposure to authentic input, opportunities for practice and feedback from both their peers and the lecturer).

It would now be interesting to analyze learners' individual differences when implementing the proposed framework, since it has been claimed (Kasper & Rose, 2002) that particular individual variables, such as age, gender, motivation, social and psychological distance, may affect both learners' awareness and production of their pragmatic knowledge. Consequently, future studies that focus on the relationship between these individual variables and their pragmatic development are called for.

Appendices

Appendix A

Sociopragmatic Factors

Factors	Explanation	Politeness Effect
▪ *Social distance*	It refers to the degree of familiarity that exists between the speakers (e.g. Travel Agent – Customer, do they know each other?).	Social distance increases ↓ politeness increases
▪ *Power*	It refers to the relative power of a speaker with respect to the hearer (e.g. Hotel Manager – Receptionist, rank within a company).	Power increases ↓ politeness increases
▪ *Imposition*	It refers to the type of imposition the speaker is forcing someone to do (e.g. to borrow money versus to borrow a pen).	Imposition is great ↓ politeness increases

Appendix B

Pragmalinguistic Forms

Request Realization Strategies
(1) Indirect: -Hints: *Statement*
(2) Conventionally indirect (hearer-based): -Ability: *Could you …? / Can you ….?* -Willingness: *Would you …?* -Permission: *May I …?* -Suggestory formulae: *How about …?*
(3) Conventionally indirect (speaker-based): -Wishes: *I would like …* -Desires/needs: *I want/need you to …* -Obligation: *You must … / You have to …*
(4) Direct: -Performatives: *I ask you to …* -Imperatives: *Lend me your car* -Elliptical phrase: *Your car*

Note: Based on Trosborg (1995).

Suggestion Realization Strategies
(1) Indirect: -Impersonal: *It would be a good idea to … / It would be helpful if you … / It might be better to …* -Hints: *I've heard that …*
(2) *Conventionalized forms:* -Specific formulae: *Why don't you…?/How about…?/Have you thought about …?* (interrogative forms) -Possibility/Probability: *You can/could … / You may/might …* -Should/ought to: *You should …* -Conditional: *If I were you, I would …* -Need: *You need …*
(3) Direct: -Performatives: *I suggest that you …/ I recommend you …* -Noun of suggestion: *My suggestion would be …* -Imperative: *Try using* -Negative imperative: *Don't try to …*

Note: Based on Martínez-Flor (2005).

References

Alcón, E., & Martínez-Flor, A. (2005). Pragmatics in instructed language learning [Special Issue]. *System*, *33*(3).

Bachman, L. F. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (1996). Pragmatics and language teaching: Bringing pragmatics and pedagogy together. In L. F. Bouton (Ed.), *Pragmatics and language learning*, *7* (pp. 21-39). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2001). Empirical evidence of the need for instruction in pragmatics. In K. R. Rose, & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 13-32). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Mahan-Taylor, R. (2003). *Teaching Pragmatics*. Washington DC: U.S. Department of State Office of English Language Programs. Available online at http://exchanges.state.gov/education/engteaching/pragmatics.htm

Belz, J. A. (2002). Social dimension of telecollaborative foreign language study. *Language Learning & Technology*, *6*(1), 60-81.

Belz, J. A., & Kinginger, C. (2002). The cross-linguistic development of address form use in telecollaborative language learning: Two case studies. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, *59*(2).

Belz, J. A., & Kinginger, C. (2003). Discourse options and the development of pragmatic competence by classroom learners of German: The case of address forms. *Language Learning, 53*(4), 591-647.

Biesenbach-Lucas, S. (2005). Communication topics and strategies in e-mail consultation: Comparison between American and international University students. *Language Learning & Technology, 9*(2), 24-46.

Brown, P. & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Byram, M. (1997). Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Canale, M. (1983). From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy. In J. C. Richards, & R. W. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and communication* (pp. 2-27). London: Longman.

Canale, M. & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, *1*, 1-47.

Canning-Wilson, C. (2000). Practical aspects of using video in the foreign language classroom. *The Internet TESL Journal, 6(*11).

Celce-Murcia, M., Dörnyei, Z., & Thurrell, S. (1995). Communicative competence: A pedagogically motivated model with content specifications. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, *6*, 5-35.

Clennell, C. (1999). Promoting pragmatic awareness and spoken discourse skills with EAP classes. *ELT Journal*, *53*(2), 83-91.

Cortazzi, M., & Jin, L. (1999). Cultural mirrors. Materials and methods in the EFL classroom. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Culture in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 196-219). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crandall, E., & Basturkmen, H. (2004). Evaluating pragmatics-focused materials. *ELT Journal*, *58*(1), 38-49.

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

Edmonson, W., & House, J. (1981). *Let's talk and talk about it. A pedagogic interactional grammar of English*. München, Wien, & Baltimore: Urban & Schwarzenberg.

Eslami-Rasekh, Z., Eslami-Rasekh, A., & Fatahi, A. (2004). The effect of explicit metapragmatic instruction on the speech act awareness of advanced EFL students. *TESL-EJ, 8*(2), 1–12. Available online at http://www-writing.berkeley.edu/TESL-EJ/ej30/a2.html

Grant, L., & Starks, D. (2001). Screening appropriate teaching materials. Closings from textbooks and television soap operas. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, *39*, 39-50.

Haverkate, H. (1984). *Speech acts, speakers and hearers. Pragmatics and beyond 4*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Company.

Henessey, J. M. (1995). Using foreign films to develop proficiency and to motivate the foreign language student. *Foreign Language Annals*, *28*, 116-20.

House, J., & Kasper, G. (1987). Interlanguage pragmatics: Requesting in a foreign language. In W. Lörscher, & R. Schulze (Eds.) *Perspectives on language performance, 2. Festschrift for Werner Hullen* (pp. 1250-1288). Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.

Hymes, D. H. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride, & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 269-293). Baltimore: Penguin Books.

Judd, E. L. (1999). Some issues in the teaching of pragmatic competence. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Culture in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 152-166). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kasper, G. (1992). Pragmatic transfer. *Second Language Research*, *8*, 203-231.

Kasper, G. (1997). Can pragmatic competence be taught? *NetWork, 6*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii, Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center. Available online at http://www.nflrc.hawaii.edu/NetWorks/NW06/

Kasper, G. (2000). Data collection in pragmatics research. In H. Spencer-Oatey (Ed.), *Culturally speaking. Managing rapport through talk across cultures* (pp. 316-341). London and New York: Continuum.

Kasper, G. (2001). Classroom research on interlanguage pragmatics. In K. R. Rose, & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 33-60). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kasper, G., & Rose, K. R. (1999). Pragmatics and SLA. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *19*, 81-104.

Kasper, G., & Rose, K. R. (2002). *Pragmatic development in a second language* (Language Learning Monograph Series). Oxford: Blackwell.

Kinginger, C. (2000). Learning the pragmatics of solidarity in the networked foreign language classroom. In J. K. Hall, & L. S. Verplaetse (Eds.), *Second and foreign language learning through classroom interaction* (pp. 23-46). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Koester, A. J. (2002). The performance of speech acts in workplace conversations and the teaching of communicative functions. *System*, *30*, 167-184.

Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics.* London: Longman.

Mach, T., & Ridder, S. (2003). E-Mail requests. In K. Bardovi-Harlig, & R. Mahan-Taylor (Eds.), *Teaching Pragmatics*. Washington DC: U.S. Department of State Office of English Language Programs. Available online at http://exchanges.state.gov/education/engteaching/pragmatics.htm

Maeshiba, N., Yoshinaga, N., Kasper, G., & Ross, S. (1996). Transfer and proficiency in interlanguage apologizing. In S. M. Gass, & J. Neu (Eds.) *Speech acts across cultures* (pp. 155-187). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Martínez-Flor, A. (2005). A theoretical review of the speech act of suggesting: Towards a taxonomy for its use in FLT. *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses*, *18*, 167-187.

Martínez-Flor, A., Usó-Juan, E., & Fernández-Guerra, A. (Eds.) (2003). *Pragmatic competence and foreign language teaching*. Castellón, Spain: Servei de Publicacions de la Universitat Jaume I.

Meier, A. J. (2003). Posting the banns: A marriage of pragmatics and culture in foreign and second language pedagogy and beyond. In A. Martínez-Flor, E. Usó-Juan, & A. Fernández-Guerra (Eds.), Pragmatic Competence and Foreign Language Teaching (pp. 185-210). Castellón, Spain: Servei de Publicacions de la Universitat Jaume I.

Olshtain, E., & Cohen, A. D. (1991). Teaching speech act behavior to nonnative speakers. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp. 154-165). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Rose, K. R. (1994). Pragmatic consciousness-raising in an EFL context. In L. F. Bouton, & Y. Kachru (Eds.), *Pragmatics and language learning*, *5* (pp. 52-63). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Rose, K. R. (1997). Pragmatics in the classroom: Theoretical concerns and practical possibilities. In L. F. Bouton (Ed.), *Pragmatics and language learning*, *8* (pp. 267-295). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Rose, K. R. (1999). Teachers and students learning about requests in Hong Kong. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Culture in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 167-180). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rose, K. R. (2001). Compliments and compliment responses in film: Implications for pragmatics research and language teaching. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, *39*, 309-326.

Rose, K. R., & Kasper, G. (Eds.) (2001). *Pragmatics in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rose, K. R., & Ng Kwai-fun, C. (2001). Inductive and deductive approaches to teaching compliments and compliment responses. In K. R. Rose, & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 145-170). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ryan, S. (1998). Using films to develop learner motivation. *The Internet TESL Journal*, *6*(11).

Salazar, P., & Usó-Juan, E. (2001). The speech act of requesting in ESP materials: An example based on Tourism course books. In S. Posteguillo, I. Fortanet, & J. C. Palmer (Eds.), *Methodology and new technologies in language for specific purposes* (pp. 95-105). Castelló: Servei de Publicacions de la Universitat Jaume I.

Salazar, P., & Usó-Juan, E. (2002). The presentation of pragmatics in current Tourism texts: The speech acts of suggesting and advising. In F. Luttikhuizen (Ed.), *V Congrés Internacional sobre Llengües per a Finalitats Específiques: Actes.* [Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Languages for Specific Purposes] (pp. 311-318). Canet de Mar: Universitat de Barcelona.

Searle, J. R. (1976). The classification of illocutionary acts. *Language in Society*, *5*, 1-24.

Schmidt, R., & Richards, J. (1980). Speech acts and second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, *1*, 129-157.

Thomas, J. (1983). Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. *Applied Linguistics*, *4*, 91-112.

Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in interaction. An introduction to pragmatics*. New York: Longman.

Trosborg, A. (1995). *Interlanguage pragmatics. Requests, complaints and apologies.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Washburn, G. N. (2001). Using situation comedies for pragmatic language teaching and learning. *TESOL Journal*, *10*(4), 21-26.

Yates, L. (2003). Softening short requests. In K. Bardovi-Harlig, & R. Mahan-Taylor (Eds.), *Teaching Pragmatics*. Washington DC: U.S. Department of State Office of English Language Programs. Available online at http://exchanges.state.gov/education/engteaching/pragmatics.htm

Yates, L. (2004). The "secret rules of language": Tackling pragmatics in the classroom. *Prospect: Journal of Australian TESOL*, *19*(1), 3-21.

Acknowledgements

This study is part of a research project funded by (a) the Spanish *Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia* (HUM2004-04435/FILO), co-funded by FEDER, and (b) *Fundació Universitat Jaume I* and *Caixa Castelló-Bancaixa* (P1.1B2004-34).

Authors

ALICIA MARTINEZ-FLOR, lecturer, English Studies Department, Universitat Jaume I, Castellón (Spain). Research interests: development of learners' pragmatic competence in the classroom setting, teachability of pragmatics, second language acquisition, and foreign language learning and teaching.

ESTHER USO-JUAN, lecturer, English Studies Department, Universitat Jaume I, Castellón (Spain). Research interests: second language acquisition, interlanguage pragmatics, and EFL reading.

Communication Strategies
Applied Language Learning
2006, Vol. 16, No 1, pp. 65-82

Communication Strategies in the Foreign Language Classroom

Tony Houston
University of Missouri-Rolla

The focus of the present study is to examine the communication strategies used my learners and teachers in the foreign language classroom. The data is from introductory Spanish classrooms at the university level. The author analyzed the data for instances of communications strategies according to taxonomy developed for ESL studies. Important differences emerged between ESL and FL strategy use, many of which are attributable to the fact that ESL learners do not share a common first language (L1) as FL learners most often do. Communication strategies, by definition, occur only when there is meaning to be conveyed. Meaningful communication, therefore, is a prerequisite for their use. Avoidance and borrowing strategies circumvent target language use and, therefore, do not demonstrate strategic competence. The data from the present study illustrate the importance of conducting classes exclusively in the target language (L2) and creating opportunities for meaningful communication for developing strategic competence.

The data from the present study was analyzed by four researchers from four perspectives. The analysis was presented at a panel discussion on the nature of Foreign Language (FL) classroom discourse. In describing the nature of communication in foreign language classrooms, it is important to examine the communication strategies that learners use when their communicative needs exceed the limits of their grammatical competence. The ability to sustain communication when communicative demands exceed linguistic capacity is generally referred to as strategic competence. (Swain and Lapkin, 1981; Savignon, 1997; Tarone, 1981; 1984). Strategic competence allows the learner to negotiate meaning, and to sustain negotiation when a given form is either not present or not accessible in the learner's system. Tarone (1984) observes that "street learners" often excel in strategic competence before they have developed native-like control of grammar. Swain and Lapkin (1981) have observed that immersion students also excel in strategic competence. For learners in the foreign language classroom, who have less exposure to target language input than "street learners," opportunities to develop strategic competence are more limited.

Opportunities to develop strategic competence are limited by the nature of much of classroom discourse. In order for learners to develop strategic competence, they must have opportunities to negotiate meaning. Much of the interaction that characterizes the second language classroom, however, is teacher-fronted discourse. Research has demonstrated that teacher-fronted activities provide few opportunities for the expression and negotiation of meaning (Brooks 1990, Leeman Guthrie 1984). In contrast, small-group work yields far more negotiation of meaning without sacrificing efficiency in terms of the amount of material "covered" (Roulon and McCreary 1986). Opportunities to negotiate real meaning in the target language allow learners to develop the strategic competence that will serve them in their subsequent interactions with monolingual speakers of the target language. The present study seeks to describe strategy use in the language as a partial description of the nature of classroom interaction. Recommendations are offered as to how instructors might better exploit opportunities for strategy use.

Background

Tarone's (1980) defines a communication strategy as "a mutual attempt of two interlocutors to agree on a meaning in situations where requisite meaning is not shared." Tarone (1981) characterizes strategy use according to the following conditions:

1. The speaker desires to communicate meaning x to a listener.
2. The speaker believes the linguistic or sociolinguistic structure desired to communicate x is unavailable, or is not shared with the listener.
3. The speaker chooses to do one of the following:
   a. avoid - that is, not attempt to communicate meaning x; or
   b. attempt alternate means to communicate meaning x. The speaker stops trying alternatives when it seems clear to the speaker that there is shared meaning.

This characterization of strategy use identifies two necessary conditions under which communication strategies may be observed, (1) the transmission of meaning and (2) the real or imagined inadequacy of the speaker's (or listener's) linguistic system to meet the communicative demand of a given situation. From the learner's perspective, a communication problem generally arises when a form is "unavailable." From the instructor's perspective, a communication problem arises when a form is "not shared with the listener." Thus, although instructors can be expected to use strategies to make themselves understood to learners, they are less likely to use strategies to compensate for deficiencies in their own linguistic systems.

Although the above characterization is sufficiently broad to encompass strategy use by instructors as well as learners, Tarone (1984) defines communication strategies only in terms of what learners do. Consider the following taxonomy:

1. Avoidance
   a. Topic avoidance. The learner simply tries not to talk about concepts for which the target language structure is not known.
   b. Message abandonment. The learner begins to talk about a concept but cannot continue and stops in mid utterance.
2. Paraphrase
   a. Approximation. The learner uses a single target language vocabulary item or structure, which the learner knows is not correct, but which shares enough semantic features in common with the desired item to satisfy the speaker (e.g., use of superordinate term: pipe for waterpipe; use of analogy: like an octopus).

b. Word coinage: The learner makes up a new word or phrase in order to communicate a desired concept (e.g., airball for balloon).

c. Circumlocution. The learner describes the properties of the object or action instead of using the appropriate target language item or structure (e.g., "It's oval and shiny," "She is, uh smoking something...that's Persian.")

3. Borrowing

a. Literal translation. The learner translates word-for-word from the native language (e.g., "he invites him to drink" for "They toast each other".

b. Language mix. The learner uses the native language term without bothering to translate (e.g., Turkish tirtil for caterpillar).

4. Appeal for assistance. The learner asks for the correct term (e.g., "what is this? What called?).

5. Mime. The learner uses nonverbal tactics in place of a lexical item or action (e.g., clapping one's hands to illustrate applause), or to accompany another communication strategy (e.g., "It's about this long.").

Of the strategies identified by Tarone (1984), native-speakers tend to use paraphrase strategies, such as circumlocution and approximation, to resolve communication problems. Thus, a comparison of strategy use by instructors and learners should demonstrate more use of paraphrase strategies by instructors. The initial reaction of ESL learners to communication problems is avoidance (Tarone and Yule, 1983). Avoidance is not considered a desirable strategy, since it does not lead to "communication of intended meaning or development of resources for subsequent communication problems" (Tarone, 1984). Recommendations for developing strategic competence generally reflect an emphasis on the paraphrase strategies that characterize native speakers. Both Tarone (1984) and Lee and VanPatten (2003) recommend paraphrase tasks for developing strategic competence.

Because communication strategies are characterized by the desire of the speaker to convey meaning, the transmission of information must be regarded a necessary condition for their use.

"Exercises designed to give the student practice in using communication strategies to solve communication problems should require that the speaker alone have information that the listener or listeners require in order to complete some task." (Tarone, 1984).

The Present Study

The research questions that guided the present study are as follows:

1. Which communication strategies do foreign language learners and instructors use?
2. With what frequency and in what contexts are these strategies used?
3. How do instructors and learners respond to communication break-downs?

Data for the present study came from three different Spanish classrooms at the university level. The instructors, all female, were graduate teaching assistants with relatively little-- between zero and one year- experience. All instructors received training in Communicative Language Teaching during their first year of graduate studies. A general profile of the instructors is given in Table 1.

All three classes were first-year language classes, either second semester of study or one semester “review” for university students who had previous language study (e.g., in high school). These latter classes tend to focus more on second semester material and lessons, using about a month at the beginning to “revive” the knowledge and skills generally associated with the first semester of study.

The basic program in Spanish is guided by the tenets of Communicative Language Teaching The main text for the first-year sequence is *¿Sabías que. . .?,* a book that uses a student-centered, task-based approach. Spanish graduate teaching assistants are trained the first semester through an intensive four day workshop followed by a semester long course in language teaching. This course, taught by a faculty member with a specialization in second language acquisition and teaching, follows the book *Making Communicative Language Teaching Happen* (Lee & VanPatten, 2003). Thus, the Spanish instructors are trained in communicative, task-based language instruction and are given the materials that apply the principles they have learned.

Method

The data were gathered by three graduate students enrolled in a course on classroom language acquisition. Each student observed and tape-recorded two fifty-minute class sessions during one week for each instructor. The students told the instructors that they were attending a class on classroom language acquisition and wanted to get natural data on how learners act and interact in classrooms. Thus, none of the instructors knew that their own discourse patterns and those of their students was the object of a research study.

The students sat in the back of the classroom with their tape recorders and took field notes to supplement the taped sessions. Field notes included information such as use of gestures by teachers, nodding by students, and other kinds of information that could not be discerned from an audiotaping. The six students then transcribed the class sessions using the coding scheme in Larsen-Freeman & Long (1991). The data were analyzed by tallying the communication strategies used by instructors and learners. The communication strategies identified by Tarone (1984) served as a basis for this analysis.

Results

At this point it is useful to review the research questions that guided the present study are as follows:

1. Which communication strategies do foreign language learners and instructors use?
2. With what frequency and in what contexts are these strategies used?
3. How do instructors and learners respond to communication break-downs?

Instructors and learners used many of the same strategies used in ESL classes, but the patterns of usage were different. Surprisingly, avoidance was used only by instructors, and never by learners without instructor interference. Also of interest is that these foreign language learners used language mix in place of the avoidance strategies employed by ESL learners. The analysis revealed, not surprisingly, that instructors used far more communication strategies than the learners did. Whether native or nonnative speakers, and regardless of experience, instructors demonstrated remarkable similarity in their use of communication strategies. The strategies used and their frequencies are found in Table 2. The contexts in which these strategies are used are detailed below. Instructor and learner responses to communication breakdowns are summarized at the end of this section.

To understand the excerpts that follow, it is necessary to understand that in the transcriptions, the instructors' speech is to the left and the learners' speech is to the right. The symbol "^" indicates a pause. An "x" indicates speech that the transcriber could not comprehend. Spelling and pronunciation follow each transcriber's original text. A translation is provided below each turn in italics.

Word Coinage by Instructor

Instructors made extensive use of strategies, to present vocabulary and elicit target forms. Uses of approximation and word coinage tended to be examples of what Pica (1993) has characterized as pre-modified input, which contrasts with interactionally modified input. Instructors simply inferred a communication breakdown even when none was explicitly indicated. In the following example, Instructor C uses word coins the word *completado as an alternative for completo.

> En la clase ¿quién tiene? ¿Qué grupo tiene el cuento más completo? Más completado. ¿Este grupo? OK Bueno.
>
> *In the class who has? What group has the story most complete? Most completed. This group? OK Good.*

Approximation by Instructor

In the following example, Instructor A uses approximation to explain a task. Learner silence is the only indication of a communication breakdown. When learners do not respond to ejemplos (examples), the instructor uses the semantically related term modelos (models).

¿entienden ejemplos?	
You understand examples?	
	(no answer)
modelos...	
models...	

Approximation by Learner

In the above example, Instructor A used approximation to explain a task. Although no clarification was solicited, other than by learner silence, the instructor provided a semantically related term to clarify. The use of approximation by learners, on the other hand, tended to be a spontaneous response to communicative demand. In the following example, a learner in the same class uses approximation to negotiate a task. The student asks for more time using the semantically related term minutos (minutes) in place of the more appropriate word tiempo (time).

¿Quién ha terminado? *Who has finished?*	
	Más minutos *More minutes*
	Sí *Yes*
Más minutos, ok. *More minutes, ok.*	

Approximation by Learner

Another context in which learners used approximation was to respond to the propositional content of a message, as seen in the following example from Instructor B's class. In this example, the teacher is presenting the vocabulary for parts of the body and uses the news of a dismembered accident victim to illustrate.

Piernas [writes it on the board] Tenemos las piernas, y al fin tenemos los... *Legs [writes it on the board] We have legs, and finally we have…*	
	Pies. *Feet.*
Han escuchado este fin de semana, había un accidente. Un estudiante estaba tomando mucho alcohol. Fue a la estación de trenes y estaba caminando entre los ferrocariles con sus amigos y saltó en un tren. Pero se cayó, y ahora tiene solo un brazo, y una pierna. Pobrecito Y qué más puedo decir.	

You've heard this week, there was an accident. A student was drinking a lot of alcohol. S/he was at the train station and s/he was walking between the tracks with his/her friends and jumped on a train. But s/he fell, and now s/he has only one arm, and one leg. Poor thing. And what more can I say.

[class reacts]

Ouch. (XXX) [class laughs] ¿Ella o él?

Ouch. (XXX) [class laughs] He or she?

Él, un hombre. Ahora con el pelo. Tenemos diferentes características con el pelo. Colores.

He, a man. Now for hair. We have different characteristics with hair. Colors.

Circumlocution-Style Display by Learner

Unlike approximation, learner use of circumlocution did not conform to the requisite conditions under which strategy use is said to occur. The following example -- from Instructor B's class-- demonstrates that "circumlocution" is used by learners to display information elicited by the instructor. Because the exchange is for the purpose of information display, the communication is not referential. In other words, no previously unknown information is transmitted.

Nieto?. Nieto?. Nieto?.. Dime en español qué es un nieto, dame la definición de un nieto. Dame dame una definición de un nieto. En español. [laughs].................

Grandchild?. Grandchild?.. Tell me in Spanish what is a grandchild, give me the definition of a grandchild. Give me the definition of a grandchild. In Spanish. [laug hs].................

hijo de su hijo

child of one's child

Muy bien. Hijo de sus hijos. Son nietos.

Very good. Child of their children. They are grandchildren.

Examples such as the one above were not counted as communication strategies because they were neither a response to a communication breakdown, nor did they involve the transmission of information. They were simply prompted displays of information. They might, however, be considered as evidence that learners posses the linguistic skills to perform circumlocution when prompted to do so. They could even be regarded as a useful preparation for subsequent strategy use. Strictly speaking-- however-- they are not tokens of strategy use. In this case, strategy use did not occur because an opportunity for referential communication was displaced by information display.

Mime by Instructor

Although no examples of mime were found in the data, instructors made extensive use of various other visual strategies to demonstrate vocabulary and elicit target forms. As demonstrated in the following sample, visual strategies were used by instructors provide the learner an opportunity to display information rather than to transmit information.

Aprendimos el color ^^ ¿éste es el color? *We learned the color ^^ this is the color?*	
	Azul *Blue*

Message Abandonment by Instructor

Avoidance is a strategy most often associated with learners who avoid a topic or abandon a message when they cannot access a particular form. In the data observed here, it was the instructors, not the learners who abandoned messages. When this instructor perceived that learners did not comprehend the message, the instructor abandoned the message abruptly. Learners, who had relatively little control of the topics, were not in a position to exercise this prerogative.

	¿qué es 'ya'? *What is* ya?
¿Alguien puede ayudarle qué significa 'ya'? ¿Sabes la palabra 'todavía'? *Can someone explain what 'already' means? Do you know the word 'yet'?*	
	Uh hum *Uh hum*
¿todavía? Más o menos ¿todavía? *yet? More or less yet?*	

Creo que sí

I think so

¿Crees que sí?

You think so?

No estoy seguro

I'm not sure

No estás seguro? Ok. Entonces 'ya' que acá en este momento. Ha gastado en este momento gastaste todo. En este momento. ¿nueve? Cathy

You're not sure? Ok. Well 'already' there at this moment. Has spent at this moment you have spent everything. At this moment. Nine? Cathy.

Message Abandonment by Learner

Although avoidance is most often associated with learners, in the present study instructors used avoidance most often. Instructors used avoidance to control the topic. It is interesting to note that the one instance of avoidance by a learner results when the instructor and learner are at cross-purposes.

Hice la tarea

I did homework

Hice la tarea. Muy bien. Y Andrew ¿tuviste mucho trabajo este fin de semana? ¿Tuviste mucho trabajo?

I did homework. Very good. And Andrew did you have a lot of work this weekend? Did you have a lot of work?

No—

No--

No entiende?

You don't understand?

No.

No.

OK ¿Alguien puede ayudarlo? ¿No? Tuviste. ¿Qué es el verbo 'tuviste'?

OK. Can someone help him? No? You had. What is the verb 'you had'?

Tener

To have

Tener. Muy bien Y ¿es indicativo o en el pasado?

To have. Very good. And is it indicative or in the past?

El pasado

The past

El pasado Ok Entonces 'yo tener' ¿cómo se dice 'yo tener' en el pasado?

The past Ok Well then 'I-to have' how do you say 'I-to have' in the past?

Tuve

I had

Tuve Ok [writes on board] Entonces tuviste trabajo [writes on board] este fin de semana.

I had. Ok [writes on board] Well then you had work [writes on board] this weekend.

Oh. Tuve que mirar la televisión.

Oh. I had to watch television.

¿Tuve que mirar?

I had to watch?

Sí.

Yes.

Ok ¿Por qué? ¿Es tarea? ¿o para divertirse? Ok Entonces. Miraste el la tele televisión? *Ok Why? Is it work? Or to have fun? Well then. You watched the-the tele-television?*	
	(xx)
Miré. Mirar [writes on board] Entonces en el pasado. Miraste *I watched. To watch [writes on board] Then in the past. You watched*	
	Miraste *You watched*
Tú [points to self] Miré *You [points to self] I*	
	Miré la television *I watched television*

The learner never answered the question "¿tuviste mucho trabajo?" The learner apparently took the instructor's grammatical explanation of the question as a prompt to use the form tuve. When this misunderstanding resulted in an incoherent answer, the instructor's focus returned to the meaning of the utterance. This example corroborates findings by Brooks (1990) and Kinginger (1990) that state that when learners perceive that the goal of the interaction is to manipulate form, they abandon the message. Message abandonment by the learner, here, is a function the instructor's excessive linguistic support.

Another aspect of the previous interaction worth mentioning is that the communication task preceding this excerpt was "gratuitous." Lee (2000) describes learner-to-learner interaction that does not require learners to negotiate meaning or recall the product as gratuitous. In the previous excerpt, learners were assigned to interview classmates about their activities from the previous weekend. In the "follow-up," however, learners did not make use of that information. Making learners "responsible for what happens in class" (Lee 2000, Lee & VanPatten 2003) would have been helpful for promoting the transmission of previously unknown information-- a precondition for strategy use.

Borrowing by Instructor

Instructors in the present study used the target language for entire utterances to explain unknown words, to explain tasks, and to conduct class business. In the following example, Instructor B uses English extensively and learners respond in English.

They said there [reading from homework exercise], What two cities, contemporary cities of Teotihuacan that still exist? Rome and Greece?? [asking the class, not reading]

They said there [reading from homework exercise], What two cities, contemporary cities of Teotihuacan that still exist? Rome and Greece?? [asking the class, not reading]

Greece

Greece

How?. Where is Teotihuacan? [¿]Dónde está Teotihuacan?

How?. Where is Teotihuacan? Where is Teotihuacan?

En México

In Mexico

En México. Roma está en Italia, perdón, y Grecia, es Grecia. No pueden ser las respuestas.

In Mexico. Rome is in Italy, pardon, and Greece, is Greece. Those can't be the answers.

Borrowing by Learner

Learners use English to appeal for assistance and to communicate about procedure. As the following example from Instructor A's class illustrates, English was used for entire utterances.

¿Algunas preguntas del examen de ayer? ^^ que tengan?

Any questions from yesterday's exam? ^^ that You may have?

Yo [X...]

I [X...]

¡Ah, es verdad! ¡es verdad!

Oh, right! That's right!

Should I leave?

Should I leave?

No preguntas, no preguntas ^ porque ^^ah, Tom va a tomar el examen.

No questions, no questions ^ because ^^ah, Tom is going to take the exam.

Besides using English for procedural matters, learners also used English to negotiate tasks. The following example from Instructor B's class illustrates this tendency.

Linda tiene pelo negro
do you want more?
[class laughs]

Linda has dark hair do you want more?
[class laughs]

Instructors sometimes prompted learners to use English to demonstrate comprehension, thus actively encouraging L1 use. Prompting L1 use is not a response to a communication breakdown, but it does seem to be based on the assumption that learners do not have the ability to paraphrase. It can be understood as an inducement of a learner strategy or as an instructor strategy. Of the nine instances of borrowing by learners, two were prompted by the instructor.

¿Cómo se dice esto en inglés?

How do you say this in English?

I bathe myself

I bathe myself

While the above strategy may be more expedient than other types of comprehension checks, it encourages learners to associate forms with their translations rather than with a semantic representation. It also promotes the norm that whenever there is a communication breakdown, using the L1 is an acceptable communication strategy.

Literal Translation by Learner

Learners employed the strategy of literal translation only during follow-up discussions to group work. This example from Instructor A's class underscores the role of information-exchange for promoting strategy use. Unfortunately, the instructor co-opted the learner's message rather than allowing the learner to clarify it. This instance of co-opting a learner message is not a response to a communication breakdown, but it is based on the presumption that other learners would not understand. It may be considered a communication strategy but is not one of the strategies in the original taxonomy. This is the only instance of co-opting the learner's utterance observed in the data, but it is consistent with the tendency of instructors to assume the communicative burden.

	Él es un muchacho muy guapo, pero se parece ^^ al chico de la puerta del lado. *He is a boy very handsome but he looks like the boy next door.*
Ahh, el chico de la casa de al lado ¿entienden? *Ahh, the boy next door. You understand?*	
	No *No*
Yo vivo aquí, y esta persona vive aquí ¿Ok? Él es un chico ^^ yo soy una chica, pero ^ vivimos en casas ^^ juntas ¿entiende? ¿sí? *I live here, and this person lives here Ok? He is a boy ^^ I am a girl, but ^ we live in houses ^^ together understand? yes?*	
	(no answer)
O sea ^^ ciento veintidós Maple Street, ^ ciento veintitrés Maple Street, ¿ok? *That is ^^ 122 Maple Street, ^ 123 Maple Street, ¿ok?*	

Appeal for Assistance by Learner

The most common strategy used by learners was appeal for assistance. Instructors respond to these appeals in a variety of ways, depending on the type of assistance requested. Appeals for assistance either elicited a specific response ('Is x correct?' 'Which is correct, x or y?' or 'How do you say x?) or a more open-ended response, ('What does x mean?') In the following example, the learner makes a limited appeal for assistance. All that is required of the instructor is identification of the correct form. The instructor provides only the assistance requested by the learner and resumes the lesson.

¿Se?

Themselves?

se

themselves

¿Dos personas?

Two people?

Uh Hum. Ok gracias. [...]

Uh Hum. Ok thanks. [...]

Instructors in the present study responded to communication breakdowns either by borrowing, paraphrase, and message abandonment or by co-opting the learner's utterance. They used paraphrase strategies to restate their utterances when there was no indication of a problem. Learners responded to communication breakdowns mainly by borrowing, but there was one instance of message abandonment when the instructor conveyed a grammatical purpose for the interaction. Learners used circumlocution only when prompted to display information. They used approximation spontaneously, in response to communication demands.

Discussion

An important observation to make about the data in the present study is the different patterns of strategy use by foreign language learners as compared to ESL learners. Whereas ESL learners rely heavily on avoidance strategies, there was only one instance of avoidance by a learner in the present study. That instance was associated with the instructor co-opting the learner's message. It may be that these foreign language learners do not need to avoidance because they have a common first language as recourse.

The reliance on English in the foreign language classroom is to be discouraged in order to create optimal conditions for the development of strategic competence. Instructors in the present study actively encouraged learners to use English in order to demonstrate comprehension. Learners should be encouraged to negotiate meaning in the L2 as if their L1 were not available as recourse-- as ESL learners most often must do. By relying exclusively on the L2 to transmit information learners are more likely to develop communication strategies that will prepare them to interact with monolingual native speakers of the target language. Although it may not always be possible to negotiate meaning in the target language, each use of the native language should be regarded as a lost opportunity for developing strategic competence so that instructors and learners always have this goal in mind.

An essential aspect of strategic competence is knowing when communication has broken down. If learners are unaware that their meanings have been understood, they will be denied the opportunity to clarify their own meanings. Musumeci (1996) found that instructors in content-based Italian classes denied learners opportunities to clarify their meanings. They never told students that their messages weren't understood. The present study demonstrates that assuming the communicative burden for clarifying learner messages can lead instructors to co-opt learner utterances, denying them opportunities to clarify their own meanings. Instructors should avoid the temptation to co-opt a learner's utterance.

Paraphrase tasks and other information-gap activities are ideal for developing strategic competence. In paraphrase tasks, learners must describe an object that another learner cannot see. The other learner must name the object. A critical element information-gap tasks is the transmission of previously unknown information, which is also a condition of strategy use. Interview tasks should emphasize the exchange of unknown information. To insure that learners are engaged in exchanging information, follow-up tasks should make learners responsible for task outcomes so that tasks are not gratuitous. Testing the informational outcomes from tasks can also help to reinforce the exchange of information.

If *i+1* can be understood as optimal input for acquisition, then *o+1* can be understood as optimal output for skills development. Form-focused instruction usually anticipates the vocabulary and grammar that learners will need to complete a task. It is only when a form is not available that learners must use communication strategies to compensate. There should be room in the curriculum for tasks that move learners beyond an isolated grammar point or vocabulary group, with goals defined in terms of language functions. In terms of the binding-access framework (Terrell 1986), input drives acquisition by promoting the binding of form to meaning. Output practice reinforces form-meaning connections when the learner accesses target forms in the developing system. Strategic competence compensates when a form is not in the system or is not accessible.

One of the limitations of the present study is that the data reflect only teacher-fronted discourse. The transcripts included notes on the duration of the group work, but learner-to-learner interaction was not transcribed. The duration of the group work was not always noted. Although these data do not provide a contrast between learner-centered and teacher-fronted discourse, they do illustrate that teacher-fronted discourse provides limited opportunities for developing strategic competence.

Commenting on the same data that was analyzed in the present study, Lee (2000) observed that in Instructor A's class, the discussion was not a discussion as the word is commonly understood because it "excluded many more people than it included (p. 19)." He further observed that the instructor's questions "served to extract the subject from the learners rather than have instructor and learners exchange ideas (p. 19)." Lee (2000) uses these observations to make the case that task-based tasks are preferable to a teacher-fronted discussion of the same topic. His work provides the contrast between teacher-centered and learner-centered discourse that is missing in the present study. Although Lee (2000) only described Instructor A's class, the present study demonstrates that the problems he observed are not particular to Instructor A. All three instructors demonstrated a pronounced tendency to dominate the interaction rather than turning it over to learners.

Conclusion

Recommendations for developing strategic competence generally reflect an emphasis on the paraphrase strategies that characterize native speakers. These recommendations underscore the role of the transmission of information previously unknown to one of the interlocutors. The present study demonstrates that communication is undermined when information display displaces referential communication. An instructional model that makes learners responsible for the outcome of their interactions with other learners would go a long way towards promoting meaningful communication in the classroom, thereby increasing the opportunities for strategy use. Exclusive use of the target language would also promote the value of negotiating meaning when communication breaks down, thus encouraging learners to use alternative forms of expression when the optimal form is unavailable to them.

Appedices

Table 1. *Profile of Spanish Teaching Assistants*

Instructor	Native speaker	Years Experience
A	+	0
B	-	1
C	-	0

Table 2. *Strategy Use by Classroom*

Strategies Used	by Instructor			by Learners		
	A	B	C	A	B	C
Avoidance	2	-	3	-	-	1
Paraphrase	6	4	4	1	3	-
Borrowing	4	2	3	3	1	2
Appeal for Assistance	-	-	-	3	-	6
Mime	-	-	-	-	-	-

References

Brooks, F. B. (1990). “Foreign language learning: A social interaction perspective. In VanPatten & Lee (Eds.) *Second Language Acquisition--Foreign Language Learning.* Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Kinginger, C. (1990). *Task Variation and Classroom Learner Discourse.* Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.

Larsen-Freeman & Long. (1991). *An Introduction to Second Language Acquisition Research*. Longman Inc. New York.

Lee, J. F. (2000). *Tasks and communicating in language classrooms*. McGraw-Hill.

Lee, J. F. & VanPatten, B. (2003). *Making communicative language teaching happen.* McGraw-Hill.

Leeman Guthrie, E. (1984). Intake, communication, and second language teaching. In S. J. Savignon & M.S. Burns (Eds.), Initiatives in communicative language teaching (pp. 35-54). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Musumeci, D. (1996). Teacher-learner negotiation in content-based instruction: Communication at cross-purposes? *Applied Linguistics, 17*(3), pp. 286-325.

Paribakht, T. (1982). The relationship between the use of communication strategies and aspects of target language proficiency: A study of Persian ESL students. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Toronto.

Roulon, K., & McCreary, J. (1986). Negotiation of Content: Teacher-fronted and small-group interactions. In R. Day (Ed.). *Talking to learn: Conversation in second language acquisition* (pp. 182-199). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Savignon, S. J. (1983). *Communicative Competence: Theory and Classroom Practice.* Addison-Wesley.

Swain, M. & Lapkin, S. (1981). *Bilingual education in Ontario: A decade of research.* Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Education.

Tarone, E. (1980). "Communication strategies, foreigner talk, and repair in interlanguage. *Language Learning, 30*, 417-431.

Terrell T. (1986). "Acquisition in the Natural Approach: The Binding/Access Framework." *Modern Language Journal*, *70*, 213-227.

Tarone, E. (1981). Some thoughts on the notion of 'communication strategy.' *TESOL Quarterly, 15*, 285-295.

Tarone, E. (1984). Teaching strategic competence in the foreign language classroom. In S.J. Savignon & M.S. Burns (Eds.), Iniciatives in communicative language teaching (pp. 127-136). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Bill VanPatten, James F. Lee and Diane Musumeci for making their data available to me and for affording me the opportunity to participate in the panel discussion that brought about this work. I would also like to thank them for their advise and support. Any shortcomings are mine alone.

Author

TONY HOUSTON, Assistant Professor of Spanish, Department of Modern and Classical Languages, Saint Louis University, 326 Ritter Hall, 220 N. Grand Blvd., St. Louis, MO 63103-2007. Specializations: Second Language Acquisition and Psycholinguistics.

ICT- Integrating Computers in Teaching. (2004). By David Barr. Bern, Switzerland: Peter Lang Publications. ISBN: 3-03910-191-9

Reviewed by DR. SWATHI VANNIARAJAN
San Jose State University

David Barr's *ICT: Integrating Computers in Teaching* is a book with a misleading title. It reviews extensively and also critically the state of computer technology in three universities, two in Britain and one in Canada rather than providing suggestions or lessons on how computers and teaching can be integrated. Also, there is very little information in the book about how technology can be used to enhance language teaching. As such, any reader who seeks to read the book for the purposes of integrating technology into his/her teaching will find the book a disappointing reading experience; however, for a careful reader who is prepared to walk all the way to the last chapter from the first, there is a great deal of information that can enhance his/her understanding of the role of computer technology in teaching.

The book is divided into six chapters. The first chapter "What is a learning environment?" attempts to define learning in terms of behaviorist and constructivist approaches. The chapter identifies four important ingredients to a creation of a favorable learning environment: tools, resources, people, and (environmental) designs. The goal of any learning environment is to "facilitate learning" and it need not "refer exclusively to the classroom environment" (p.24).

In Chapter Two, "Towards a computer based environment", the author describes how computers and recent developments in technology can be used to assist learning in general and language learning in particular. In the author's perception, language instructors are generally anxious about the spread of computer assisted language learning programs (CALL) due to their assumption that these programs will someday replace human teachers. The author argues that such a scenario will never happen for various reasons, the primary reason being that CALL programs, as they are today, are not sufficiently spontaneous and that they "cannot address questions that have not been pre-programmed." (p.35). The secondary reason is that "students cannot yet conduct a conversation in a foreign language with a computer: human contact is required for this type of interaction." (p.35). The other peripheral reasons are that CALL programs cannot give feedback to the learner when he/she makes a grammatical error; the programs can at most refer the learner to the instructions or to the grammar lesson which the learner may not be capable of understanding. In contrast, the author contends that human teachers can understand when the learner makes an error, why the learner has made the error. As such, they can structure the lesson accordingly by providing proper explanations. This does not mean that CALL programs are of no use. According to the author, CALL programs do have their own edutainment values and that they do enable students to work on the programs on their own. This, according to the author, is in fact the greatest advantage to instructors since they will have some freed spare time to devote their attention to other important matters like doing research, or focusing their attention on the weaker areas of the students and so on. The author concludes this section by claiming that CALL programs do not and are not going to replace the teacher and so teacher anxiety that they are going to replace the teacher is unwarranted. In short, they are not "stand alone creations" (p.36).

The author then describes how boundaries between teaching and learning environments are changing due to the adaptation of technology by both students and institutions. With the available technology, it will be possible for instructors to identify the available unidirectional or read-only (non-interactive) resource materials on the internet and also create bidirectional (interactive) learning environments in which student teacher interactions can take place through audio as well as video conferencing.

Unidirectional resource materials are a great boon to both students and teachers; students can download additional learning materials from the web and teachers can, for example, "set assignments that require students to search the Web to find answers. It is a way of linking the language classroom to the outside world, providing access to a gamut of resources, exercises and material that are available worldwide" (pp.42-43). The current technology also enables teachers to create their own unidirectional resource materials such as converting their lectures into audio files and transparencies into powerpoint slides and make them available to students via their course websites so that students can study them at their own leisure time, especially if they have problems in understanding the class lectures. The conversion of class lectures into video and audio clips has another advantage also. It enables the same class lecture to be disseminated to learners in different locations reducing teaching or traveling costs. The author concludes this section by claiming that it is possible that students may prefer oral input in the target language in the form of audio and video clips than receiving written input since oral input in the form of lectures, instructions and suggestions in the target language can expose them to aspects of the target language, such as accent and tone, which are not obvious in written language.

Bidirectional technology also has its own distinctive advantages. For example, video conferencing enables classes to be conducted online when a face-to-face meeting is not possible. "The advent of inexpensive webcams and sound recording equipment means that an increasing number of computer users can communicate audiovisually instead of through the medium of text. The implications for language learning are considerable" (p.51). Even simple bidirectional technological resources such as e-mail can be put to great use. In fact, e-mail is one of the greatest gifts of the internet to the teachers of distance learning courses. According to the author, e-mail "allows for quick and efficient communication for users who may be separated by space and time....Electronic submission of work is particularly useful for distance learning courses and when it is impractical to attend campus, such as at weekends or late the evening when the campus is closed." (p.47). The use of e-mail has another use also. It enables learners who are shy of speaking in classes to use this as a medium to talk to the teacher. According to the author, "both parties do not need to be on-line at the same time and so tutors will be able to reply to student queries when they have time or are not teaching." (p.51). The use of e-mail to clarify students' queries can free up class time also; teachers do not have to spend time in clarifying student questions since not all students may need that service; as such, class time can be used for working on activities that can benefit the whole class.

In chapters describing the use of technology at the University of Ulster, the University of Cambridge, and the University of Toronto, the author talks about the computer resources that are available in respective settings and how knowledgeable the instructors, students, and the supporting staff are. A critical evaluation of how successful or unsuccessful the integration of technology into the learning environment in these universities is also painstakingly provided. The author concludes the chapters by claiming that management support in creating the technical infrastructure and educating both students and instructors that technology can enhance learning are quite important for successful dissemination of technology in higher education institutions. “Users need to feel that the infrastructure is relevant to them and enhances the learning and teaching experience” (p.196).

Overall, the book is well written and is well organized. It’s greatest strength is its lucid style. It also has a good bibliography which the readers may find very useful. In my summative opinion, the book is dense with a great deal of information; yet, in order to benefit from the book, one will have to wade through a lot of unnecessary details. Also, the state of affairs with regard to computer technology in the three universities may not interest everybody since technology is fast changing and readers will be far more interested in what is going to be next rather than what has gone before. Yet, a careful reader, who is willing to patiently go through all the pages, may find a lot of useful tips in the author’s critical perspectives of the state of technology in the three universities and the rest of the chapters.

Language Play, Language Learning. (2000). By Cook, G. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Reviewed by NATALIA ANTOKHIN
Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center

Guy Cook's book "***Language Play, Language Learning***" gives a comprehensive and insightful explanation of the nature and function of language play in human life. He analyzes language play from linguistic, semantic, and pragmatic points of view. Cook describes a variety of approaches of other disciplines to language play and its genres and investigates language use in a social and psychological context. The author focuses on two interrelated issues. The first is to show the importance of language play in human life and the second is to explain the implications for applied linguistics and language teaching. He is convinced that language play should not be considered as an insignificant or nonessential activity. According to Cook, language play is essential to human thought, culture, learning and creativity.

There have been a number of investigations conducted in recent years concerning language play and, specifically, the role of literature and poetry in language learning. Shook (1996) explored potential learner benefits of early exposure to literature. There have been studies of reader and personal responses to literary texts and their beneficial effects on learner critical thinking skills and communicative language teaching (Esplugas & Landwehr, 1996; Hirvela, 1996). Shanahan (1997), discussing the difference between "two camps" (those who make emphasis on communicative competence and those who stress the importance of exposure to culture and, especially, literature), noticed that the reliance of the former on data from empirical studies often conflicted with the feelings of the latter, that intuitional aspects of language learning are essential to language acquisition. He suggested three aspects of articulation of these feelings through research: (a) the extent to which language itself is laden with affect that may be catalyzed as an inducement to learning; (b) the extent to which the affective element is embedded in the nature of symbolic expression - and thus metaphor, myth, and literature; (c) the specific ways in which language and literature may encode culture and have an affective impact on learners in the classroom.

Cook's book is an extensive and thorough example of such investigation. Describing the ability of humans to employ language play to strengthen their capacity to adapt as individuals and as societies, the book also considers the implications of language play for language learning and teaching.

The book consists of three parts: descriptive, theoretical, and pedagogic. In **Part One** the author looks at the extraordinary importance and extent of language play in human life. He examines the forms of language play and the reason for the attractiveness of rhythm and repetition, and considers the role of children's verse in child development. Cook examines the extent and importance of fiction for both children and adults and how - through activities such as insulting, joking, and ritual - linguistic patterning and alternative realities are used in both the private and the public sphere as means of social organization.

Part Two takes up the questions raised in Part One, attempting to characterize language play, and examines some of the theories which have been advanced both for play in general, and for language play in particular. The author assesses the conflicting claims of evolutionary and sociocultural accounts of play and examines how play shares features with creative processes beyond the human sphere, which involve the interaction of chance, externally-determined forces, and choice.

Central for our profession is the last section of the book - **Part Three**, **Language learning -** that considers the implications of an understanding of language play for language teaching and learning. He begins with questioning the popular view that language learning is best effected through concentration upon “meaning” rather than ‘”form”, and through activities which are “useful”’ and “real,” rather than “contrived”. Cook maintains that he does not intend to propose that language teaching and learning should be conducted through play. What he seeks to develop is the notion of a play element in language learning, in which understanding of language play may influence ideas about every aspect of teaching: from the initial motivation, through interim means, to the final goals. Cook thinks that knowing a language, and being able to function in communities which use that language, entails being able to understand and produce play with it, making this ability a necessary part of advanced proficiency.

In subsequent subchapters Cook discusses current beliefs of those methodologists who are preoccupied with task-based teaching. He feels that a good deal of contemporary language teaching “deliberately” turns its attention away from language play, and focuses exclusively upon simulation of the discourse of the “bulge,” as he says it, in which students go about their daily business, interacting with the people with whom they have to negotiate their needs along the way. Although this is the reason many of them are learning language, Cook emphasizes that an analysis of play demonstrates that: it is not necessarily the case that the best way to equip learners for these needs is to tackle them directly, any more than it is best for children to prepare for adult life by working rather than playing or for adults to gain understanding of the complexities of social interaction by reading fact rather than fiction.

Cook proceeds, saying that there is a need for much more investigation into what students like and want. He also turns his attention to the idea of broader interpretation of tasks for language learners. Cook brings up as an example Skehan’s (1998) tasks: students are asked to act as judges or they must respond to advice columns in a magazine, etc. These tasks, in his opinion, are no longer confined to routine topics involving work or other uncontroversial subject-matter, nor to mere information exchange or problem-solving, and are more likely to be of personal interest and relevance to students. But then he wonders whether such expansion of tasks that some offer (when a task must not specify language items, but only activities that attempt to elicit, practice, or make students notice particular structure) leaves anything that is not task – and whether the term has become too general to be useful.

The author also talks about a widely discussed differentiation between form and meaning in language teaching. He is critical of the theoretical premises for the argument of focusing solely on meaning in teaching language. In his opinion, some researches have extended Chomsky’s ideas about first language acquisition, and maintained that, as in Chomskyan linguistics (with the main idea that innate knowledge of the principles and parameters of Universal Grammar is still available to the second language learner), language in SLA studies was ‘narrowly conceived as phonology, syntax, and morphology, and the acquisition of semantics, pragmatics, and discourse were often ignored’. In the extension of this UG-based approach, theories were advanced that second language acquisition would be triggered by comprehensible input or by interaction in which there was negotiation of meaning. Conversely, acquisition would be only minimally affected - if at all - by instruction, graded syllabuses, or conscious attention to form.

At the same time, there are alternative theories - ethnographic studies, acculturation theory, sociocultural approaches based upon Vygotskiyan learning theory, and variable competence models that are compatible with the author's notion of play as a use of language, in which form, meaning, and function are in dynamic and mutually determining interaction. In Cook's opinion, such "more open-minded" theories do not seek to separate the formal language system from its social and psychological uses, and many of those who subscribe to these theories doubt the results of SLA research. In support he points to Larsen-Freeman's criticism of SLA investigation that is based on controlled experiment and observation: "We know from chaos theory, she writes, that complex systems are comprised of many interacting parts, the behavior of which (even the tiniest), when combined, is unpredictable. As such, it is futile to expect that by aggregating findings from simple univariate cause-effect links made in laboratory settings that we can build a theory of SLA which will hold when all factors are combined" (Larsen-Freeman, 1997).

Cook proposes a greater role in language pedagogy for attention to form, artifice, and ritual for future prospects in language teaching. Developing his argument, Cook analyzes play, learning, and work to emphasize that the work elements of learning have tended to be over-stressed recently and that perhaps it is worth reintegrating those elements of learning which are common with play. He analyzes common elements in learning and games, describes how the pedagogic potential of game elements in learning has often been stifled by negative attitude to play, an unnecessary division between 'structural' and "communicative" syllabuses, and the dichotomy between formalism and functionalism: "We have... two radically different explanations of the *forms of language*. In one they are homogenized and independent, shaped by forces internal to the system; in the other, they are the servants of pre-established intentions and needs. We also have two quite different approaches to language *functions*. ...For formalism, there is a need to specify why an autonomous system happens to be so well suited to the functions it performs, or why it was selected in the course of evolution, if not for its functionality. For functionalism, which assumes functions existing prior to forms, there is the issue of how complex functions could have come into existence without language form to realize them. The debate points rather obviously to a middle position, in which both form and function exert a dynamic reciprocal influence upon each other, leading to the ever greater complexity of both" (p.190).

In the last section of his book Cook admits that incorporating a play element into language teaching needs testing out in practice for possible advantages. In his opinion, a play element would validate the explicit deductive teaching of rules, like in games which are typically marked by discussion of rules at every stage. The same is true of many other activities, such as meetings, legal and legislative procedures, rituals, political competition, and so on. Cook also thinks that a play element would help remedy the apparent dilemma of needing to choose between an emphasis on structure or an emphasis on use. He argues that the need for authentic, varied, and motivating examples, in which particular forms are foregrounded, could be partly remedied by giving more prominence to literature, even in language courses for specific purposes.

Language play focuses attention upon specific linguistic choices, either because meaning or effect is dependent upon them, or because these choices are patterned and repeated. The rhyme, the pun, the joke, the advertisement, the tabloid headline, the insult, cannot be paraphrased. Cook emphasizes that in that, as in literature, there can be no claimed division between form and function, no sense of alternative ways of 'getting the same meaning across', as there appears to be in more transactional discourse. Literary texts provide examples of almost every kind of language use, from casual conversation to ritualistic incantation. Among other advantages of a play element to language teaching the author mentions reinstating the use of invented examples, rote learning repetition, and recitation, as enjoyable learning strategies. He emphasizes also that a play element would broaden the range of permitted interactional patterns within the classroom. Cook concludes his book, saying that language play, including all kinds of interaction with literary texts, should not be seen as at odds with language work. He wants teachers of language to see language play as profound, as well as trivial, as adult, as well as childlike, as something which proceeds, rather than follows on from other more "useful" activity.

The investigation of the role of language play has been continuing with research and debate. Broner and Tarone, E.E. (2002) challenged the SLA models that, according to the authors, assumed the negotiation of meaning as the only causal variable in SLA. Using ludic language play, as defined by Cook (2000), and language play as rehearsal in private speech, as considered by Lantolf (1997), they demonstrated that these two types of play can be distinguished in classroom discourse, and emphasized its role in the development of interlanguage. In his response to Hanauer's (2001) study of the poetry-reading task for second language learning Mattix's (2001) argues, that the approach of task-based instruction, while a useful tool in the language learning classroom, is too narrow a theoretical framework to analyze the use of poetry in such a context. Referring to Cook's works (1995, 2000), he noted that not all "authentic" discourses are primarily concerned with meaning, and vice-versa. Iddings (McCafferty & Iddings, 2005) investigated how language play (mimicking, rhyme, rhythm, alliteration, puns, songs, mockery, repetition, parody, fictional words, and substitutions) creates opportunities for second language learning. She focused on the role of language play in developing learner metalinguistic awareness.

Judging by this lively discussion, Cook's ideas provoked reevaluation of some preconceived beliefs that are being applied in language classrooms. The major strength of the book is that the author looks at many issues of learning and teaching language from an unorthodox point of view, debating the notions that seemed to have become absolute truth. It should be noted, however, that the author sometimes exaggerates the controversy and forces doors open. His criticism, for example, of those who try to divorce form and meaning in teaching/learning processes is somewhat misplaced, since the majority of linguists and language teaching professionals recognize the complexity of the interrelationship of these notions in theories and in practical applications. Still, Cook's special appreciation of all genres of literary language is a quite inspiring encouragement to look for interesting, unorthodox, and stimulating literary materials, to explore their features in such a way that students learn to appreciate the language itself, as well as discover new ways to use it.

References

Cook, G. 1995. Discourse and Literature: the interplay of form and mind. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Iddings, C. & McCafferty, S. 2005. Language play and language learning: Creating zones of proximal development in a third-grade classroom. In Tyler, A. (Ed.), Georgetown University Round Tables on Language and Linguistics: Language in Use, Washington, D. C.: George Town University Press

Esplugas, C. & Landwehr, M. (1996). The use of critical thinking skills in literary analysis. *Foreign Language Annals,* 29: 449-61.

Hall, G. 2002. Poetry, Pleasure, and Second Language Learning Classrooms**.** *Applied Linguistics, 24/3:395-399*.

Hanauer, D. 2001. 'The task of poetry reading and second language learning.' *Applied Linguistics* 22/3: 295-323.

Hirvela, A. (1996). Reader-response theory and ELT. *ELT Journal*, 50: 127-34.

Larsen-Freeman, D. 1997. 'Chaos/complexity science and second language acquisition'. *Applied Linguistics,* 18/2:141-65.

Mattix, M. 2001. The pleasure of poetry reading and second language learning. *Linguistics.23/3:*

Shanahan, D. 1997. Articulating the relationship between language, literature, and culture: Toward a new agenda for foreign language teaching and research. *Modern Language Journal,* 81: 164-74.

Shook, D. (1996). Foreign language literature and the beginning learner-reader. *Foreign Language Annals*, 29: 201-16.

Skehan, P. 1998. A cognitive approach to language learning. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

General Information

ALL Index

Authors and Articles

Davis, Lynne. (1998). *Essay Scores as Instruments for Placement and Advancement in an Intensive English Program. 9*(1 & 2), p. 107.
Derwing, Tracey M. (1997). *Pronunciation Instruction for "Fossilized" Learners: Can It Help? 8*(2), p. 217.
Derwing, Tracey M & Rossiter, Marian J. (2003). *The Effects of Pronunciation Instruction on the Accuracy, Fluency, and Complexity of L2 Accented Speech. 13*(1), p. 1.
Douglas, Dan. (1989). *Testing Listening Comprehension. 1*(1), p. 53.
Dow, Kathleen A. (2006). *Linguists: The Hidden Strength of U.S. Intelligence. 16*(1), p.1.
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.
Dunkel, Patricia A. (2004). *The Effects of Notetaking, Lecture length, and Topic on a Computer-Based Test of ESL Listening Comprehension. 14*(1). p. 83.
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.
Ewald, Jennifer. (2006). *Students' Evaluations of Dialogue Journals: Perspectives on Classroom Themes. 16*(1), p.37.
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.
Gonzallez-Bueno, Manuela. (2001). *Pronunciation Teaching Component in SL/FL Education Programs: Training Teachers to Teach Pronunciation. 12*(2), p. 133.
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.
Hayakawa, Harumi & Yoshinori Sasaki. (2003). *Does a Quiz Facilitate or Spoil Language Learning? Instructional Effects of Lesson Review Quizzes. 13*(1), p. 33.
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.
Hinkel, Eli. (2001). *Matters of Cohesion in L2 Academic Texts. 12*(2), p. 111.

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.
McCollum, Daniel L. (2003). *Investigating Non-Cognitive Components of Foriegn Language Achievement. 13*(1), p. 19.
McGarry, Richard. (2004). *Error Correction as a Cultural Phenomenon. 14*(1), p. 63.
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.
Mills, Susana V. (2006). *An Exploratory Study of Differing Perceptions of Error Correction between Teachers and Students: Bridging the Gap. 16*(1), p.55.
Mojica-Diaz, Clara C. (2006). *The Effects of Formal Instruction and Study Abroad on Improving Proficiency: The Case of the Spanish Subjunctive. 16*(1). p.17.
Mollaun, Pamela. (2004). *The Effects of Notetaking, Lecture length, and Topic on a Computer-Based Test of ESL Listening Comprehension. 14*(1). p. 83.
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 Second/ Foreign Language Learning Styles and Strategies. 4*(1 & 2), p. 65.
Oxford, Rebecca L. (1996). *Employing a Questionnaire to Assess the Use of Language Learning Strategies. 7*(1 & 2), p. 25.
Oxford, Rebecca L. (1997). *A Gender-Related Analysis of Strategies Used to Process Written Input in the Native Language and a Foreign Language. 8*(1), p. 43.
Patton, Jon. (1992). *Factors Relating to Learning a Foreign Language among High- and Low-Risk High School Students with Learning Disabilities. 3*(1 & 2), p. 37.

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.
Hedgcock, John. (2001). *Review: Herschensohn: The Second Time Around: Minimalism and L2 Acquisition. 12*(1). p. 87
Hedgcock, John. (2003). *Review: Nikolov: Issues in English Language Education. 13*(1), p. 73.
Hedgcock, John S. (2005). *Review: Alan Davis & Catherine Elder, Eds: The Handbook of Applied Linguistics.* 15(1 & 2), p. 67.
Hirai, Mutsumi. (2004). *Review: Nihongo Shokyu Dokkai Yomikata + Kakikata: Reading and Writing in Japanese for Beginners. 14*(1), p. 107
Jackson, Gordon L. (2000). *Review: González and Farrell: Composición Práctica. 11*(1), p. 221.
Jourdenais, Renee. (2000). *Review: Schneider: Multisensory Structured Metacognitive Instruction. 11*(1), p. 211.
Ko, Myong Hee. (2006). *Review: Andrew K. English & Laura K. English: North Star Reading and Writing: High Intermediate and Advanced. 16*(1), p.81.
Kuo, J. (1997). *Review: Taylor: Writing and Literacy in Chinese, Korean, and Japanese. 8*(1), p. 128.
Lesikin, Joan. (2000). *Review: Kozyrev: Talk it Over! Talk it Up! 11*(1), p. 217.
Nation, Paul. (1997). *Review: Strange (Ed.): Penguin Readers. 8*(2), P. 317.

Editorials

Interviews

News and Views

Smith, Patrick H. & León, Natalia Martinez. (2003). *Transnationalism and Language-in-Education Planning in Mexico. 13*(1), p. 57.
Woytak, Lidia. (2003). *Say, Yes! to the National Museum of Language. 13*(1), p. 61.
Woytak, Lidia. (2005). *Towards Faster, Bigger, and Better Computers.* 15(1 & 2), p. 77.

General Information

Calendar of Events*

2007

Southern Conference on Language Teaching (SCOLT), 1–3 March, Atlanta, GA. Contact: Lynne McClendon, Executive Director, SCOLT, 165 Lazy Laurel Chase, Roswell, GA 30076; (770) 992-1256, Fax (770) 992-3464; Email: lynnemcc@mindspring.com Web: www.valdosta.edu/scolt

Central States Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 8–10 March, Kansas City, MO. Contact: Patrick T. Raven, Executive Director, CSCTFL, PO Box 251, Milwaukee, WI 53201-0251; (414) 405-4645, Fax (414) 276-4650; Email: CSCTFL@aol.com Web: www.centralstates.cc

Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL), 21–24 March, Seattle, WA. Contact: TESOL, 700 S. Washington Street, Suite 200, Alexandria, VA 22314; (703) 836-0774, Fax (703) 836-7864; Email: conventions@tesol.org Web: www.tesol.org

Association of Teachers of Japanese Seminar, 22 March, Boston, MA. Contact: Yoshiko Mori, Seminar Committee Chair; Email: moriy@georgetown.edu Web: www.japaneseteaching.org/ATJseminar/2007/

Association for Asian Studies (AAS), 22–25 March, Boston, MA. Contact: AAS, 1021 East Huron St., Ann Arbor, MI 48104; (734) 665-2490; Fax (734) 665-3801; Email:annmtg@aasianst.org Web: www.aasianst.org

17th International Conference on Pragmatics and Language Learning, 26–28 March, Honololu, HI. Contact: National Foreign Language Resource Center, University of Hawai‘i at Manoa, 1859 East-West Road #106, Honolulu, HI 96822; (808) 956-9424, Fax (808) 956-5983; Email: nflrc@hawaii.edu Web: nflrc.hawaii.edu/prodev/pll/

International Society for Language Studies (ISLS), 2–4 April, Honolulu, HI. Contact: John Watzke; Email: john@isls-inc.org Web: www.isls-inc.org/conference/conference.html

American Educational Research Association (AERA), 9–13 April, Chicago, IL. Contact: AERA, 1230 17th St., NW, Washington, DC 20036-3078; (202) 223-9485, Fax (202) 775-1824, Web: www.aera.net

Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (NECTFL), 12–14 April, New York, NY. Contact: Northeast Conference, Dickinson College, PO Box 1773, Carlisle, PA 17013-2896; (717) 245-1977, Fax (717) 245-1976; Email: nectfl@dickinson.edu Web: www.nectfl.org

Social and Cognitive Aspects of Second Language Learning and Teaching, 12–14 April, Auckland, New Zealand. Contact: Farina Ibnul; Email: f.ibnul@auckland.ac.nz Web: www.arts.auckland.ac.nz/sites/index.cfm?P=9209

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

Southwest Conference on Language Teaching (SWCOLT), 12–15 April, Las Vegas, NV. Contact: Jody Klopp, Executive Director, SWCOLT, 713 Rock Hollow Road, Edmond, OK 73034; (405) 330-1318, Fax (405) 340-0923; Email: jklopp@swcolt.org Web: www.swcolt.org

American Association for Applied Linguistics (AAAL), 21–24 April, Costa Mesa, CA. Contact: AAAL, 3416 Primm Lane, Birmingham, AL 35216; (205) 824-7700, Fax (205) 823-2760; Email: aaal@primemanagement.net Web: www.aaal.org

National Council of Less Commonly Taught Languages (NCOLCTL), 26–29 April, Madison, WI. Contact: NCOLCTL, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 4231 Humanities Building, 455 N. Park Street, Madison, WI 53706; (608) 265-7903, Fax (608) 265-7904; Email: ncolctl@mailplus.wisc.edu Web: www.councilnet.org/conf/conf2007/prpsl.htm

International Reading Association (IRA), 13–17 May, Toronto, Canada. Contact: International Reading Association, Headquarters Office, 800 Barksdale Rd., PO Box 8139, Newark, DE 19714-8139; (302) 731-1600, Fax: (302) 731-1057; Web: www.reading.org

First Congress of Chinese Applied Linguistics, 16–21, May, Bejing, China. Contact: Email: celea@fltrp.com Web: www.celea.org.cn/english/5celea.asp

Second CELC Symposium for English Language Teachers, 30 May – 1 June, Singapore. Contact: Symposium Secretariat, Centre for English Language Communication, National University of Singapore, 10 Kent Ridge Crescent, Singapore 119260; (65) 6516-3866, Fax (65) 6777-9152; Email: symposiumsec@nus.edu.sg Web: www.nus.edu.sg/celc/symposium/

Fifth International Conference on Language Teacher Education, 31 May – 2 June, Minneapolis, MN. Contact: CARLA, University of Minnesota, 619 Heller Hall, 271 19th Avenue South, Minneapolis, MN 55455; (612) 626-8600, Fax (612) 624-7514; Email: lteconf@umn.edu Web: www.carla.umn.edu

LSA Summer Institute, 1–27 July, Stanford, CA. Contact: Department of Linguistics Attn: 2007 LSA Summer Institute, Stanford University, Building 460, 450 Serra Mall, Stanford, CA 94305-2150; Email: linginst07@stanford.edu Web: www.lsadc.org/info/inst-2007.cfm

American Association of Teachers of French (AATF), 12–15 July, Baton Rouge, LA. Contact: Jayne Abrate, AATF, Mailcode 4510, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, IL 62901-4510; (618) 453-5731, Fax (618) 453-5733; Email: abrate@siu.edu Web: www.frenchteachers.org

EUROCALL, 5–8 September, University of Ulster, Coleraine, Northern Ireland, UK. Contact: Web: www.eurocall-languages.org/confs/index.html

British Association for Applied Linguistics, 6–8 September, Edinburgh, UK. Contact: Web: www.baal.org.uk

Second International Conference on Task-based Language Teaching, 20–22 September, University of Hawai'i-Manoa, Honololu, HI. Contact: Email: organizers@tblt2007.org Web: www.hawaii.edu/tblt2007/index.html

African Studies Association (ASA), 18–21 October, New York, NY. Contact: Kimme Carlos, Annual Meeting Coordinator, Rutgers University, Douglass Campus, 132 George Street, New Brunswick, NJ 08901-1400; (732) 932-8173, Fax (732) 932-3394; Email: asaamc@rci.rutgers.edu Web: www.africanstudies.org

American Translators Association (ATA), 31 October – 3 November, Miami, FL. Contact: ATA, 225 Reinekers Lane, Suite 590, Alexandria, VA 22314; (703) 683-6100, Fax (703) 683-6122; Email: conference@atanet.org Web: www.atanet.org

American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL), 16–18 November, San Antonio, TX. Contact: ACTFL, 700 S. Washington St., Suite 210, Alexandria, VA 22314; (703) 894-2900, Fax (703) 894-2905; Email: headquarters@actfl.org Web: www.actfl.org

American Association of Teachers of German (AATG), 16–18 November, San Antonio, TX. Contact: AATG, 112 Haddontowne Court #104, Cherry Hill, NJ 08034; (856) 795-5553, Fax (856) 795-9398; Email: headquarters@aatg.org Web: www.aatg.org

American Association of Teachers of Italian (AATI), 17–19 November, Nashville, TN: Contact: Paolo Giordano, President AATI, Foreign Languages and Literatures, University of Central Florida, PO Box 161348, Orlando, FL 32816; (773) 508-2855, Fax (407) 823-6261; Email: pgiordan@mail.ucf.edu Web: www.aati-online.org

Chinese Language Teachers Association (CLTA), 16–18 November, San Antonio, TX. Contact: CLTA Headquarters, Cynthia Ning, Center for Chinese Studies, Moore Hall #416, University of Hawaii, Honolulu, HI 96822; (808) 956-2692, Fax (808) 956-2682; Email: cyndy@hawaii.edu Web: clta.osu.edu

National Network for Early Language Learning (NNELL), 16–18 November, San Antonio, TX. Contact: Mary Lynn Redmond, NNELL, PO Box 7266, B 201 Tribble Hall, Wake Forest University, Winston-Salem, NC 27109; Email: nnell@wfu.edu Web: www.nnell.org

2008 Events

Linguistic Society of America (LSA), 3–6 January, Chicago, IL. Contact: LSA, 1325 18th St. NW, # 211, Washington, DC 20036-6501; (202) 835-1714, Fax (202) 835-1717; Web: www.lsadc.org

Central States Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 6–8 March, Dearborn, MI. Contact: Patrick T. Raven, Executive Director, CSCTFL, PO Box 251, Milwaukee, WI 53201-0251; (414) 405-4645, Fax (414) 276-4650; Email: CSCTFL@aol.com Web: www.centralstates.cc

American Educational Research Association (AERA), 23–28 March, New York, NY. Contact: AERA, 1230 17th St., NW, Washington, DC 20036-3078; (202) 223-9485, Fax (202) 775-1824; Web: www.aera.net

Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (NECTFL), 27–29 March, New York, NY. Contact: Northeast Conference, Dickinson College, PO Box 1773, Carlisle, PA 17013-2896; (717) 245-1977, Fax (717) 245-1976; Email: nectfl@dickinson.edu Web: www.nectfl.org

Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL), 2–5 April, New York City, NY. Contact: TESOL, 700 S. Washington Street, Suite 200, Alexandria, VA 22314; (703) 836-0774, Fax (703) 836-7864; Email: conventions@tesol.org Web: www.tesol.org

Southern Conference on Language Teaching (SCOLT), 3–5 April, South Carolina. Contact: Lynne McClendon, Executive Director, SCOLT, 165 Lazy Laurel Chase, Roswell, GA 30076; (770) 992-1256, Fax (770) 992-3464; Email: lynnemcc@mindspring.com Web: www.valdosta.edu/scolt

International Reading Association (IRA), 4–8 May, Atlanta, GA. Contact: International Reading Association, Headquarters Office, 800 Barksdale Rd., PO Box 8139, Newark, DE 19714-8139; Web: www.reading.org

AILA 2008, 24–29 August, Essen, Germany. Contact: AILA 2008 Conference Office, Julian Sudhoff, Universität Duisburg-Essen, Campus Essen, FB Geisteswissenschaften, Anglistik, Universitätsstrasse 12, 45117 Essen, Germany; +(49) 201-183-2727; Email: orga-aila-2008@uni-due.de Web: www.aila2008.org

British Association for Applied Linguistics, 11–13 September, Glasgow, UK. Contact: Web: www.baal.org.uk.

American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL), 21–23 November, Orlando, FL. Contact: ACTFL, 700 S. Washington St., Suite 210, Alexandria, VA 22314; (703) 894-2900, Fax (703) 894-2905; Email: headquarters@actfl.org Web: www.actfl.org

American Association of Teachers of German (AATG), 21–23 November, Orlando, FL. Contact: AATG, 112 Haddontowne Court #104, Cherry Hill, NJ 08034; (856) 795-5553, Fax (856) 795-9398; Email: headquarters@aatg.org Web: www.aatg.org

Chinese Language Teachers Association (CLTA), 21–23 November, Orlando, FL. Contact: CLTA Headquarters, Cynthia Ning, Center for Chinese Studies, Moore Hall #416, University of Hawaii, Honolulu, HI 96822; (808) 956-2692, Fax (808) 956-2682; Email: cyndy@hawaii.edu Web: clta.osu.edu

National Network for Early Language Learning (NNELL), 21–23 November, Orlando, FL. Contact: Mary Lynn Redmond, NNELL, PO Box 7266, B 201 Tribble Hall, Wake Forest University, Winston-Salem, NC 27109; Email: nnell@wfu.edu Web: www.nnell.org

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 E-mail

Preferably use Windows-based software, or name the software used. Attach manuscripts to e-mail. aj@monterey.army.mil

Copyright

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

PB-65-06-2
United States Army
PIN: 083047-2/N-000
Approved for public release.
Distribution is unlimited.