

Volume 16 (1) 2010

Contents

ARTICLES

- Intercultural language learning (ICLL): Awareness and practice
of in-service language teachers on a professional development programme
Heather Richards, Clare Conway, Annelies Roskvist & Sharon Harvey 1
- Older Dutch migrants: exploring benefits of formal instruction in
L2 English pre-migration and ultimate attainment in L2
Ineke Crezee 17
- Noticing-reformulation tasks as a stimulus towards continued autonomous
phonological development
Joanna Smith & Basheba Beckmann 36
- SLA and grammar instruction materials: A study of coursebook writers'
considerations
Jacquelyn Arbury 52
- Taking pride in Te Reo Maori: How regular spelling promotes
literacy acquisition
Christian U. Krageloh & Tia N. Neha 66

REVIEWS

- The Cambridge guide to second language teacher education
A. Burns & J. Richards (Eds.)
Reviewed by Roger Barnard 77

Values, philosophies and beliefs in TESOL: Making a statement 81
G. Crookes
Reviewed by Marilyn Lewis

Dictionary use in foreign language writing exams: Impact and implications 84
M. East
Reviewed by Martin Andrew

Teaching ESL/EFL listening and speaking 86
P. Nation & J. Newton
Teaching ESL/EFL reading and writing
P. Nation
Reviewed by Anne Feryok

Tasks in second language learning 89
V. Samuda & M. Bygate
Reviewed by Anne Feryok

GUIDELINES FOR CONTRIBUTORS 91

Journal of the Applied Linguistics Association of New Zealand Inc.
ISSN 1173-5562
© ALANZ

ARTICLES

INTERCULTURAL LANGUAGE LEARNING (ICLL): AWARENESS AND PRACTICE OF IN-SERVICE LANGUAGE TEACHERS ON A PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME

**Heather Richards, Clare Conway, Annelies Roskvist
and Sharon Harvey**

AUT University

Abstract

Teaching culture in the language classroom is not new. However, with a paradigm shift to a focus on intercultural language learning (IcLL) in New Zealand schools, there are new views on culture and its place in the language teaching curriculum (Ministry of Education, 2007a). Teachers' knowledge and application of this new dimension in the classrooms is essential. Formalised professional development can assist teachers in gaining the knowledge and skills to develop the intercultural competence of their language learners. This paper considers the extent to which in-service teachers on a language teaching professional development course incorporate IcLL into their classes. The findings from course participants through observations and interviews indicate that language teachers of students in Years 7-9 were limited in their understanding and demonstration of IcLL in the classroom.

Introduction

The paper, which is based on a larger study (Harvey, Conway, Richards & Roskvist, 2009) funded by the New Zealand Ministry of Education, examines the extent to which in-service teachers on a language teaching professional development course incorporate Intercultural Language Learning (IcLL) into their classes. In addition, it aims to develop further understanding of the place of teaching culture in the language classroom in schools. The paper investigates the following questions:

1. To what extent are in-service language teachers on a professional development programme aware of the need to develop IcLL in their language lessons?
2. How are these teachers implementing IcLL in their classrooms?

We provide information about the Learning Languages area of the *New Zealand Curriculum (2007)* [Ministry of Education, 2007a], and discuss conceptualisations of intercultural language learning, before presenting and discussing the research findings.

The New Zealand Curriculum

The New Zealand school curriculum has included the learning of additional languages for many years, supported by ongoing Ministry of Education development and review. Ministry documents include curriculum guidelines for teaching Chinese,

Spanish, Samoan, Japanese, French and German (Ministry of Education, 1995a; 1995b; 1996; 1998; 2002a; 2002b; 2002c). Also provided are support materials with teaching notes, comprehensive lesson plans and classroom activities (see for example Ministry of Education, 1999, 2003). In 2007, after considerable research and development work, the Ministry of Education published the *New Zealand Curriculum (2007)* for English-medium teaching and learning in schools, Years 1-13 (Ministry of Education, 2007a). Previously the curriculum had seven learning areas, and learning additional languages was part of the general Language area. In the new 2007 document, learning languages has been separated out to form its own new learning area, which has raised the status of learning and teaching languages in schools. A key reason for this new focus has been to “encourage students to participate more actively in New Zealand’s diverse multicultural society and in the global community” (Education Review Office, 2009, p. 3).

At the heart of the new Learning Languages area is Communicative Competence. This is supported by two areas: Interacting and Making Meaning, and Knowledge Awareness. Knowledge Awareness comprises two equally weighted strands: Language Knowledge and Cultural Knowledge. Learners who can use their knowledge of language and knowledge of culture across cultural boundaries to successfully engage with others, are described as interculturally competent speakers (Byram, 1995). Developing language learners’ intercultural competence is desirable for a number of reasons: to enhance students’ engagement in the language learning process (Liddicoat, Papademetre, Scarino, & Kohler, 2003); to develop young learners’ favourable attitudes towards others (Nikolov & Djigunović, 2006); to enable learners to view the world through different eyes (Bennett, Bennett & Allen, 2003); and to enable learners to “understand more about themselves and become more understanding of others” (Ministry of Education, 2007b, p.1). This paper considers the extent to which language teachers on a professional development course implement IcLL in their classes.

Conceptualisations of IcLL

Teaching culture has been an integral part of language teaching classrooms, but the ways in which it is taught continues to evolve. Crozet, Liddicoat, and Lo Bianco (1999) distinguish four historical approaches. Culture was traditionally taught through literature, architecture and artefacts (high culture) with an expectation of using the Target Language (TL) to read and understand text. Later, in the ‘culture studies’ approach, there was a shift to studying events, institutions, people and places and a greater focus on knowing about or having contact with the TL country. The subsequent ‘culture as practices’ approach viewed the teaching of culture in terms of knowing about practices, values and behaviours of people in the TL country (small culture), developing cross cultural understanding and helping the learner to use appropriate language and behaviour in a variety of situations. The fourth approach, referred to as ‘intercultural language teaching’ (ILT) involves a new understanding of cross cultural exchange in language education. ILT aims to develop intercultural

competence through “the learning of how language and culture connect in one’s first and target language” (Crozet et al., 1999, p. 11). The way people construct culture in their everyday lives is through language, and intercultural speakers are those who can communicate effectively across cultures and engage in negotiating meaning (Roberts, Byram, Barro, Jordan & Street, 2001, cited in Bateman, 2002). Intercultural language teaching is “concerned with the human relationships and identities of speakers in the target culture context” (Byram, Gribkova & Starkey 2002, p. 10).

To clarify and assess the concept of being interculturally competent, a number of approaches have been proposed. Byram (1997) formulates five *savoirs* (knowledge and skills) that the interculturally competent language speaker needs in order to negotiate across cultural boundaries. Sercu (2004, p. 77) expands on Byram’s model by suggesting that for learners to be successful with these five *savoirs* they also need to develop metacognitive strategies in order to “plan, direct and evaluate [their] own learning processes.” Crozet and Liddicoat (1999) explore three dimensions in ILT: learning about culture, comparing cultures, and intercultural exploration. In ILT teachers provide opportunities for learners to study the language and culture—the ‘linguaculture’; to make comparisons between their own and the target cultures; and to explore differences to come to a deeper awareness of their own cultural boundaries. The process assists learners in gaining a better understanding about themselves and others, which may lead to positioning themselves in a comfortable third place (Kramsch, 1993).

Although the personal and interpersonal shift required to move into the third place cannot be taught, aspects of culture can be taught explicitly (Crozet & Liddicoat, 1999) and the classroom is a place where learners have the opportunity to gain knowledge, develop skills and reflect on learning (Byram, 1997). Elsen and St John (2007) make strong links between intercultural competence and learner autonomy, proposing a pedagogical framework which has application for teachers who seek a structure for incorporating intercultural competence into the language lesson. The pedagogical framework is supported by four bases which take learners through a number of processes. In *frontlining the familiar* learners notice boundaries and differences in their own context before *facing the foreign*—moving beyond their own personal experiences of culture. In the third stage, *foreignising the familiar*, as learners reflect on their own culture they become more aware of their own attitudes and beliefs. This leads to the final stage, *familiarising the foreign*, where teachers encourage learners to take opportunities beyond the classroom to personally interact with members of the target language community.

The conceptualisation of intercultural competence is continuing to evolve. At the end of a recent professional development programme in Australia, experienced language teachers and language teacher educators expressed a range of understanding about both the nature and effective implementation of intercultural competence in the language classroom (Morgan, 2008). Morgan noted that no clear agreement on a definition of intercultural language learning was reached and indicated, along with

Scarino and Crichton (2008), a continuing need for further exploration, research and discussion.

Alongside the reconceptualisation of teaching culture in the classroom and the practicalities of implementation is the question of effective methods of assessment of IcLL which is acknowledged as a most complex area for development. There are challenges in determining the content areas (Sercu, 2004) and there is a need to avoid the oversimplification and generalisation of assessing what is easily observed, such as trivial facts and figures (Byram, 1997). Furthermore, consideration needs to be given to test types and whether to assess holistically or discretely (Byram, 1997; Sercu, 2004). Other challenges include establishing assessment criteria, standardising marking against these criteria, choosing appropriate grade methods (Sercu, 2004) and incorporating assessment scales on cultural content in curriculum documents (Crozet & Liddicoat, 1999). Scarino (2008, p. 20) in exploring assessment, states it is still “the least well-developed dimension of intercultural language learning”, noting that the traditional paradigm of assessment, based on facts and bodies of knowledge, does not lend itself to assessing the dynamic, interactive social phenomenon of IcLL. In an attempt to further mitigate the challenges, she calls for an element of experimentation and creativity in assessing IcLL and for assessment to capture learners’ progress and growth in IcLL over time.

With regard to both the teaching and assessment of language and culture in New Zealand schools, the links between language and culture are recognised in curriculum support materials and guidelines provided by the Ministry of Education for the teaching of international languages. *Hao! An introduction to modern standard Chinese* (one of the Ministry of Education’s International Language Series courses) explains that “language and culture go hand in hand” and suggests that “students’ learning can be enhanced by the frequent inclusion of relevant and interesting cultural activities” (2003, p. 5). An examination of this resource indicates that the teaching of culture is mainly aligned with the ‘culture studies’ and ‘culture as practice’ approaches mentioned above. For example, students learn about location and names of major cities, a history of Chinese writing, and traditional and modern sports. They study practices around eating food, counting numbers on fingers, and the significance of certain colours and numbers. In some units there are indications of developing an intercultural approach. For example, Unit 5 provides prompts for teachers to facilitate a discussion on some differences and similarities between school life in New Zealand and China. With regard to assessment of learning outcomes, self and peer checking sheets are used at the end of each unit and in most units, the assessment focus is primarily on language. However, there is an occasional focus on developing knowledge of culture, for example, learners are asked to self assess and respond to the prompt “now I can talk about how Chinese people used to tell the time in the old days” (Ministry of Education, 2003, p. 56).

The present study

Taking into account the heightened focus on culture in the Languages Learning area of the *New Zealand Curriculum 2007*, and the varying and evolving conceptualisation of IcLL, the present study investigates the implementation of IcLL by language teachers on a professional development programme. It reports on data from a more comprehensive study undertaken for the Ministry of Education (Harvey, Conway, Richards & Roskvist, 2009) which investigated a number of areas including IcLL. This paper, reporting on IcLL, examines qualitative data from seven case studies—volunteers from the participants on the 2008 year-long professional development programme for teachers of Chinese, French, German, Japanese or Spanish. The overall aims of the programme were to develop teachers' language proficiency and capability in second language teaching to improve outcomes for learners.

The seven case study teachers, all native speakers of English, were selected to ensure a wide mix of the following variables: geographical area in New Zealand, type of school, school decile rating, varying school communities (rural, small town, large city), level of students, range of languages taught and length of language teaching experience, which varied from no prior experience to four years teaching language in the classroom. The design for the research involved interviews and observations, with each case study participant interviewed and observed three times during the year. The interview questions were semi-structured, enabling the researchers to probe teacher understandings of their developing knowledge of the curriculum—both knowledge of language and knowledge of culture (Kervin, Vialle, Herrington & Okely, 2006). The case study teachers were asked about their main lesson aims, and whether they were making links between language and culture (and to give examples where appropriate). Observation prompts based on good language teaching practice were developed from key literature (Krashen, 1981; Erlam, 2005; Gibbs & Holt, 2003; Ellis, 1993; Crozet & Liddicoat, 1999). Observations were carried out in the teachers' own classroom during their regular class time, and interviews generally took place after these observed lessons. Handwritten notes were taken during interviews and observations.

To analyse observation data an IcLL framework was developed (see Figure 1). Our framework was devised from two main sources, the first of which was the Cultural Knowledge strand of the Learning Languages area of the *New Zealand Curriculum (2007)*. This strand is underpinned by the work of researchers from a variety of contexts, particularly Byram (1995) and Kramsch (1993) and informs the Achievement Objectives for the Communication strand of the curriculum. Key features are that learners recognise the target culture(s) is(are) organised in particular ways, make connections with known cultures and compare and contrast cultural practices, leading to learners understanding more about themselves and becoming more understanding of others (Ministry of Education, 2007b). Secondly, our IcLL framework was informed by the work of Byram (1997), Crozet and Liddicoat (1999) and Elsen and St John (2006).

Intercultural Language Learning (IcLL) Framework				
Learners make connections with known cultures	Learners compare and contrast cultural practices and make meaning	Learners make links between culture and language and make meaning	Learners reflect on own culture(s) through eyes of others.	Learners interact in a culturally competent way with a TL community
<p><i>Teacher provides opportunities for students to personalise their learning and to gain an understanding of their own environment.</i></p> <p>Eg. Who's been on a picnic? Where? What food do you take? Here's a picture of Carlos Moreno and his family on a picnic. What food can you see? What do you call 'sausages' in Spanish.</p>	<p><i>Teacher provides opportunities for learners to explicitly notice similarities and differences.</i></p> <p>Eg. Which of these Spanish foods are the same as the food you eat. Which ones are different?</p>	<p><i>Teacher provides opportunities for learners to explicitly link and explore language and culture.</i></p> <p>Eg. Carlos says 'Buen apetito! 'When does he say this? Why? Do you know a word in English that is similar? Do you say anything? What do you say?</p>	<p><i>Teacher provides opportunities for learners to explicitly understand more about their own culture</i></p> <p>Eg. Carlos is coming to stay with you. What would he think about your picnic in NZ?</p>	<p><i>Teacher provides opportunities for learners to cross cultural boundaries and interact in the T</i></p> <p>Eg. Our class is going to contact Carlos and his classmates via the internet to find out about their school lunch time and food.</p>

Figure 1: Intercultural Language Learning Framework with fictionalised examples

The difficulty with any framework for observation is that it involves organisation and categorisation of components (Scarino, 2008). Consequently, the components of the IcLL framework do not exist in isolation; they are inter-related, and so to an extent they are 'porous'. In addition, they are not necessarily observed sequentially in a lesson. However, they do represent a change of focus, providing opportunities for learners to become interculturally competent. As shown in Figure 1, each component of the designed framework includes fictional examples of teaching events to demonstrate the kind of intercultural teaching and learning opportunities that could take place. In the first component the teacher encourages learners to make

connections with known cultures. There is a focus on personalising the learning so that students understand and articulate more about their own environment. Comparisons between the Target Culture (TC) and known culture(s) in the second area allow for deeper exploration. The teacher provides opportunities for the students to compare underlying beliefs, values or behaviour, thereby establishing new meanings and understandings. In the next component, the teacher enables students to understand the interrelationship of language and culture through making links between the two. In the example given, a discussion of the term used at the start of a Spanish meal could lead to whole class talk about what class members say before their own meals. A significant step in the process of becoming interculturally competent is the recognition that there are multiple views of the world. So in this component students need opportunities to reflect on how their own culture(s) may be viewed by others. In the final component, to meet the overall aim of intercultural competence, students need opportunities to manage interaction across cultural boundaries, for example, face to face or via the internet. As previously stated, the components are not necessarily sequential, but they do provide one way for recorded observation data to be analysed.

Findings

Interview and observation data from the seven case study teachers provide insights into their awareness of IcLL and their implementation of it in the classroom.

Awareness of IcLL

When asked in the first interview about their developing knowledge of the *New Zealand Curriculum (2007)*, no teachers indicated any awareness at all about developing IcLL. All teacher responses were concerned with developing learners' linguistic competence. In order to further explore teachers' awareness of IcLL, in subsequent interviews the researchers included questions about the main aims of the last language lesson teachers had taught. The results shown in Figure 2 indicate that teachers' previous lesson aims were predominantly related to language and communication, rather than culture.

As can be seen in Figure 2, the data from interview two (undertaken mid-course) reveals that only two of the seven case study teachers had explicit cultural aims. Findings from interview three at the end of the course indicated that a different two teachers had cultural aims. Overall, data from 14 interviews revealed only four mentions of teachers having cultural aims in their lessons. These aims were: looking for differences and similarities between students in New Zealand and the TC; comparing differences between New Zealand and TC climate and seasons; understanding the special rules around mealtime and sharing food; using TL structures for students to talk about themselves so that they could become aware of the difference between nationality and cultural identity. While there was the potential for discussion of cultural dimensions within the linguistic aims (eg. a revision of

CASE STUDY TEACHER MAIN LESSON AIMS				
Teacher	Interview 2		Interview 3	
	Language/ communication aims	Cultural aims	Language/ communication aims	Cultural aims
Teacher 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SS to take ownership of own learning. Learn and practise new vocabulary. Develop ss confidence in communicating in TL. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extended teaching practice. Review of formulaic expressions. Revision of parts of the body. 	
Teacher 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduce new vocabulary. Move kids along in relation to TL. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SS to communicate in TL (food likes and dislikes). 	
Teacher 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Learn adjectival phrases. Learn vocabulary for school subjects. Asking and answering questions. To help their oral production. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To introduce and get ss to learn weather phrases. 	
Teacher 4		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SS to experience the cultural aspects of welcoming people and TL etiquette around food. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vocabulary: animals, colours. Grammar revision: I like. 	
Teacher 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Practise formulaic phrases. Revise colours. Practise clothes vocab through listening and writing. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New formulaic language. Revise greetings. Grammar: word endings. Vocabulary: names of countries; / <i>am v. I'm from</i>. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SS to be aware of difference between nationality (I'm from NZ) and cultural identity (I'm Samoan).
Teacher 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revision. Preparation for summative test. Reading for comprehension. Pronunciation and listening. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SS to be introduced to new vocabulary by need (not list). SS to have shared their words with group and done task in TL. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SS to recognise difference between NZ and TL climate and seasons.
Teacher 7		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cultural knowledge – deepen ss understanding of TL people & countries. – looking for similarities and differences in TL film. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focus on form (perfect tense). Teaching grammar more explicitly. Group work to pair work to individual. 	

Figure 2: Case study teacher main aims of last lesson taught

greetings and the accompanying body language) the teachers did not articulate this during interviews or observed lessons.

Another area explored in interviews was teacher awareness of the need to make links between language and culture. The data gathered indicated that by the end of the professional development programme, teachers showed a range of awareness. Two teachers acknowledged they had no real focus on making links between the TL and students' own culture, but indicated they would try to do so in the future. However, these teachers' ideas for future integration were limited to food, festivals, facts and folk tales. One teacher commented "I don't know much about culture. I know the [TL] school system is different, but I need to know more about this and what is useful for the kids. The course could point out ways to teach more about this." Another teacher commented how, where possible, she gave students information about the culture, but did not make explicit links and comparisons. Two other case study teachers indicated that they had limited use of resources such as videos to make comparisons, but they hoped to expand on this the following year. Only two teachers said they were able to freely integrate language and culture in their lessons, one giving a clear example of how she made explicit comparisons between activities permitted in youth culture in New Zealand compared with those in the TL country.

Implementation of IcLL

Insights into how teachers were implementing IcLL in the classroom were gained from observation data. The data from 20 observations showed that the seven case study teachers were operating to varying degrees in three components of the IcLL framework (see Figure 3).

Figure 3 shows two observed occasions where teachers were providing opportunities for their learners to personalise their learning and make connections with known cultures. For example, one teacher was observed linking TL fairy stories and English fairy stories before students read the story in the TL and then acted the parts, having noticed the different sounds animals make in different cultures. In another instance a teacher contextualised new vocabulary through reference to the All Blacks and the current rugby relationships between the two countries. There were two instances of teachers providing opportunities for students to compare and contrast cultural practices. One was related to a comparison of transport between the TC and New Zealand, and the underlying notion of punctuality. Another teacher focussed learners on seasons and weather in New Zealand and the TC and explored reasons for the differences before students read about a day in the life of a student in the TC. In observed lessons, four teachers were making links between culture and language. Two teachers linked phrases in the target language with English phrases. For example, one teacher drew the students' attention to the use of the same concept— 'cauliflower ears'—in both languages to describe large ears. Another teacher raised awareness of the concept of different words used by different cultures who speak the same language. Figure 3 indicates that no teachers were observed operating in two areas of the framework. No explicit opportunities were provided for learners to reflect on their own culture through the eyes of others, nor for students to interact in the TL community.

Intercultural Language Learning (IcLL) Framework					
	Learners make connections with known cultures <i>Teacher (T) provides opportunities for students to personalise their learning and to gain an understanding their own environment.</i>	Learners compare and contrast cultural practices and make meaning <i>Teacher(T) provides opportunities for learners to explicitly notice similarities and differences</i>	Learners make links between culture and language and make meaning <i>Teacher (T) provides opportunities for learners to explicitly link and explore language and culture.</i>	Learners reflect on own culture(s) through eyes of others. <i>Teacher (T) provides opportunities for learners to explicitly understand more about their own culture</i>	Learners interact in a culturally competent way with a TL community <i>Teacher (T) provides opportunities for learners to cross cultural boundaries and interact in the TL</i>
Teacher 1					
Teacher 2					
Teacher 3					
Teacher 4					
Teacher 5			T made link by noting TL word for clothing item used in two TL countries and compared this with the use of different vocabulary items in USA and NZ.		

Teacher 6	Explicit link. T asked 'Who did NZ play rugby with in last World Cup?' Students responded accurately.	T elicited opposite seasons and weather between NZ and TC	T made link through comparing TL phrase 'cauliflower ears' and its common use in NZ and in TC.	
Teacher 7	<p>T made links between English fairy tales with, and TL fairy tales, using map of TL to show where story took place. T asked students what they ate for breakfast before they researched what TL speakers have for breakfast</p> <p>T asked students about the number of Olympic medals NZ had while students researched TL medals score</p> <p>T asked 'Did you notice animals make different sounds in TL (than in English)?'</p> <p>T compared condiments with hot chips in NZ cf TC</p>	<p>T compared use of buses in TC and in NZ (eg. notions of punctuality) and students noted the differences in transport.</p>	<p>T made links between different phrases she knew would interest the students eg. English 'scaredy cat' but in TL 'scared rabbit'</p>	

Fig 3: Analysis of observed classes using IcLL Framework

Figure 3 also reveals that four of the seven teachers did not provide any opportunities at all to develop learners' IcLL, although there were times when they could have done so. Researchers observed occasions where the 'teaching moment' in terms of developing intercultural knowledge was lost. For example, in one class, students learned vocabulary for a wide range of school subjects studied in the TC. However, the teacher did not take this further by asking students to compare and contrast the number and type of subjects studied in the two different countries and the number of lessons per day. Nor was there any discussion on the subjects that were considered important in cultures. Such discussions could encourage learners to reflect on what happens in their own school and their own cultural beliefs about the value of knowledge.

Discussion

From the data it seems that of the seven case study teachers only two were engaging in trying to develop interculturally competent language learners. Five of the case study teachers at the end of the course showed limited awareness and implementation of IcLL. The two teachers who articulated cultural lesson aims (see Figure 2) and who were observed developing students' IcLL to some extent (see Figure 3) had a number of factors in common. They were both highly proficient in the TL, and both had had experience of living in the TC. In addition they were experienced teachers and although they had no previous formal training as language teachers, they had been teaching the TL for three or more years to high school learners. Although these teachers were providing IcLL opportunities for their learners, it did not appear however (from interview and observation) that they were encouraging learners to see their own culture(s) through the eyes of others, nor to have opportunities to cross intercultural boundaries and interact in the TL.

Of concern are the five case study teachers who had limited awareness of IcLL at the end of the course and who demonstrated weak attempts to implement it in the classroom. Although the professional development course was very successful in assisting case study teachers to develop learners' linguistic competence (Harvey, Conway, Richards & Roskvist, 2009), it was less effective in providing ways for teachers to develop interculturally competent learners. A possible reason for this is the influence of the Generic Framework (Ministry of Education, 2007b) on the content of the professional development course. As previously mentioned, the Generic Framework includes both Language and Cultural Knowledge with equal weighting. Language Knowledge is supported by ten general principles for designing effective language programmes (Ellis, 2005). These principles formed an integral part of the professional development programme, with case study teachers demonstrating significant gains in their knowledge and practice of teaching language. However, there are no similar principles for Cultural Knowledge in the current Generic Framework (ibid).

For teachers to develop IcLL, a set of pedagogic principles needs to be firmly embedded in the Generic Framework (Ministry of Education, 2007b). Drawn from

international intercultural language teaching and learning, six pedagogic principles of intercultural communicative language teaching and learning (iCLT) have recently been developed for the Ministry of Education (Newton, Yates, Shearn & Nowitzki, 2009) and are in the process of being incorporated into language education in New Zealand schools (Newton, 2009). The principles are being discussed in forums such as the Ministry of Education National Advisory Conference, March, 2010, with a view to helping teachers understand and develop their language learners' intercultural competence. The place of these six pedagogic principles in the Generic Framework is an area for consideration: whether they should be a discrete set alongside the existing Ellis principles, or whether there should be a combined set of principles that embrace both the intercultural and Ellis principles. The publication of a clear set of principles and guidelines for operationalising them in the classroom would assist teacher educators to further engage with IcLL, and in turn inform teacher professional development programmes. A set of principles may also contribute to further discussion of appropriate ways to assess intercultural language learning which, as indicated earlier, is still a complex and evolving area. Once possible means of assessing IcLL are developed, there may be a greater chance of language teachers fully embracing intercultural language learning.

Conclusion

In New Zealand there has been a variety of approaches to the teaching of culture in the language classroom, from teaching culture through literature, to culture studies, and culture as practices and, more recently, intercultural language teaching (Crozet, Liddicoat & Lo Bianco, 1999). With the introduction of the Learning Languages area in the *New Zealand Curriculum (2007)* there is now a greater focus on developing intercultural competence so learners are able to successfully communicate with those of other cultures. In turn, learners gain greater insights into their own world. The expanded view of culture is a complex, dynamic area, and implementation by practitioners is still evolving.

This paper examines the IcLL knowledge of a range of New Zealand in-service language teachers on a one year professional development course, and identifies the opportunities they provided for learners to develop intercultural competence. Teachers revealed in interviews that they had few explicit cultural aims in their lessons and they were generally limited in making links between language and culture. Observation data analysed against the IcLL framework revealed that only two of seven case study teachers demonstrated provision of some IcLL opportunities. These two teachers were experienced language teachers (though without specific language teaching qualifications), were highly proficient in the target language and had spent considerable periods of time in the TC. In observations, the other case study teachers made little or no attempt to provide opportunities for learners to develop intercultural understanding. Significantly, no teachers in the study were observed to provide opportunities for learners to see their own culture through the eyes of others.

To enable teachers to fully engage learners in intercultural competence, there is a need for intercultural language learning principles to be embedded in the Generic Framework (Ministry of Education, 2007b) and for continuing discussion on ways to operationalise the principles. In addition, further exploration of effective methods of assessing the complex area of IcLL is necessary. IcLL is then more likely to become a central part of language teaching professional development programmes, and in turn a core part of teaching languages in the classroom.

Acknowledgements

We would like to acknowledge the support of the Ministry of Education in funding the original 2008 study (Harvey et al., 2009), in particular Margaret Hardiman (Senior Advisor, Languages) in the Ministry who worked closely with the researchers for the duration of the project. As well, we would like to thank the case study teachers for generously volunteering their time and classes, which has contributed to the developing understanding of the role of IcLL in the New Zealand language classroom. We would also like to thank Afshana Ali, research administrator, for her support during the project.

Acronyms

IcLL	Intercultural Language Learning
iCLT	intercultural Communicative Language Teaching
ILT	Intercultural Language Teaching
SLA	Second Language Acquisition
TC	Target Culture
TL	Target Language

References

- Bateman, B. (2002). Promoting openness towards culture learning: Ethnographic interviews for learners of Spanish. *Modern Language Journal*, 86(3), 318-331.
- Bennett, J., Bennett, M. & Allen, W. (2003). Developing intercultural competence in the language classroom. In D. Lange & R. Paige (Eds.) *Culture as the core: Perspectives on culture in second language education* (pp. 237-265). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.
- Byram, M. (1995). Intercultural competence and mobility in a multi-national contexts: A European view. In M.L. Tickoo (Ed.) *Language and culture in multilingual societies* (pp. 21-26). Singapore: SEAMO Regional Language Centre.
- Byram, M. (1997). *Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Byram, M., Gribkova, B., & Starkey, H. (2002). *Developing the intercultural dimension in language teaching: A practical introduction for teachers*. The Council of Europe. Retrieved April 29, 2009 from <http://lrc.cornell.edu/director/intercultural.pdf>
- Crozet C. & Liddicoat, A. (1999). The challenge of intercultural language teaching: Engaging with culture in the classroom. In J. Lo Bianco, A. Liddicoat & C. Crozet (Eds.), *Striving for the third place: Intercultural competence through language education* (pp. 113-115). Melbourne: Language Australia.

- Crozet, C., Liddicoat, A. & Lo Bianco, J. (1999). Introduction: Intercultural competence from language policy to language education. In J. Lo Bianco, A. Liddicoat & C. Crozet (Eds.), *Striving for the third place: Intercultural competence through language education* (pp. 1-20). Melbourne: Language Australia.
- Education Review Office. (2009). *Readiness to implement the New Zealand Curriculum*. Wellington: Education Review Office. Retrieved June 30, 2009, from <http://ero.govt.nz/ero/publishing.nsf/Content/readiness-nz-curric-jan09>
- Ellis, R. (1993). The structural syllabus and second language acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27(1), 91-113.
- Ellis, R. 2005. Instructed second language acquisition: A literature review. Wellington: Ministry of Education. www.minedu.govt.nz
- Elsen, A. & St. John, O. (2007). Learner autonomy and intercultural competence. In M. Raya and L. Sercu (Eds.), *Challenges in teacher development: Learner autonomy and intercultural competence* (pp. 15-38). Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Erlam, R. (2005). Maximising instructional effectiveness in the language classroom. *The New Zealand Language Teacher*, 31, 38 - 40.
- Gibbs, R. & Holt, R. (2003). *The teaching of international languages in New Zealand schools in Years 7 and 8: An evaluation study*. Report to the Ministry of Education. Auckland: Auckland University of Technology.
- Harvey, S., Conway, C., Richards, H., & Roskvist. (2009). *Evaluation of Teacher Professional Development Languages (in Years 7-10) and the impact on language learning opportunities and outcomes for students*. Report to the Ministry of Education. Auckland: Auckland University of Technology.
- Kervin, L., Vialle, W., Herrington, J. & Okely, T. (2006). *Research for educators*. Canada: Thomson Learning Nelson.
- Kramsch, C. (1993). *Context and culture in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Krashen, S. (1981). *Second language acquisition and second language learning*. Oxford, England: Pergamon.
- Liddicoat, A., Papademetre, L., Scarino, A. & Kohler, M. (2003). *Report on intercultural language learning*. Canberra: Australian Government, Department of Education, Science and Training. Retrieved 19 June, 2009 from <http://www.education.tas.gov.au/school/educators/resources/lote/cultural>
- Ministry of Education. (1995a). *Chinese in the New Zealand Curriculum*. Wellington: Learning Media.
- Ministry of Education. (1995b). *Spanish in the New Zealand Curriculum*. Wellington: Learning Media.
- Ministry of Education. (1996). *Samoan in the New Zealand Curriculum*. Wellington: Learning Media.
- Ministry of Education. (1998). *Japanese in the New Zealand Curriculum*. Wellington: Learning Media.
- Ministry of Education. (2002a). *French in the New Zealand Curriculum*. Wellington: Learning Media.
- Ministry of Education. (2002b). *German in the New Zealand Curriculum*. Wellington: Learning Media.
- Ministry of Education. (2002c) *Learning languages: A guide for New Zealand schools*. Wellington: Learning Media.
- Ministry of Education. (1999). *Hai! An introduction to Japanese*. International Language Series. Wellington: Learning Media.
- Ministry of Education. (2003). *Hao! An introduction to modern standard Chinese*. International Language Series. Wellington: Learning Media.
- Ministry of Education. (2007a). *The New Zealand Curriculum (2007)*. Wellington: Learning Media.
- Ministry of Education. (2007b). *The generic framework for teaching and learning languages in English-medium schools*. Wellington: Learning Media.

- Morgan, A. (2008). Developing programs for intercultural language learning: Insights from project team feedback. [online]. *Babel*, 43(1), 23-30, 33, 39. Retrieved June 18, 2009 from <http://search.informit.com.au.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/fullText;dn=200900430;res=APAFT>
- Newton, J. (2009). A place for 'intercultural' communicative language teaching (iCLT) in New Zealand ESOL classrooms. *TESOLANZ Journal*, 17, 1-12.
- Newton, J., Yates, E., Shearn, S. & Nowitzki, W. (2009). *Intercultural communicative language teaching (iCLT): Implications for effective teaching and learning*. Unpublished draft report to the Ministry of Education.
- Nikolov, M. & Djigunović, J. (2006). Recent research on age, second language acquisition and early foreign language learning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 26, 234-260.
- Scarino, A. 2008. Assessment in intercultural language learning [online]. *Babel* 43(1), 20-22, 38-39. Retrieved June 18, 2009 from <http://search.informit.com.au.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/fullText;dn=200900429;res=APAFT>
- Scarino, A., & Crichton, J. (2008). Why the intercultural matters to language teaching and learning: An orientation to the ILTLP program. (Intercultural Learning and Teaching in Practice). [online]. *Babel*, 43,(1), 4-6, 38. Retrieved June 18, 2009 from <http://search.informit.com.au.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/fullText;dn=200900424;res=APAFT>
- Sercu, L. 2004. Assessing intercultural competence: A framework for systematic test development in foreign language education and beyond. *Intercultural Education*, 15(1), 73-89.

OLDER DUTCH MIGRANTS: EXPLORING BENEFITS OF FORMAL INSTRUCTION IN L2 ENGLISH PRE-MIGRATION AND ULTIMATE ATTAINMENT IN L2

Ineke Crezee
AUT University

Abstract

This paper reports on the findings of research undertaken to examine whether a group of older Dutch migrants were showing signs of first language (L1) reversion and concomitant signs of second language (L2) attrition. Rather surprisingly, it appeared that the most important factor impacting on respondents' continued ability to communicate in the L2 involved their prior education, with those who had learned the L2 English by means of formal classroom instruction - using the Grammar Translation Method or GTM - appearing to show less signs of L1 reversion. The paper discusses some of the findings and reflects on the benefits of the GTM in combination with almost complete immersion in an L2 environment. The findings seem to present an argument for continued structured English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) instruction to migrants and refugees to the point where they are able to find employment in language rich L2 environments, allowing them to consolidate their L2 proficiency to a level that is more 'immune to forgetting' (Neisser, 1984).

Background and literature review

The data for the current paper were collected as part of a study undertaken in fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of PhD. The aim of the study overall was to investigate the incidence of first language (L1) reversion and concomitant Second Language (L2) attrition in a group of healthy older L1 Dutch migrants, all of whom had arrived in New Zealand between 1950 and 1965 and who had now reached retirement age. The social relevance of the study lay in its implications for social policy. If older Dutch migrants were indeed showing signs of L2 English attrition, this might have consequences for social policy in terms of the provision of interpreter and bilingual healthcare services.

A large number of Dutch migrants arrived in New Zealand between 1950 and 1965 (Schouten, 1992), looking for better opportunities for themselves and their children. Most found themselves settling, at least initially, in different areas of the country, with many bonded to an employer for two years (Schouten, 1992). The study involved a number of these migrants, now aged sixty-five and over and officially retired. Respondents were from two groups of linguistic environments post-retirement: the predominantly L1 environment of the Dutch Village (DV) in Auckland and the predominantly L2 environment of New Zealand society at large.

One of the hypotheses underpinning the study was that relative isolation from the L2 post-retirement would be a contributing factor in L2 attrition and L1 reversion (de Bot & Clyne, 1989; de Bot & Clyne 1994; Kipp, 2002). This meant that one could expect that respondents who were now living in a predominantly L1 environment such as the Dutch village in Te Atatu, Auckland, would be showing greater signs of L1 reversion and L2 attrition. In other words, the author expected to find that predominant linguistic environment post-retirement would be a significant factor in the incidence of L1 reversion and L2 attrition. However, the author found that in fact respondents' educational background, and most importantly any L2 instruction received prior to emigrating to New Zealand, played a more important role in respondents' continued ability to communicate in the L2 than did predominant linguistic environment post-retirement.

The study was preceded by an extensive review of the literature in relation to any factors which might impact on migrants' use and maintenance of both their L1 and L2. Obviously, there are many factors which may impact on the above (De Bot and Makoni, 2005; Byalistok et al., 2004), and the original literature review therefore brought together studies and theories from a wide range of areas. Given the paucity of empirical research in the area of first language (L1) reversion, commented on by Schmid and Keijzer (2009, p. 83), the researcher decided to include studies in relation to bilingualism and the bilingual mind (Paradis, 1994; 2004), moving on to bilingualism in a migrant context. The literature review also looked at contact phenomena, including codeswitching and the use of grammatical structures from the other language (e.g. Poplack, 1981; Myers-Scotton, 1993; Milroy and Muysken, 1995; Muysken, 2000). Since the subjects of the study were L2 learners, the literature also included a review of the literature on Second Language Acquisition (SLA) (Ellis, 1994). There is an apparent dearth of language attrition and language reversion studies, as noted by Schmid (2004) and Schmid and Keijzer (2009). Schmid and Keijzer describe first language attrition as a change in language proficiency where a language 'appears to become less easily accessible and word-finding difficulties, interferences from the second language and lexical and grammatical 'errors' may begin to occur' (2009, p. 1). According to Schmid and Keijzer first language reversion occurs as immigrants grow older and 'they tend to use the L1 more than they did in middle age' (2009, p. 2). They comment on possible problematic issues relating to studies into first language attrition and reversion among older migrants, including the role of confounding variables such as early dementia (2009, p. 2).

As regards language and ageing, de Bot and Makoni (2005) adopt an integrative approach, based on Dynamic Systems Theory, which involves taking account of interacting variables that constantly change due to interaction with the environment and self-reorganization (2005, p. 5). This approach is obviously very suited to any research including language development over a lifespan, but it also bespeaks the very difficulty of dealing with a research area that involves many potentially confounding variables. The study reviewed for this article attempted to examine a number of controllable variables, by means of multiple analyses of varying data sets across different social and gender subsets Byalistok et al. (2005) argue that the issue

of language proficiency is closely related to that of language use and that research needs to look at the daily use of and exposure to the L2. The questionnaire used in the study included a number of questions related to L2 and L1 exposure and use and the contexts of use. The literature review included a brief look at the work of Jiménez Jiménez (2004) who applied Socio-Cultural Theory (SCT) in his attrition research, including the phenomena of pauses and repetitions by bilingual speakers looking to access particular lexical items. The study drew on this aspect of attrition research undertaken by Jiménez Jiménez, but did not apply SCT in terms of respondents' experience of their pre- and post-retirement environments, as the influence of these environments was explored by the sociolinguistic lifehistory questionnaires employed.

Within the New Zealand context, Roberts (1999; 2005) and Hulsen (2000) looked at language maintenance among bilingual migrants, however neither applied a mixed approach including recorded free speech and linguistic analyses such as that suggested by Schmid (2004). Hulsen (2000) investigated language maintenance among three generations of Dutch migrants, using lexical tests and questionnaires which included questions relating to attitudes towards the use of the speakers' languages. The PhD research study reviewed here followed Schmid's (2004) recommendations for a mixed approach including questionnaires and elicited free speech. Schmid recommended an approach which would involve a full investigation of lexical, morphological and syntactic complexity and richness of the data produced by attriters in order to achieve a truly balanced view. Schmid (2004) also discussed the use(fullness) of self-assessments in the absence of retrospective data with relation to the speakers' ultimate attainment in their L1 and L2.

The methodological approach to the study reviewed here largely adopted and expanded on Schmid's (2004) recommendations. The study used a combination of research instruments, including sociolinguistic life history questionnaires, self-assessments of L2 proficiency at several points in time, elicited free speech, linguistic analyses of the latter and assessments of respondents' L2 proficiency by respondents' adult children. In this way the study not only filled a gap in the research, but also made an innovative contribution to it by being the first to include a mixed approach, which was expanded on by means of five different linguistic analyses. These turned up many interesting examples of codeswitching, which will not be included here, as they are outside of the scope of this article.

This article will look at just one of the findings of the study, which involved a possible link between formal instruction in the L2 received in the classroom and ultimate attainment in the L2. All of those interviewees, who had learned English as a foreign language prior to emigration to New Zealand, had been taught through the Grammar Translation Method (GTM). The GTM was the second language learning method employed in secondary school classrooms in the Netherlands from the nineteen thirties through to the nineteen fifties. In decades to follow, the GTM was abandoned in favour of other methods of foreign language instruction including the audiovisual method and the communicative method respectively. Liu and Shi (2007)

review the strengths and weaknesses of a number of approaches to SLA, finding that the GTM enabled learners to develop a good understanding of the structure and vocabulary of the foreign language learned. Scherer and Wertheimer (1964) studied groups of students studying a foreign language using different approaches. They found that students who acquired their second language using the audio-lingual method did better at speaking and listening, while those in the grammar translation group did better at reading and writing.

A large-scale study known as the Pennsylvania Project (Smith, 1970) compared the effects of three language learning methods on beginning and intermediate French and German classes at secondary school level. These methods again included firstly, the traditional grammar-translation method, secondly the functional skills (audio-lingual) method and thirdly the combined functional skills/grammar method. When tested, those students who were taught by means of the 'traditional method' surpassed the 'functional skills' group in reading ability. This is of relevance to the current study, as those respondents who acquired their L2 English in the classroom all learned it by means of the grammar translation method.

Also of interest to the study was research into learners acquiring an L2 through immersion. Those respondents who had come to New Zealand with little or no knowledge of English, acquired it by immersion in the New Zealand workplace and New Zealand society. This situation can be compared to some extent to that which exists in communicative classrooms, where the emphasis is on understanding and being understood. Ellis writes that 'other studies suggest that communicative classrooms may not be so successful in promoting high levels of linguistic competence' and continues by saying that 'researchers have for some time recognized that immersion learners generally fail to acquire certain grammatical distinctions' (1994, p. 603).

The fact that immersion learners fail to acquire certain grammatical distinctions may well be partly due to the particular type of input from and interaction with native speakers that may be observed in situations where migrants acquire a second language through immersion. However, it may also be that language learners who need to learn an L2 from scratch through total immersion in the L2 environment are at an immediate disadvantage, because they usually end up in manual type jobs which do not afford them the opportunity to acquire a high-level range of vocabulary and structures. Kam (2002) points out with reference to bilingual migrants in Australia that limited proficiency in English correlates with lower paid employment and occupational mobility. Within the New Zealand context, the Adult ESOL Strategy document states that new residents to New Zealand who lack [English] language skills are "at a serious disadvantage in terms of finding and retaining employment" (2003, p. 5). The document quotes data from the 2001 Census which shows that "a higher percentage of non-English speaking adults are unemployed compared with the general population and those who are in work earn significantly less than the average wage, regardless of their qualifications" (2003, p. 5), a statement which is supported by a statistical evidence (p. 23).

At the time the respondents to the study arrived in New Zealand no official ESOL strategy existed, however participants all stated there had been plenty of opportunities for employment, which would have meant opportunities for full immersion in an L2 work environment. The question remains whether those who arrived here with little or no English successfully overcame this initial hurdle or whether this kind of start in L2 learning in the migrant context continued to affect them throughout their lifetime.

Methodology

Respondents interviewed for the main study consisted of a total of 30 older Dutch migrants, all of whom had arrived in New Zealand between 1950 and 1965 when they were aged between 18 and 35 years of age. Sample selection took place using the ‘snowballing’ method, where one respondent refers the researcher on to another potential interviewee. Ethics approval was sought and obtained, including permission to exclude the influence of possibly confounding research variables such as Alzheimer’s Disease (AD) and Cerebro-Vascular Accidents (CVAs) (Hyltenstam & Stroud, 1985; Obler, 1993; Hyltenstam, 1995; Paradis, 2004).

All respondents were interviewed by the researcher at home, in their own environment, with interviews recorded on an iAudio X5 digital recorder. During the interviews, respondents were asked a range of questions from a sociolinguistic life history questionnaire (cf. also Taumoevalau, Starks, Davis & Bell, 2002). Questions covered a range of topics, including social background in the Netherlands, educational background, manner of English acquisition (cf. Ellis, 1994), L1 and L2 maintenance and use pre- and post-retirement, their exposure and use of both the L1 and L2 in a variety of domains, such as family, work and friends. Subjects were also asked to self-assess their English proficiency and understanding at three key points in their lives: upon arrival in New Zealand, at the point of their ultimate attainment (pre-retirement), and at the time of the interview (post-retirement). In order to obtain an external check on respondents’ self-assessments, respondents’ adult children were asked to complete a brief questionnaire on their parents’ level of English proficiency at the point of their ultimate attainment (pre-retirement) and at the time of the interview (post-retirement). It was assumed that subjects would reach the level of ultimate attainment during their working lives and this assumption is in line with those proposed by other attrition researchers (e.g. Schmid and Keijzer, 2009, p. 84)

During the interview, subjects were also asked to recount their experiences post-arrival in New Zealand. They were also asked how their lives were going at the moment. The elicited free speech resulting from these questions was subjected to a number of linguistic analyses, aimed at identifying possible signs of L1 reversion and L2 attrition, including the use of L1 structure in L2 subclauses, codeswitching to the L1 in verb plus complement structures, and increased response latency. (Goldman-Eisler, 1968; de Bot, 1998; Jiménez Jiménez, 2004). Information from adult children’s questionnaires was used in order to find out whether these linguistic features had always been present in respondents’ speech (i.e. were fossilised) or whether these features had increased since

respondents had reached retirement age (backsliding).

Findings/Results

This section will start with a very brief overview of the secondary schooling system as it existed in the Netherlands between the 1930s and 1950s, followed by information as to school types attended by respondents. Data will be presented showing the percentages of respondents who acquired English as a second language prior to migrating to New Zealand and the method of acquisition. This will be followed by a breakdown of respondents who had attended schools where foreign languages were a compulsory component of the curriculum and were taught by means of the GTM. Additional data presented will show respondents' self-assessed L2 proficiency on arrival in New Zealand cross-tabulated with the type of school attended by respondents.

The next part of this section will describe data concerning respondents' L2 proficiency on arrival and their occupational attainment in New Zealand. This will be followed by a presentation of findings in relation to respondents' self-assessed levels of ultimate attainment in the L2 cross-tabulated with data as to those who had acquired English by means of the GTM. The final part will present findings of the linguistic analysis across educational groups, focusing on possible signs of L1 reversion and L2 attrition. In all sections to follow, those respondents who had attended *MULO*, *HBS* or *Handelsschool* secondary education had acquired English as an L2 through the GTM.

Types of secondary schools and the GTM

During the era in which respondents attended school, English and other foreign languages were part of the secondary school curriculum at schools for *MULO*, *HBS* and *Handelsschool* education, but were not taught at schools providing instruction in home economics (*Huishoudschool* or *Nijverheidsschool*) or trades (mainly *Ambachtsschool*). Table 1 provides a very brief overview of the various school types in existence when the respondents were of secondary school student age. Please see glossary for an explanation of school names and types of education.

Table 1: Schools where foreign language instruction was part of the curriculum in the Netherlands, 1920s to 1960s

School	Foreign language instruction	Method of instruction	Typical duration of studies
MULO	German, French, English	GTM	3 or 4 years
Handelsschool	German, French, English	GTM + business correspondence	3 or 4 years
HBS (pre-university)	German, French, English	GTM	5 or 6 years
Gymnasium (pre-university)	German, French, English, Latin, Greek	GTM	6 years

The GTM used to teach foreign languages as part of the secondary school curriculum generally involved teachers providing students with written texts (including poems and excerpts from English, French and German literature) and asking the latter to translate these into Dutch. Students were also asked to translate Dutch into English, German and French. This method of teaching emphasised an understanding first of syntax and second of vocabulary and was deemed appropriate since students were learning foreign languages for the purpose of written business correspondence (cf. also Smith, 1970; Ellis, 1994; Liu & Shi, 2007).

School types attended by respondents

Respondents in the current study were asked what type of secondary education they had attended and for how long, in order to gain an impression of the number of years they might have been exposed to formal instruction in the L2. However the number of years may not adequately reflect the amount of classroom education actually received by participants, as many reported having had their education interrupted for various reasons. Respondents had generally attended a range of secondary schools in the Netherlands, ranging from trade-related to pre-university education. Table 2 shows how types of secondary education experienced by respondents ranged from evening classes to secondary schooling in preparation for trades (*Ambachtsschool*), office jobs (*MULO*), to pre-university education (*HBS*).

Table 2: School types attended by respondents

Type of Education	Focus of Education	Number of respondents
<i>Ambachtsschool</i>	Trades and trades apprenticeships	5
<i>Nijverheidsschool</i>	Home economics	2
<i>Huishoudsschool</i>	Home economics	4
<i>MULO</i>	Mixed business skills/academic, including languages	14
<i>Handelsschool</i>	Mixed business skills/academic, including languages	5*
<i>HBS</i>	Pre-university – academic, including languages	2*
Total		33**

* Not all respondents completed this type of school for the usual duration.

** Three respondents were included under more than one category: one attended both MULO and HBS, and two attended both MULO and Ambachtsschool

It became evident from findings from the sociolinguistic life questionnaire that social class had been somewhat predictive of the type of schooling respondents had been allowed to attend post primary school. Typically, there had been a tendency for male respondents from either a farming or working class background to have attended trade-related types of secondary school, while respondents from a middle class background had generally been allowed to attend 4-year *MULO* secondary school education, in preparation for work in an office or business environment. Some respondents in this group had attended *Handelsschool* while respondents from an upper (middle) class background had generally been encouraged to attend schools offering accelerated *HBS* pre-university education in a large range of subjects.

The emphasis on foreign language instruction in the Netherlands may appear unusual; however it is understandable in the context of the pragmatic nature sometimes attributed to the Dutch (cf. Vossestein, 2005). Part of this has traditionally been an awareness of the fact that, in order to do business with other countries, one needs to speak their language. Similarly, those who wish to reside in another country prepare by learning the language spoken at their destination. Hence, those migrants who were preparing to migrate to countries such as New Zealand, Canada and Australia almost invariably arranged to receive some (private) instruction in English before departure, and this is reflected in Table 3.

Table 3: Type and duration of instruction in English for all main study respondents

Venue	Number of respondents
Private tuition only	4
Private tuition plus secondary school L2	3
L2 instruction at secondary school 1-2 years	2
L2 instruction at secondary school 3-4 years	12
L2 instruction at secondary school 5-6 years	3
No English instruction at all	9
Total	30*

* Includes participants who received L2 instruction at secondary school as well as private L2 tuition

Private English classes were usually provided by primary school teachers, with most respondents saying they took lessons once a week for a period of between six months and one year. Primary teachers were not specialists in the English language, but had acquired English as part of their general teacher training curriculum. Most

respondents stated that they had not been able to learn more than ‘the basics’, due to the limited duration and contact of such private tuition sessions.

It will be clear from the above that just over half of the 30 main study respondents (n=17) acquired English in the classroom environment prior to immigrating to New Zealand, whilst just under a third of respondents (n=9) came to New Zealand without any previous knowledge of English. Those respondents who arrived in New Zealand with little or no knowledge of English subsequently acquired most of their English through immersion in an English speaking social or work environment. It should be added that respondents came to New Zealand at a time of full employment.

Level of proficiency on arrival and type of secondary schooling

There was a strong link between self-assessed levels of proficiency and type of secondary schooling in the Netherlands. When reading the table below, it should be remembered, once again, that those respondents who had attended *MULO*, *HBS* or *Handelsschool* secondary education had all acquired English as an L2 using the GTM.

Table 4: Self-assessed L2 proficiency on arrival in New Zealand and secondary education in the Netherlands

Self-assessed L2 proficiency on arrival	Type of Secondary Education				
	None	Trades or Home Economics Type School	<i>MULO</i>	<i>Handelsschool</i> (Commercial Studies + Lang.)	<i>HBS</i>
Non-existent	2	6			
Very limited	1	4	1		
Fair		1*	5*	1	
Good			5		
Very good			1		5**
Total = 32***	3	11	12	1	5

* Includes one respondent who had attended Trade School for three years and *MULO* for one year

** Includes one respondent who attended both *MULO* and *HBS*

*** Two respondents appear in the table twice because they attended two types of School

Overall, respondents varied in regard to their self-assessed level of proficiency and understanding in the L2 upon arrival in New Zealand, with self-assessments ranging from ‘non-existent’ to ‘very good’. It was interesting to note that all those who had learned English at a school for pre-university *HBS* education assessed their level of proficiency as ‘very good’. Respondents who had attended *MULO* education generally assessed their level of L2 proficiency on arrival in New Zealand as ‘fair’ to ‘good’, while those who had attended pre-university education in the Netherlands

generally assessed their level of L2 proficiency in arrival in New Zealand as ‘good’ to ‘very good’. The following section will show that respondents who already had a fair to good level of English on arrival in New Zealand were generally able to move on to job opportunities in a language rich L2 environment in New Zealand.

Occupational attainment

It will have become clear that respondents arrived here with varying levels of L2 English proficiency and comprehension, linked to their level of English acquisition, which was in turn linked to type of school attended in the Netherlands. Even so, some of those who had acquired English in the secondary school classroom commented that they had initially had some problems with listening comprehension and some vocabulary, including the use of words such as ‘bob’ (for shilling). However, most of those same respondents felt their proficiency in English had improved very quickly because they were very familiar with the structure of the language. One respondent recounted how his brother and he had arrived in New Zealand simultaneously. The respondent had learned English at school, but his brother had not. The interviewee recounted how, once he had arrived in New Zealand, what he had learned at school about the formation of sentences came back to him.

Once respondents were in paid employment, they found that constructing sentences was fairly easy and most commented that they found themselves speaking quite fluently within six months to a year. Interestingly, respondents who had learned English at secondary school through the GTM typically moved from jobs involving manual labour to administrative employment and then often on to management positions. One respondent had been involved in HR positions for one of the health boards, a position that had required him to be involved in mediation meetings. One may speculate that working in a language rich English speaking environment also enabled him to enlarge his vocabulary.

Both the female respondents who had had pre-university education had worked in administrative jobs. Of the three male pre-university *HBS* graduates, two had gone on to tertiary education. One had qualified as an engineer, and had worked in that capacity in New Zealand for many years, while the other had not worked in his area of training, but had gone on, first to managerial roles, and then to managing his own business. The remaining male *HBS* graduate had also ended up in a managerial position. All three were still very fluent in their L2 at the time of the interview, to the extent of being able to use puns and word plays.

By comparison, interviewees who had come to New Zealand without any English had typically acquired their L2 through total immersion in an L2 English speaking work environment. Interestingly, these respondents had overall not reached the same level of ultimate attainment in their English as the group discussed above, both as assessed by themselves and as assessed by their adult children. Even more interestingly, this had apparently impacted on their ultimate attainment in terms of employment also, with these same respondents remaining in positions requiring manual labour. Hence

there appeared to be something of a vicious circle: poor English on arrival being linked to employment choices being limited to those not requiring advanced proficiency in English and those types of occupations not affording respondents the opportunity to improve their English to the point where they were able to move on to jobs which would allow them to expand their use of English to a wider range of registers and media (such as the opportunity to produce reports using the written medium).

Table 5 shows male respondents' self-assessed English proficiency on arrival in New Zealand and their eventual professional attainment in New Zealand. Although the sample is quite small (n=12) a pattern can be seen between proficiency in English on arrival, on the one hand, and occupational attainment in New Zealand on the other hand.

Table 5: L2 Proficiency on arrival in New Zealand and occupational attainment, male respondents

Proficiency on arrival	Occupational attainment in New Zealand			
	Manual (factory)	Trades	Administration /Managerial	Own business
Non-existent	2			
Very limited		2		
Fair			1	2
Good			2	1
Very good			2	
Total = 12	2	2	5	3

A similar pattern of linkages between prior education, proficiency in English on arrival, on the one hand, and career in New Zealand and ultimate attainment in English on the other hand, could be observed in most female respondents.

Obviously, individual differences in language aptitude also played a role in respondents' ultimate attainment in their L2 as will be clear when we look at those who had rated their L2 proficiency on arrival as either 'non-existent' or 'very limited'. Of the nine respondents who had come to New Zealand without any formal instruction in the L2, one assessed her ultimate attainment in English as very good and this respondent was indeed still very fluent in her L2 at the age of 80. Another two assessed their ultimate proficiency in English as good, while one maintained that his general proficiency in English had always remained limited. The last respondent was struggling to find English words at the time of the interview, and admitted to a considerable preference for speaking Dutch, his L1, for ease of expression. Some of those who had not learned any L2 before arriving, but who were able to use words

like ‘hello’ ‘thank you’ and ‘goodbye’ described their L2 proficiency on arrival as ‘very limited’ rather than ‘non-existent’.

L2 proficiency on arrival and ultimate attainment

Overall, there appeared to be a link between respondents’ level of L2 proficiency on arrival in New Zealand and their ultimate attainment in the L2. Table 6 shows how most of those who had rated their L2 proficiency on arrival as ‘good’ assessed their ultimate attainment in the L2 as ‘very good’. Respondents had been asked to self-assess their ultimate attainment in L2 English in terms of proficiency, understanding, vocabulary and (correct use of) grammar.

Table 6: Self-assessment of L2 proficiency on arrival in New Zealand and ultimate attainment in L2, all respondents

Proficiency on arrival	Self-assessed ultimate attainment in the L2			
	Limited	Fair	Good	Very good
Non-existent	1	1		1
Very limited		1	3	2
Fair		1	5	
Good				7
Very good				4
Total = 30	1	3	12	14

The researcher found a pattern of relationships between respondents’ exposure to English at work, type of work and ultimate attainment in English. The twelve male respondents had worked in a range of jobs and there appeared to be a link both between level of education prior to coming to New Zealand, English proficiency on arrival, on the one hand, and type of career in New Zealand and ultimate attainment in English on the other hand.

One Dutch Village (DV) male respondent had come to New Zealand without any English, having only attended evening classes in trades in the Netherlands. He had worked as a manual labourer/factory hand all of his life and assessed his ultimate attainment in English as no more than ‘fair’. At the time of the interview, he professed a strong preference for speaking Dutch, his L1, all the time, and complained that his wife (whose English proficiency was native-speaker like, having been taught English at MULO level by a native speaker of RP English) always answered in English. Two Non-Dutch Village (NDV) male respondents showed a very similar pattern. Both had arrived in New Zealand with little or no English, though one had “picked up” some English whilst being in military service and undergoing training in the United States of America. Both had done manual work, one in the freezing works, the other in an aluminum smelter) all their lives and although both liked to read in both languages, both their spoken English and spoken Dutch showed persistent intra-sentential codeswitching and what Muysken (2000)

terms congruent lexicalisation, where material from the lexical inventories of different languages is inserted into a shared lexical structure more or less randomly. Muysken (2000) does not attribute congruent lexicalization to either a ‘high’ or a ‘low’ level of bilingualism, but rather to structural closeness, dominance in use and a relaxed, non-purist attitude. None of the three speakers who used congruent lexicalization in the current study had acquired their L2 through formal instruction prior to migration, however the study was not large enough to contribute to the discussion on factors which may contribute to speakers’ use of this type of codeswitching. A very different pattern was observed in those male respondents (both DV and NDV) who had learned English at secondary school before coming to New Zealand. These usually assessed their English proficiency on arrival as ‘good’. After arriving in New Zealand, they had started in manual work, but had gone on to management positions until retirement. These respondents assessed their ultimate attainment in English as ‘very good’. Their own assessments were supported by their adult children and also by the linguistic analysis.

One DV male respondent and two NDV male respondents had completed pre-university education in the Netherlands, and had learned English between three to six years through the secondary school classroom. These all assessed their English proficiency on arrival in New Zealand as ‘very good’, had ended up in management positions and assessed their ultimate attainment in English as ‘very good’. All three of these respondents were still extremely fluent in English, their L2, and used a wide range of expressions without hesitation, in spite of being among the older respondents in the study. Obviously, these respondents who had not learned the L2 through formal instruction prior to arriving in New Zealand were also less likely to have attained a ‘critical threshold’ in their L2 proficiency, which de Bot and Clyne (1989) consider to be an important factor in the context of L1 reversion.

Table 7: Self-assessed ultimate attainment in the L2, all respondents.

Self-assessed ultimate attainment in the L2 in NZ	Dutch Village	Non-Dutch Village	Total
Non-existent	0	0	0
Very limited	1*	0	1*
Fair	1	2	3
Good	6	6	12
Very good	7	7	14
All = 30	15	15	30

Overall respondents’ own assessment of their ultimate attainment in L2 English proficiency corresponded largely with the assessment of the same provided by respondents’ adult children. Table 8 shows the number of cases (n=22) where respondents’ self-assessment of their ultimate attainment in terms of L2 English

proficiency corresponds with that provided by their adult children.

Table 8: Instances where self-reported ultimate attainment in the L2 corresponded with assessment by adult children, all respondents

Ultimate attainment of L2 proficiency	Self-assessment	Assessment by adult children
Non-existent	0	0
Very limited	0	0
Fair	3	3
Good	7	7
Very good	12	12
Total	22	22

L2 proficiency on arrival and L2 maintenance post-retirement

As mentioned above, free speech elicited from respondents was subjected to a number of linguistic analyses in order to try and identify possible markers of L2 attrition accompanied by a return to the First Language (L1). As part of the linguistic analysis, findings of the linguistic analysis were compared across different groups, including older/younger, male/female, predominant L1/L2 language environment post-retirement. As part of this respondents were also divided up into two ‘educational background’ groups, according to whether they had received:

- very little or no (Second Language) L2 secondary school classroom acquisition prior to arrival in New Zealand (hereafter to be referred to as the ‘Limited L2 on arrival’ group)
- L2 English acquisition in secondary school classroom at the level of *MULO* or Pre-University education (hereafter to be referred to as the ‘Secondary school L2 on arrival’ group).

The first group included respondents who had either not had any secondary schooling, or who had attended a trade-oriented type of secondary school, where the curriculum did not include the teaching of foreign languages. This group also included respondents who had completed less than one year of foreign language education at secondary school. All of these respondents had assessed their proficiency in English on arrival in New Zealand as either ‘non-existent’ or ‘very limited’.

Overall findings for the linguistic analysis across educational groups showed that respondents who arrived in New Zealand with limited English were responsible for a majority of tokens in relation to features which could be interpreted as characteristic of L2 attrition accompanied by L1 reversion. Such features included CS (code

switching) from L2 to L1 in subclauses and Verb plus Complement (V+C) structures, and greater response latency as apparent from respondents' use of filled and unfilled pauses, a greater percentage of message abandonment in the L2 and incorrect tokens of the third person singular.

Findings across educational groups largely overlapped with findings across occupational groups. This may suggest that prior education and level of English on arrival had a considerable effect on respondents' eventual occupations which would in turn have impacted on subjects' ability to consolidate their knowledge of the L2, at a number of levels, including syntax, morphosyntax and lexicon. Overall, findings suggested that prior levels of education were the strongest predictor of ultimate attainment in English, and of continued undiminished ability to communicate in English post-retirement. Being exposed to a mainly L2 English speaking environment post-retirement played a lesser role in enabling respondents to maintain their communicative ability in English after retirement age.

Discussion of findings

This paper was based on findings of a study which used interviews, sociolinguistic life history questionnaires. The latter included outcomes of respondents' self-assessments, which were cross-tabulated with information on previous education, including the acquisition of the L2 English by means of the GTM. Outcomes of self-assessments were also cross-tabulated with assessments by respondents' adult children. The study contained linguistic analyses at morphosyntactic, syntactic and lexical level, as well as an overview of findings across social groupings such as older and younger respondents, males and females, DV versus NDV and respondents across different educational backgrounds. The study looked at a large range of variables including speakers' choices of language use (L1 or L2) in a range of contexts (home, work, social) on arrival in New Zealand, during their working lives, leading up to retirement and following retirement. Information from questionnaires was supplemented with a range of comments which came up spontaneously during interviews, concerning identity, host society attitudes, and attempts at assimilation. This led to an abundance of qualitative data, both of a linguistic and sociolinguistic nature, too plentiful to include within this article, but leaving scope for further publications.

As stated, the researcher had assumed that the speech community to which respondents were predominantly exposed post-retirement would have a major impact on respondents' continued ability to express themselves in the L2. The findings of the study showed that, in fact, this was a relatively minor factor and that the method in which subjects had first acquired their L2 English played a more significant role. Overall, the findings indicated that respondents' level of English on arrival in New Zealand was linked to their level of ultimate attainment in their L2, and that in turn was linked to their career progression in this country also. The type of secondary schooling attended in the Netherlands was strongly linked to the level

of English respondents reported having on arrival in New Zealand. The method of teaching foreign languages used at secondary schools whose curricula included the three foreign languages (German, French and English) was the Grammar Translation Method). In brief, it appeared that the Grammar Translation Method had provided subjects with a very strong structural basis for L2 acquisition, which, combined with total immersion in an L2 speaking work environment, allowed respondents to reach a high level of ultimate attainment in the L2, and significantly assisted their career progression in New Zealand. These benefits appear to have persisted post-retirement, as reflected in participants' continued L2 proficiency and lack of L1 reversion. Current ESOL teaching practice combines a range of teaching methods, including aspects from the communicative, functional and audiolingual approaches as well as a seeming revival of elements of the GTM (e.g. Hinkel and Fotos, 2002).

Conclusion

As mentioned above, Kam (2002) pointed out that limited proficiency in English correlates with lower paid employment and occupational mobility. The present study showed that lower occupational mobility was usually linked with a lower ultimate attainment in the L2. The question remains whether this initial hurdle can be successfully overcome or whether this kind of start in L2 learning in the migrant is linked to lower levels of ultimate attainment, L2 consolidation and a greater risk of L2 attrition once the migrant reaches post-retirement age.

Findings from the study discussed here appear to suggest that the formal L2 instruction using the GTM followed by total immersion in the L2 environment served learners well in that it allowed them to quickly consolidate their understanding and use of English. This in turn enabled them to move on to other jobs in a more language rich L2 environment, which led to further consolidation of the L2 English. It would seem that the latter provided a considerable degree of 'immunity against forgetting' (Neisser, 1984).

Based on the findings of the study, I would say an effective immigration policy should not overlook the need for migrants to consolidate their English proficiency, preferably by means of formal instruction. Where new migrants arrive here without the level of L2 English proficiency and understanding that will enable them to find employment in a language rich environment, efforts should be made to offer them courses that will help them achieve such levels. The methods used should combine the best of all worlds, enabling learners to combine correct structure and word order, with acceptable pronunciation and pragmatically and culturally acceptable communicative efforts. Such courses should ideally incorporate placements in L2 rich work environments so as to allow learners to further develop their oral and aural competencies. This article therefore lends support to the recommendations of the Adult ESOL Strategy report published by the Ministry of Education in New Zealand in 2003.

Appendix

Glossary of School Types

Ambachtsschool – (literally: Trade School). This type of school provided students for employment in one of the trades over the course of a couple of years, with students attending either fulltime or parttime, e.g. in combination with apprenticeships. The curriculum usually included Dutch, Mathematics and subjects relating to the trade the student was training towards.

Handelsschool – (literally: Commerce School) - this type of school prepared graduates for employment in an office environment requiring knowledge of commerce, accounting, and the three foreign languages for the purpose of foreign correspondence. Students usually attended either fulltime or parttime over the course of three or four years.

HBS - (Literally: Higher Citizens School) - this type of secondary school provided pre-university education in a wide range of subjects (including Dutch, three foreign languages, mathematics, history, geography and the sciences) over the course of either five or six years, fulltime. Its main aim was to prepare graduates for university studies.

Huishoudsschool – (literally: Household School) - this school was aimed at girls and the curriculum included subjects such as cooking and sewing, with students attending either fulltime or parttime.

MULO - (*Meer Uitgebreid Lager Onderwijs*). This type of secondary school provided education in **or** 14 subjects (including Dutch, three foreign languages, mathematics, history, geography and the sciences) over the course of either three four years, fulltime. Its main aim was to prepare graduates for work in an office environment.

Nijverheidsschool – (literally: Trade/Industry School) - this school offered trade related education, with students attending either fulltime or parttime.

References

- De Bot, K. (1998). The psycholinguistics of language loss. In G. Extra and L. Verhoeven (Eds.), *Bilingualism and Migration* (pp. 345-361). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- De Bot, K. & Clyne, M. G. (1989). Language reversion revisited. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 11, 167-177.
- De Bot, K. & Clyne, M. G. (1994). A 16-year longitudinal study of language attrition in Dutch immigrants in Australia. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 15(1), 17-28.
- De Bot, K. and Makoni, S. (2005). *Language and ageing in multilingual contexts*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- De Bot, K. & Weltens, B. (1991). Recapitulation, regression and language loss. In H. Seliger & R. Vago (Eds.), *First language attrition* (pp. 31-51). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Byalistok, E., Craik, F., Grady, C., Chau, W., Ishii, R., Gunji, A., et al. (2005). Effect of bilingualism on cognitive control in the Simon task. Evidence from MEG. *Neuroimage*, 24, 1, 40-49.
- Bialystok, E., Craik, F. I. M., Klein, R., & Viswanathan, M. (2004). Bilingualism, aging, and cognitive control: evidence from the Simon task. *Psychology & Aging*, 19, 290-303.
- Dodde, N. L. (1983). *Het Nederlandse onderwijs verandert – ontwikkelingen sinds 1800*. Muiderberg: Coutinho.
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Goldman-Eisler, F. (1968). Psycholinguistics. Experiments in spontaneous speech. London and New York: Academic Press.
- Hulsen, M. (2000). *Language loss and language processing. Three generations of Dutch migrants in New Zealand*. PhD thesis, University of Nijmegen, Nijmegen.
- Hinkel, E. and Fotos, S. (2002) *New perspective on grammar teaching in second language classrooms*. New York and London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Hyltenstam, K. (1995). The codeswitching behaviour of adults with language disorders – with special reference to aphasia and dementia. In L. Milroy and P. Muysken (Eds.). *One speaker - Two languages* (pp. 302-343). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hyltenstam, K. & Stroud, C. (1985). The psycholinguistics of language choice and code-switching in Alzheimer's dementia: some hypotheses. *Scandinavian Working Papers and Bilingualism* 4, 26-44).
- Jiménez Jiménez, A. (2004). A socio-cultural approach to language attrition. In M. Schmid, B. Köpke, M. Keijzer, and L. Weilemar, (Eds.) (2004). *Proceedings of the International Conference on First Language Attrition*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kam, M. C. (2002). Motivation in second language learning: Ethnolinguistic vitality or psychological construct that counts? Paper presented at the 2002 AARE Conference Problematic Futures: Educational Research in an Era of Uncertainty, Brisbane, Australia.
- Retrieved 10 February 2010 from: <http://www.aare.edu.au/02pap/kam02261.htm>.
- Kipp, S. (2002, August). Social networks, individual biography and individual difference - their impact on language use 30 years on. Paper presented at the International Conference on First Language Attrition: Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Methodological Issues. Amsterdam, the Netherlands.
- Liu, Q. X. & Shi, J. F. (2007). An analysis of language teaching approaches and methods-effectiveness and weakness. *US-China Education Review*, 4 (1), 26.
- Milroy, L. and Muysken, P. (1995). *One speaker, two languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Muysken, P. (2000). *Bilingual speech: A typology of code-mixing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1993). *Duelling languages: grammatical structure in codeswitching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Neisser, U. (1984). Interpreting Harry Bahrick's discovery: What confers immunity against forgetting? *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 113, 32-35.

- Obler, L.K. (1993). Neurolinguistic aspects of second language development and attrition. In K. Hyltenstam and A. Viberg (Eds.), *Progression and regression in language: Sociocultural, neuropsychological, & linguistic perspectives* (pp. 178-195). Stockholm, Centre for Research on Bilingualism: Cambridge University Press.
- Olshtain, E. & Barzilay, M. (1991). Lexical retrieval difficulties in adult language attrition. In H.W. Seliger & R.M. Vago (Eds.), *First language attrition* (pp. 139-150). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Paradis, M. (2004). *A Neurolinguistic theory of bilingualism*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Paradis, M. (1994). Neurolinguistic aspects of implicit and explicit memory: implications for bilingualism and SLA. In N. Ellis (Ed.), *Implicit learning of languages* (pp. 393-419). London: Academic Press.
- Poplack, S. (1981). Syntactic structure and social function of codeswitching. In R. Duran, (Ed.) *Latino Language and Communicative Behavior*, (pp. 169-184). Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.
- Roberts, M. (1999). *Immigrant language maintenance and shift in the Gujarati, Dutch and Samoan communities of Wellington*. Unpublished doctoral thesis. Wellington: Victoria University of Wellington.
- Roberts, M. (2005). Immigrants' attitudes to language maintenance in New Zealand. In A. Bell, R. Harlow and D. Starks (Eds.), *Languages of New Zealand* (pp. 248-270). Wellington: Victoria University Press.
- Scherer, A. & Wertheimer, M. (1964). *A psycholinguistic experiment in foreign language teaching*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Schmid, M. (2004). First language attrition: The methodology reviewed. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 8, 3, 239-255.
DOI: 10.1177/13670069040080030501
- Schouten, H. (1992). *Tasman's legacy: The New Zealand-Dutch connection*. Wellington: New Zealand-Netherlands Foundation.
- Smith, P. (1970). *A comparison of the audiolingual and cognitive approaches to foreign language instruction: The Pennsylvania foreign language project*. Philadelphia: Center for Curriculum Development.
- Taumoefolau, M., Starks, D. Davis, K. & Bell, A. (2002). Linguists and language maintenance: Pasifika languages in Manukau, New Zealand. *Oceanic Linguistics*, 41, 1, 15-27.
- (2003) *The Adult ESOL Strategy*. Wellington: Ministry of Education. Retrieved from <http://www.minedu.govt.nz/~media/MinEdu/Files/EducationSectors/TertiaryEducation/AdultESOLStrategyPDF.pdf>

NOTICING-REFORMULATION TASKS AS A STIMULUS TOWARDS CONTINUED AUTONOMOUS PHONOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENT

Joanna Smith & Basheba Beckmann

Unitec New Zealand

Abstract

This article reports on a study that asks whether students were still engaged in developing their pronunciation three months after their course had finished. Students who attended a semester-long course which employed the Noticing-Reformulation technique (Smith and Beckmann, 2005) reported heightened awareness of pronunciation in their own and others' speech and felt that they were able to continue to develop their own pronunciation. Students mention specifically the value of hearing their own voice on tape, and of modelling other speakers. This article argues that increased awareness of phonological features, alongside production assistance, supports medium-term, autonomous phonological change.

Introduction:

The goal of pronunciation teaching has been a moving target in recent years. There has been a shift away from expecting students to achieve native speaker –likeness due to an array of factors, from the poly-centric nature of English (making it hard to define exactly what 'native speaker' means) to the awareness that a person's accent is intricately tied up with his or her identity (Norton, 1997, 2000). Possibly also, the nature of phonological change has been conceptualised inappropriately as something which can be achieved in a short amount of time, leading to frustration on the part of both teachers and learners who share only a short amount of time together in a classroom situation. For these reasons, the authors suggest that one major aim of pronunciation instruction is simply for students to become more aware of English phonology – being able to recognise features in both their own accents, and the features they hear in those around them. We suggest that an increased awareness is a pre-requisite to any kind of phonological change, and that it empowers students to then make accent choices which will best suit their individual needs. Another aim, of course, is to help students be able to manipulate these features, and become phonologically more flexible, with the help of production instruction. In this article, we'll first investigate the notions of awareness and autonomy, then look at the idea that pronunciation change is best viewed over a longer time period. We'll then report on a study which elicits student perceptions as to whether their increased awareness had indeed facilitated change, and whether they were still involved in developing their pronunciation three months after their course had finished.

Awareness

Attention, or focus on the forms of a language is not in any way a new idea in Second Language Acquisition (SLA). Sicola (2008) points out that:

Attention to form can be viewed as the driving force behind SLA because it is the mediating factor that determines what L2 input data is made available for further processing, and what passes by without registering, whether lexical, morphosyntactic, pragmatic, or phonological. (p. 11)

Sicola (2008) further characterises attention according to Tomlin and Villa's (1994) model, which involves the following three levels in the attending process: **Alertness**, or a simple readiness to receive input. **Orientation**, or an alignment of attentional resources towards specific input data. Learners can be assisted in becoming oriented towards a particular form, by teacher (or other) input. **Detection**, or the level where acquisition ultimately occurs. It is here that 'cognitive registration of sensory stimuli' (Tomlin and Villa, 1994: 192-193) happens.

Taking the idea of detection further, Robinson (2001) suggests that detection can occur with or without **Awareness**. Awareness, according to Robinson, is 'conscious perception or noticing' (p. 18, as cited in Sicola, 2008). In other words, detecting a form can be a conscious or sub-conscious event.

Whether or not sub-conscious awareness is sufficient for learning, Schmidt (1994) suggests that, without conscious awareness, detection could simply be called 'registration' (p. 18), and he suggests it is not sufficient for learning a form. By contrast, the very act of noticing is a 'necessary and sufficient condition for the conversion of input to intake for learning'. (p. 17, as cited in Sicola, 2008)

'Noticing the gap' (conscious registration) between a learner's output and the target has been discussed in the literature for some time (Schmidt & Frota, 1986; Swain, 1985; 1998) and the authors agree that it seems to be a necessary step towards phonological acquisition. For this reasons, the authors recommend a pronunciation teaching method which focuses on awareness.

The Noticing-Reformulation technique is described in Smith & Beckmann (2005) and summarised here.

1. Setting a context – students are shown a stimulus which acts as a context for a short written text.
2. Initial output – Learners read the short text onto a tape.
3. Noticing own speech – Learners listen to their recording and then analyse their pronunciation according to selected features. A worksheet may be provided by the teacher, guiding students' noticing.
4. Model input – Learners are then given a recording of a model pronunciation of the text.

5. Noticing model – Learners analyse the model text for the target features.
6. Noticing the gap – Learners compare their own pronunciation with the model pronunciation, using their analyses as a guide.
7. Reformulation – learners practise and prepare for a second recording, aiming to reduce discrepancies.
8. Informed output –Learners record the text a second time.
9. Reflection – learners compare their first and second recordings and comment on any changes.

Both noticing and production are crucial to this activity. Conscious noticing is facilitated at steps 3, 5, 6 and 9. Production assistance can be given at stage 7, if the teacher has not already given a targeted lesson prior to the activity. Various models can be used for the input at stage 4. Indeed, the target pronunciations can be varied, in order to give students practice at producing a variety of different accents. It is worth mentioning that because students are reading a text, rather than producing their own words, the notion of ‘autonomy’ in the sense of ‘voice’ (see below) is reduced. However, having a set text to work with enables comparison of exact words and phrases for phonological features. It would be impossible for students to compare their phonological output with a model if the words were different.

It is worth mentioning that Fraser (2000) also advocates a similar technique (‘Critical Listening’) where student recordings are compared with a model, but her particular emphasis is not on having a pre-determined model text to work with, but rather that the teacher can provide an ‘impromptu’ model text as necessary.

Autonomy

Pennycook, in his 1997 contribution to a volume on autonomy and independence in language learning, outlines different understandings of the notion of autonomy. He explains that there is a general, widespread understanding of autonomy which has to do with students knowing techniques in order to be self-driven in their acquisition of language. This is a worthwhile goal, given the limitations of language classes, and indeed in this article we investigate whether students are self-driven in their phonological development, three months after their course of study is finished.

Another, more pertinent idea in his view has to do with learners finding their own voice, or ‘cultural alternative’. In the area of phonology, this can imply that learners should be able to choose their own target accent.

In order to afford students the choice of accent, they must first be exposed to different accents. This was recommended by Jenkins (2002) and indeed has been accepted in many English classrooms in New Zealand at least. Most English courses provide models of speakers with a variety of regional accents. Exposure alone, however, is usually not enough – specific teaching must also accompany it.

Jenkins, in her 2006 summary of current perspectives on Teaching WEs and ELF, suggests that there is:

...a growing consensus among researchers on the importance of language awareness[...]Teachers and their learners, it is widely agreed, need to learn not a variety of English, but about Englishes, their similarities and differences, issues involved in intelligibility, the strong link between language and identity and so on[...] This [...] would enable each learner's and speaker's English to reflect his or her own sociolinguistic reality, rather than that of a usually distant native speaker. (p. 173)

If we are to seriously take into account this 'sociolinguistic reality', then learners should not only be able to choose their own 'target accent', they should also be able to decide to what degree they employ that accent, and in which situations. For various reasons, we may choose to speak more or less like an interlocutor. This ability to choose whether we sound like our conversation partner is called accommodation. Jenkins (2002, 2006) also promotes the value of teaching accommodation.

In order to achieve autonomy in the second sense, then, (namely allowing students the choice of accent, and possibly also enabling them to accommodate), we again emphasise the need for a specific focus on *Awareness* in pronunciation instruction. Students need to be able to perceive the features of various accents, as well as their own speech, in order to eventually be able to control how they will project their own 'voice' in any given situation.

Long term acquisition

It is important to note that when dealing with phonological acquisition, as opposed to other forms of language acquisition, the process of acquisition can be much longer. Major (2001, as cited in Sicola, 2008) points out that 'in morphology and syntax if the L2 speaker knows the NS target, then it will be achieved' whereas in L2 phonology, 'the possibilities are more complicated'. The actual noticing can be particularly challenging, due to the nature of the brain's selective attention (also referred to as the 'perceptual magnet effect' by Kuhl, 1991, as cited in Taylor, 2006). Consequently, a large part of the pronunciation teacher's work must involve assisting the students to notice, or become consciously aware of, the different phonological features. Further, even after learners have perceived that there is a gap between the target and their own production, they may not be able to figure out how to physically modify their articulatory muscles to produce the target variant. Specific instruction in the mechanics of articulation are therefore often necessary, as well as assistance with production of suprasegmental features, such as intonation and stress patterns. These physical movements also take time to become fully automated, and move from conscious recall into unconscious recall, in other words, into procedural memory.

Therefore, we suggest that measuring pronunciation in particular is better done over a longer-term period than measuring other aspects of second language acquisition.

Very little research has been carried out that assesses the long-term effects of pronunciation teaching. Couper (2006) reports on a classroom-based research project in which certain gains in pronunciation (reduced use of epenthesis and absence) were retained 12 weeks after the initial instruction period. While the final error rate had risen slightly from the test taken immediately after instruction, it was still significantly lower than the original base rate observed. Interestingly, Couper's recommendations in the 'implications' section (p. 59) include (among other things) 'making learners aware that there is a difference between what they say and what native speakers say' and 'helping learners to hear the difference and practise it'. Both of these aspects are emphasised in the Noticing-Reformulation technique described in this article.

Derwing, Munro & Thomson (2007) report on a longitudinal study of two different groups of immigrants to Canada, tracking and comparing their progress in fluency and comprehensibility over a two-year period. The study shows a correlation between the subjects' progress, as determined by a group of anonymous listeners, and their "Willingness to Communicate" (as described by MacIntyre et al., 1998). The Willingness to Communicate was determined by subjects' responses to interviews.

As part of the same project, Munro and Derwing (2008) report on the segmental acquisition of the learners, and show that the rate of acquisition of L2 vowels is high in the first year of learning, and later plateaus, without further pedagogical input. The authors call for further longitudinal studies, assessing the learning trajectory of specific items.

The present study adds to this small number of studies which report on longer-term gains. It aims to assess the degree to which the teaching of awareness by using the Noticing-Reformulation technique affected students' pronunciation in the medium term. The study was undertaken three months after their course had finished. (For a longer-term view, the reader is referred to Romova, Smith & Neville-Barton, 2008, where the authors report on some long-term changes that occurred in the pronunciation and fluency of 4 students, which were part of the same cohort reported on here, over a three-year period.)

Research Questions

In light of the above discussion, there are two research questions in the current study:

1. Did the students find the focus on awareness useful in their phonological development?
and
2. Were the students still involved in the process of phonological development three months after instruction using the Noticing-Reformulation technique?

Context

This study was part of an action research project undertaken in 2004 in the context of a first year compulsory course in a Bachelor of Arts (EAL) degree in a New Zealand institute of Technology. The course aimed to help students improve their grammatical

and pronunciation accuracy by focusing learners' attention on their speaking and writing output. The pronunciation classes were two hours per week for 14 weeks, and included both theory and practical instruction. Both instruction and assessment of pronunciation made use of the Noticing –Reformulation technique, as described above.

Data Collection

A survey questionnaire (for this study and for other purposes) was used for collecting data three months after the completion of the course. The questionnaire was divided into two parts: open ended questions, plus two tables requiring ticks or numbered responses. Questions tended to move from the more general to the more specific. In order to pilot test the questionnaire, one of the course students read the survey questions and suggested changes to some items, clarifying language and suggesting additional questions. Appendix 1 includes the questions in the survey which are relevant to this study.

The surveys were given to the students personally by a student representative or a school administrator. To ensure anonymity, no names were required on the returned surveys and students were requested to return the surveys to a school administrator. A lecturer was available to answer student questions about the survey in the turnaround time between distribution and collection. All of the students (n=18) were given questionnaires, and 13 were returned.

To triangulate the data obtained in the questionnaire, a follow-up structured interview was conducted with selected individuals. Since the interviewees had been students of one of the researchers, it was important to ensure that responses were as unbiased as possible, thus the interview was conducted by a neutral third party, the school counsellor.

Due to time constraints only three students were interviewed. The interview participants were selected by a process of elimination using Kidder and Judd's (1991) model of Stratified Random sampling (p.204). Selection was in the first instance based on the students agreeing to being interviewed, then on gender, nationality, age and course assessment grades. The interviewees included one male, two females; one Korean, two Chinese; one person in their 20s, one in their 30s and one in their 40s. The interviews were recorded and later transcribed. The interview questions were structured and interviewees were sent a copy of the questions the day before the interview. Appendix 2 includes the interview questions relevant to this study.

Results and Discussion

In this section, answers to the relevant survey questions and relevant interview comments are presented, followed by discussion. Three main areas are investigated: First whether students felt they had made improvements in their pronunciation, secondly whether they were still using strategies to continually work on their

pronunciation, and thirdly, whether they still use specifically any of the noticing and reformulation techniques that were taught.

Perceived Improvement

To the question of whether or not students felt their pronunciation had improved, twelve students indicated yes, and one indicated no, 'My pronunciation is still the same'.

When asked the open-ended question of how their pronunciation had improved, the twelve respondents gave answers that fell into four broad categories: four students suggested they were more aware of their pronunciation; four students mentioned specific phonological features; six students said they noticed the pronunciation of other people, both native speakers and non-native speakers; and five students said they self-monitored their own pronunciation while speaking.

Comments from the three interviewees, related to improvements, include:

I think [I] improved my listening skill and my, in my pronunciation, particularly word stress and sentence stress and intonation, and furthermore, I can speak more.. I can speak English more naturally (S1)

It helps me a lot in my listening and speaking. Although I can't tell that I improve a lot, only one semester, but I notice the differences, which I don't know before. (S2)

I can't tell I improve a lot, but one thing I notice is I feel more confidence in my speaking, and more easy to catch the native speaker's meaning. (S2)

Yes, I will say I have improved. Um, but it's not again, it is not a huge jump because the short period of time. And I do think to improve the pronunciation in speaking, in the second language, is need a lot of time and practice and effort on it. So it's do take time, but we have to chose the right strategy for ourselves. (S3)

So, while self-reporting is not always an accurate method of judging pronunciation development, all but one student perceived improvements of some sort in their own pronunciation. It is noteworthy that both interviewees 1 and 2 mentioned the link between the productive pronunciation skills and the perceptive skills. In other words, they volunteered that their listening had improved, as a result of the pronunciation instruction. This makes sense, given that a crucial part of the teaching technique involved closely analysing different model speakers.

With regard to our first research question, namely whether the students found the dual focus on both awareness and production useful, it was evident that the answer was 'yes'.

Use of strategies

As to whether or not students were still using some of the pronunciation strategies that were practised in class, in the survey eleven students said yes, and two said no. To the open question asking for clarification of strategies students were using, only three real ‘strategies’ were mentioned, and these were: Check dictionary; Ask classmates; Refer to vowel chart. All the other responses mentioned specific phonological areas of pronunciation, which is a slight misunderstanding of the word ‘strategy’. The responses show nevertheless that students had learned the metalanguage, and perhaps had a heightened awareness, or a new way of producing these aspects of their speech. The responses were: Suprasegmentals: 9; Linking: 7; Stress: 5; Weak forms: 4; Phonemes: 4; and Intonation and pause: 2.

Of the two ‘no’ responses, suggesting students were not still using taught strategies, the further clarification comments show that one student actually was still using a strategy: ‘too much study, no time. But I notice people’s speech in real life.’ Again, this shows heightened awareness. This leaves only one student suggesting no continual use of strategies taught. The ambiguous comment written by this student was: ‘Too mechanical, analysis is harder than noticing sound’.

The interview questions sought to clarify the word ‘strategy’ and to elicit whether students were actually practising using strategies. A list of generic pronunciation learning strategies presented in the course was included for students to look at (see Appendix 2). All of the interviewees said they did continue to practise their pronunciation, each with their own approach.

Student one mentioned several strategies such as listening to tapes and repeating several times, discussing her pronunciation with her niece, who “monitors” for her, watching TV and mimicking the speakers, as well as using a tongue twister list at home, and reading books aloud.

The second interviewee suggested that while she did not have much time for practice at home, she had become much more aware of her everyday speaking, and kept her new knowledge ‘in mind’ when speaking:

To be honest, I haven’t got any time to practice it at the moment, but during speaking, I keep it in mind, try to use it, what I have learned before. Just like the linking or sentence stress, something like that. (S2)

The third student outlined quite a systematic approach in his continued practice:

Well, I do listening to native speakers, for particular phonological features. I mean every sentence people say, native speakers say, I will listen carefully, and then try to uh, find out the feature of why they say that that way, and what is the phonemic for that one, what are the phonemes. And which part they linked together, I would think about it, and try to say that in my own speech. Sometimes it’s hard, and yeah.... And I also do keep noticing my errors. (S3)

He also applied his analysis and intense listening skills to his own production, and declares:

So I definitely apply all these rules in my own speech. And that's why it sounds more natural or whatever (S3)

It is particularly interesting that, in response to both the open-ended survey question and the prompted interview question, students consistently mentioned or implied an ongoing awareness of specific phonological features, suggesting this was helpful for their continuing development. This reinforces the importance of awareness, and good quality teaching of noticing phonological features in the continued development of pronunciation.

Use of the N-R technique in particular

The usefulness of the specific noticing and reformulation strategies (as part of the assessment tasks) was questioned through closed questions in a table format. The responses are included in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Use of the N-R technique

	Strategy we used during speaking course in semester 1	How important is this activity in helping me to improve pronunciation VI= very important, I=important, NI = not important	I still do this <u>NOW</u> to help me with my pronunciation Tick ✓ the ones you do now
1	Listen to and analyse native speaker recordings by noticing specific phonological features	VI = 5 I = 5 NI = 1	4 ticks
2	Record myself speaking the same text as the native speaker	VI = 5 I = 6 NI = 0	
3	Analyse my own speaking by noticing specific phonological features	VI = 3 I = 7 NI = 1	6 ticks
4	Compare my recording with native speaker	VI = 2 I = 7 NI = 2	1 tick

It is interesting to note that for all of the different strategies in the noticing-reformulation tasks, the majority of students found it either 'important' or 'very important' for helping them improve their pronunciation. However, the number of respondents who suggested they still used those strategies was quite low. Only one-third listened to and analysed native-speaker recordings. Half of the students were still involved in self-analysis. Just one student seemed to compare their recording with native speakers, although given that none of the students recorded themselves

speaking the same text as a native speaker, it is unclear exactly what was being compared.

In order to clarify student perceptions of the noticing and reformulation techniques involved, further open-ended questions in the interview were asked.

All three interviewees mentioned the experience of hearing their own voice on tape – maybe for the first time.

One was the analysis on the native speaker's voice and myself and my voice. Analysis was very useful. And mmm the analysis my voice were harder than native speaker's voice. Yeah. Umm because my pronunciation was not clear, and different from English phoneme. And I can't do that. So that was very stressful. (S1)

But sometimes, someone notice others' error, but they do not know themselves. But when they hear their own tape, they feel very strange, and know there are lots of errors in it. (S2)

I mean most of the people, I believe, do not have the opportunity to listen to themselves, apart from in this course, and um it is surprised me when I'm listening to myself. Recording and ah, I really picked up a lot of place, and um, areas I shouldn't do, and I didn't believe that I really did that, so it's really helpful. (S3)

The importance of students hearing their own voice should not be understated. As acknowledged by student 3 above, many students have never had the opportunity to hear their own voice. In discussions about what kinds of books or software programmes teachers could use to teach pronunciation (e.g. Levis, 2007), it is all too easy for teachers to forget that sometimes the most simple methods can be very effective. Students recording their own voices, whether using a manual tape recorder, a language lab, or a computer voice recorder is simple, and requires no other materials, apart from perhaps teacher provision of a model text. Student 3 uses the helpful metaphor of a mirror in describing the value of self-recording:

By noticing is really, It's like a mirror. And um, learning a language, I believe, is do you have the external affects on ourselves, and we have to copy somebody as a model. And then apply to ourselves. So we have to notice first, how the native speakers say, and then we'll try to say the same thing. (S3)

By extending this metaphor, we could question how one is to feel confident in presenting oneself, without being able to check on the presentation first.

Student two also further suggested that self awareness is crucial for the ongoing development of pronunciation:

I think if you can self awareness, and notice your errors, uh, you will know, or find out what will be better next time, so you will get your improvement. (S2)

(interviewer: Sure, yes, and is that, when you find, when you listen to yourself, is that a good learning strategy for you?)

mmm. yes. Very good for learning. The way to learn by yourself. (S2)

Two of the students mentioned ‘aha’ moments during the noticing and analysis procedures.

Yeah and beginning time, that was very difficult to follow them. So fast, I thought. So I can't do that. I wanted to give up to follow them, but um when I um follow the um record tape, with cassette record, so many times to rewind and forward, so repeat again again. After that, I surprised "AAh, I can do that!" (S1)

I remembered the the sentence stress one - it's a little bit struggling for me. Because what I picked up was the correct, you know, the correct version, the teacher give to us, and I still struggling listen many many times, and why, it is the stress, and uh yes, and after doing that, and analyzing all the errors I've been making, and then actually it's really helpful, to just to go a further step in thinking "That's quite true!" and uh apply to my own speech. It's really helpful. (S3)

The ‘aha’ moment, when the penny finally drops, is when students realise they have understood the point of what was being taught. It is then that the theory can slowly begin to be translated into practice, as seen in the quotes above, ‘you will get your improvement’, ‘I can do that’ and ‘apply to my own speech’.

Student 2 made an overt connection between theory and practice:

I think theory and real practice are both important for language learner. Usually, languages are learned mainly through imitation. Uh, so if you notice native speakers pronunciation, it will also help yourself. And theory give us the idea to do my correction. (S2)

The importance of teaching both theory and practice – connected in ‘aha’ moments - is therefore underscored by all three of our students, and suggested in the quote above as a way for the students to do their own ‘correction’.

Limitations and further research directions

One limitation of this study was that students’ actual pronunciation development was not measured, rather their perceptions of improvement were included. While students’ perceptions are valued as a crucial part of the learning process, one way to further strengthen the argument for teaching awareness would be to measure student improvement over the short and long term, using independent listeners as judges. Derwing et al. (2007) found that using likert-scale ratings was a good way to measure pronunciation improvement. Despite the fact that the listeners themselves can be a negative factor in the intelligibility process (Zielinsky 2006, Field, 2005), Derwing et

al. found that in their study, listener judgements were fairly consistent with each other, so multiple listener judgements may be a good way to measure pronunciation ability.

A further limitation of this study was that participant numbers were relatively low, and all participants were taught by the same teacher. Further studies could involve greater learner numbers, as well as learners from a greater selection of classes. A larger, diverse group may enable statistical significance judgements of any measurements to be made.

Finally, while we have suggested that teaching with the noticing-reformulation technique contributes to students' autonomy, in the sense of students being self-driven in their continued development of phonology, this study has not addressed directly the other sense of autonomy, namely choice of accent and ability to accommodate. The choice of accent is dealt with partially in Romova, Smith and Neville-Barton (2008) and more fully in Smith (forthcoming). One outstanding question for research, therefore, is whether students are, in fact, able to accommodate better after instruction with this technique.

Conclusion

This study asked two questions. First, is a focus on awareness, alongside production instruction useful for students? Second, is teaching with the Noticing-Reformulation technique useful for allowing students to continue to develop their pronunciation skills autonomously after their course of study has finished? It seems, from the perspectives of the small group of students who took part in this study three months after their course, that the answer to both of those questions is positive. Almost all of them were engaged in ongoing pronunciation development. This was enabled primarily by their heightened awareness of the different phonological features of English speech. This awareness, in turn, was fostered through guided listening of various model speakers with the noticing-reformulation technique. Not only were they guided in listening to model speakers, which was considered useful, but through asking them to analyse their own speech, they were able to put the theory into practice. Analysing their own pronunciation, while sometimes uncomfortable, was often a crucial step for the students. In general, students felt more confident in their speaking and listening skills, as suggested by their perceptions of their own improvements.

References

- Beckmann, B. and J. L. B. Smith. Student and Teacher perceptions of using Noticing-Reformulation tasks as an assessment tool. (ms)
- Couper, G. (2006). The short and long-term effects of pronunciation instruction. *Prospect*. 21(1), 46-66.
- Derwing, T., & Munro, M. (2005). Second language accent and pronunciation teaching: A research-based approach. *TESOL Quarterly*, 39(3), 379-397.
- Derwing, T., Munro, M., and R. Thomson. (2007). A longitudinal Study of ESL Learners' Fluency and Comprehensibility Development. *Applied Linguistics*, 29 (3), 359-380.
- Field, J. (2005). Intelligibility and the listener: the role of lexical stress. *TESOL Quarterly*, 39 (3), 399-423.
- Fraser, H. (2000). Tips for teaching pronunciation: Recording students' voices in the classroom. *ATESOL Journal*. Canberra, ACT. Also available online at <http://helenfraser.com.au/downloads/tipsforrecordingstudentsvoices.pdf>
- Jenkins, J. (2002). A Sociolinguistically Based, Empirically Researched Pronunciation Syllabus for English as an International Language. *Applied Linguistics* 23(1), 83-103.
- Jenkins, J. (2006). Current Perspectives on Teaching World Englishes and English as a Lingua Franca. *TESOL Quarterly*. 40(1), 157-181.
- Kidder & Judd (1991). *Research Methods in Social Relations*. Florida, USA: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers .
- Levis, J. M. (2005). Changing contexts and shifting paradigms in pronunciation teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 39 (3), 369-395.
- Levis, J. M. (2007). Computer Technology in Teaching and Researching Pronunciation. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*. 27, 184-202.
- MacIntyre, P. D., R. Clément, Z. Dörnyei, and K. A. Noels. (1998). Conceptualizing willingness to communicate in a L2: A situational model of L2 confidence and affiliation. *Modern Language Journal* 82 (4), 545-562.
- Major, R. C. (2001). *Foreign Accent: The Ontogeny and Phylogeny of Second Language Phonology*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Munro, M. and T. Derwing (2008). Segmental Acquisition in Adult ESL Learners: A Longitudinal Study of Vowel Production. *Language Learning* 58 (3), 479-502.
- Norton, B. (1997). Language, identity, and the ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly*. 31(3), 409-429.
- Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning*. London: Longman.
- Pennycook, A. (1997). Cultural alternatives and autonomy. In Benson, P. & Peter Voller (ed.s) *Autonomy & Independence in language learning*. London: Longman.
- Robinson, P. (2001). Task complexity, cognitive resources, and syllabus design: A triadic framework for examining task influences on SLA. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and Second Language Instruction* (pp. 287-318). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Romova, Z., Smith, J. and Neville-Barton, P. (2008) Can I change the way I speak? An Exploration into pronunciation and fluency after three years of tertiary EAL study. *Prospect* 23 (3), 12-23.
- Schmidt, R., & Frota, S. (1986). Developing basic conversational ability in a second language. In R. Day (Ed.), *Talking to Learn* (pp. 237-326). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Schmidt, R. W. (1994). Deconstructing consciousness in search of useful definitions for applied linguistics, *AILA Review*, 11, 11-26.
- Sicola, L. (2008). "No, they won't 'just sound like each other'": NNS-NNS negotiated interaction and attention to phonological form on targeted L2 pronunciation tasks. PhD dissertation. UPenn.
- Smith, J. & Beckmann, B. (2005). "Improving pronunciation through noticing reformation tasks". In J. Maidment (Ed.), *Proceedings of the Phonetics Teaching and Learning Conference 2005*. (CD Rom ed.). London: University College London. Available online <http://www.phon.ucl.ac.uk/home/johnm/ptlc2005/pdf/ptlcp46.pdf>

- Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass & C. G. Madden (Eds.), *Input in Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 235-253). Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers.
- Swain, M. (1998). Focus on form through conscious reflection. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 64-81). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Taylor, John R. (2006). Where do Phonemes come from? A view from the Bottom. *IJES*, 6 (2). 19-54.
- Tomlin, R. S., & Villa, V. (1004). Attention in cognitive science and second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 16, 183-203.
- Zielinski, Beth (2006). The intelligibility cocktail: An interaction between speaker and listener ingredients. *Prospect*,. 21 (1), 22-45.

Appendix 1.

Relevant Questionnaire Questions

1. Think about the speaking you do now. Do you think your pronunciation has improved since February this year?

Circle: YES NO

If yes, in what ways? Give 2-3 reasons.

If no, why not? Give 2-3 reasons.

2. Are you still using some of the pronunciation strategies we practiced in semester 1 in Focus on Accuracy (speaking part)?

Circle YES NO

If yes, which ones are you using?

If no, why not? Suggest a reason

3. The following is a list of activities and strategies we used as part of the assessment tasks. Complete the table with your honest responses.

	Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4
	Strategy we used during speaking course in semester 1 Focus on Accuracy	Usefulness during the course. 1=most useful 2=useful 3=a little useful 4= least useful	How important is this activity in helping me to improve pronunciation VI= very important, I=important, NI = not important	I still do this <u>NOW</u> to help me with my pronunciation Tick ✓ the ones you do now
1	Listen to and analyse native speaker recordings by noticing specific phonological features			
2	Record myself speaking the same text as the native speaker			
3	Analyse my own speaking by noticing specific phonological features			
4	Compare my recording with native speaker			
5	The entire speaking assessment task itself			

Appendix 2.

Relevant Interview Questions

1. Are you still practicing some of the pronunciation strategies taught in semester 1 Focus on Accuracy? Which ones? How are you using them?

NOTE: Strategies taught and practiced in semester 1 Focus on Accuracy speaking course included:

Keeping a pronunciation error noticing log /table

Listening to pronunciation tapes in the language lab.

Using pronunciation software in the CALL lab (Connected Speech).

Completing pronunciation exercises from textbooks or workbooks.

Listening to native speaker(s) for particular phonological features

Transcribing native speakers recorded texts

Recording yourself speaking a text

Transcribing your spoken text

Analysing your spoken text with a focus on 1 or more phonological features

Comparing your own speaking with a native speaker focusing on 1 or more phonological features

Noticing your own pronunciation as you are speaking

Identifying 1 or more phonological features as you speak and correcting these either as you speak or afterwards

Mimic or shadow reading recorded native speaker text(s)

2. Are there other strategies you use to help you improve your speaking/ pronunciation? Please name or describe them.
3. Do you feel your pronunciation has improved since the beginning of Semester 1, 2003?
If yes, how? Why? If not, can you suggest a reason for this?
4. 'Noticing' was a key concept taught in the Speaking sessions.
How has focusing on phonological features and noticing native speakers pronunciation helped you to improve your own pronunciation?
How has self-awareness or noticing your own errors (of phonological features) helped you to improve your pronunciation?
5. Which one was more useful (native speaker or self) or were they both equally useful?

SLA AND GRAMMAR INSTRUCTION MATERIALS: A STUDY OF COURSEBOOK WRITERS' CONSIDERATIONS

Jacquelyn Arbury

Unitec Institute of Technology, New Zealand

Abstract

This study identified aspects from Second Language Acquisition SLA theories and research which could have implications for designing grammar instruction activities. A questionnaire, largely based on these identified aspects, was used to elicit the considerations of twelve professional ELT coursebook writers when they designed grammar instruction activities. The study suggests that certain aspects from SLA theories and research could be incorporated into grammar instruction materials in language teaching coursebooks, but not in a narrowly prescriptive sense.

Introduction

Second Language Acquisition (SLA) theories and research have often focused on learners' grammatical knowledge, providing insights into how grammar is acquired and also how its acquisition could be fostered. There now appears to be general agreement amongst most SLA theorists and researchers that some kind of grammar instruction in classroom learning situations is preferable to none (e.g. Ellis, 1997b, 2006; Fotos, 2002).

There has also been a surge in the production and use of ELT (English language teaching) coursebooks, which have maintained a strong focus on grammar instruction. However, significant issues concerning how and to what extent coursebook activities can promote language learning have been largely overlooked. Impressionistic, ad hoc evaluations, perhaps based solely on the visual appeal of the book, often guide buyers' and users' decision-making, rather than a more systematic, objective and rigorous approach (Tomlinson, 2003). It is also unclear whether or to what extent coursebook writers consider SLA ideas when designing grammar instruction materials.

The purpose of this study is to investigate links between SLA research-based theories and the considerations of writers when designing grammar instruction in ELT coursebooks. The study involves first identifying which aspects from SLA theories and findings would be applicable to language learning activities and therefore could be reflected in the materials, and then quantifying to what extent such reflection seems to occur. In the context of this study, 'applicable' means the SLA aspect can be incorporated into grammar instruction materials because of the nature or attributes of that aspect. The assumption is that bringing certain identified SLA aspects into the

teaching materials could promote more effective language acquisition. A questionnaire/ interview-prompt is then used to investigate the considerations of twelve ELT coursebook writers when designing grammar instruction activities.

SLA theories and research

A number of research-based theories are concerned with fostering language acquisition, for example studies on direct and indirect interventions (Ellis, 2005; Norris & Ortega, 2000) and form-focused instruction (Long & Robinson, 1998). *Focus on forms* is characterised by direct intervention through teaching pre-selected, separate items; *focus on form* describes indirect intervention such as occasionally moving attention to form when problems with comprehension or production occur. Other theories include Pienemann's (1985) teachability hypothesis, which explains how the learners' 'built-in syllabus' enables them to acquire implicit knowledge of grammar in developmental stages, and the weaker version of the interface hypothesis, which is concerned with how explicit knowledge of grammar can be converted to implicit knowledge (Ellis, 2005, 2006, 2008; Norris and Ortega, 2000).

Although connectionism (Macaro, 2003) and socio-cultural theory (Vygotsky, 1978) also provide explanations on language acquisition, various aspects of *input* and *output*, the 'external' components of the computational model, are of specific application to ELT coursebook materials. Some of the other components of this model, such as intake and interlanguage development, occur in learners' minds and are not describable or measurable in terms of materials, although naturally the purpose of materials is for the input to become learners' intake and thus to develop their interlanguage.

Within the computational model, aspects of input include various kinds of consciousness-raising, such as highlighting the target structure, and inductive (discovery) or deductive (explanatory) learning (Ellis, 2002b; Fotos, 2002; Haight, Herron, & Cole, 2007; Nassaji & Fotos, 2004; Swain, 2005; White, 1998; Williams, 2005). Providing meaningful contextualisation of the target structure rather than discrete, decontextualised items (DeKeyser, 1998; Hinkel & Fotos, 2002; Nassaji & Fotos, 2004), and opportunities for learners to receive feedback (Fotos, 2002; Sheen, 2004; Spada & Lightbown, 1999; Takashima & Ellis, 1999) are other aspects of input which could be applicable to grammar instruction materials.

Some SLA aspects related to output are concerned with various kinds of focused tasks, i.e. tasks focused on grammar instruction as well as communication (Ellis, 2003; Kanda & Beglar, 2004; Nassaji & Fotos, 2004; Qin, 2008; VanPatten, 2004). Aspects of output also include collaborative tasks (Qin, 2008; Swain, 2001; Swain & Lapkin, 2001; Wajnyryb, 1990), on-line planning or off-line planning (pre-planning) (Mehnert, 1998; Skehan, 2007; Yuan & Ellis, 2003) and interaction (Long, 1996). Sometimes it is difficult to distinguish between input and output because of their synthesis in integrated units of work, for example in interactive activities.

Previous studies on grammar instruction materials and on materials writers' considerations

A small number of empirical researchers have made links between SLA research-based theories and grammar activities by analysing published materials. Studies by Aski (2003), Ellis (2002a), Millard (2000), Nitta and Gardner (2005), and Smith (1998) investigate a variety of language instruction materials. Overall, their findings suggest that aspects less reflective of SLA findings are still prevalent in the books they analysed. The researchers generally conclude that aspects of SLA which promote effective language learning should be included more in grammar instruction activities.

The stated considerations of materials designers could also provide insights into the extent to which SLA theories and research are reflected in grammar instruction materials. There is little empirical research in this area, even less than the limited amount of literature on empirical studies in materials analysis. After Ellis's (2002a) analysis of some grammar instruction materials, he comments on the writers' considerations as expressed in the introductions of their grammar textbooks. Ellis (2002a) maintains that the writers seem to be confused with regard to which kind of grammatical knowledge - implicit or explicit - they are targeting in their materials design. He also notes that for psycholinguistic reasons it is difficult to teach implicit knowledge, and questions writers' apparent belief in *production practice* as a means of acquiring implicit knowledge, suggesting instead that writers make explicit knowledge of grammar one of their goals. Johnson's (2000) study is a large empirical one on the design procedures of materials writers. His work on writers' knowledge and belief systems ('designer schemata') reveals a strong commitment by all participants to the principles of communicative language teaching. However, the designers could be separated into two groups: one group considers form crucial (language-oriented) while the second is more concerned with meaning (task-oriented).

Research Design and Methodology

This study employed a two-part Questionnaire/Interview Prompt (see Appendix) to elicit the considerations of some professional coursebook writers. In Section A the purpose was to investigate whether the participant writers took the following aspects from SLA theories and research into consideration when designing grammar activities:

- explicit and/or implicit knowledge of grammar, including awareness, noticing, inductive learning and/or deductive learning
- contextualisation and/or discrete items for teaching grammar
- controlled practice and/or freer communicative production in grammar teaching
- off-line planning (pre-planning) before producing the target structure
- different sources of feedback on grammatical accuracy
- social interaction in grammar activities

Section B contained questions about other considerations, not related to SLA, which could influence writers while designing grammar instruction materials. These questions focused on the importance of affect (Ellis, 2005; Tomlinson, 2003) and issues of practicality (Bell & Gower, 1998; Millard, 2000; Waters, 2009). Examples of affect include motivation, reducing anxiety, personalizing materials and making materials culturally appropriate. Issues of practicality take into account the expectations of teachers, students and publishers; controls on the format and content; and financial constraints and profitability. The questions in Section B looked at whether affect and practicality issues limited the writers' choices.

A total of fifty-two professional ELT coursebook writers were contacted, fifty from the United Kingdom and two from New Zealand. Nine UK writers and one New Zealander returned completed questionnaires, and two Auckland writers of published ELT materials attended an interview based on the questionnaire. The overseas respondents are all writers of top selling coursebooks and have published numerous ELT resources over the years.

The results of the questionnaires and interviews were analysed for significant comments related to aspects of SLA theories. The numbers of participants with the same or very similar responses were counted, and patterns of occurrence regarding similarities and differences on key points were noted. The responses for each question were then listed in a table with the number (N) of occurrences alongside. For example, the following table recorded the results to the question on using inductive and/or deductive approaches.

Table 1: Participants' preferences regarding inductive and deductive learning approaches

<i>Participants responses</i>	<i>N</i>
Preferred only inductive learning approaches	3
Preferred inductive but still used deductive learning approaches	6
Used both approaches but did not state a preference	3
Preferred only deductive learning approaches	0

Summary and discussion of the findings

SLA Considerations

It seems reasonable to assume that the participants, as specialist materials designers, would be familiar with SLA theories and research. The *extent* to which their considerations reflected these theories and research was partly gauged by examining what proportion of participants reported providing, employing, or preferring certain aspects from SLA theories and research. Sometimes writers' considerations reflected the SLA-related aspects to a large extent. The majority of

writer participants reported that they provided highlighting of target structures, inductive learning, communicative activities, instructions for off-line planning, and opportunities for feedback. These aspects are thought to promote language learning, according to various SLA theorists and researchers mentioned earlier in this article.

However, other SLA-related aspects were reflected to a lesser extent in the writer participants' considerations, despite SLA theories and research on their purported benefits. The participants were split regarding their considerations on some aspects, such as whether to provide implicit or explicit grammar activities, inductive or deductive grammar activities, meaningful contexts or decontextualised discrete items for practice, and controlled practice or communicative production. Sometimes their choice of both alternatives was in accordance with SLA theories and research. For example, both explicit and implicit grammar knowledge can promote language learning (Ellis, 2005, 2008), as can both inductive and deductive learning (Fotos, 2002). However, SLA theories and research suggest that meaningful contexts (DeKeyser, 1998; Hinkel and Fotos, 2002; Millard, 2000), and communicative production (Chaudron, 2001; Van Patten, 2004) are more conducive to language learning than large quantities of decontextualised discrete sentences and controlled practice (especially mechanical practice).

Table 2 (below) shows the identified aspects from SLA theories and research which were considered by the participants. The table also compares the results of this study with the previously discussed research on analysing grammar instruction materials (Aski 2003; Ellis 2002a; Millard 2000; Nitta and Gardner 2005; Smith 1998), and on coursebook writers' considerations (Ellis, 2002a; Johnson, 2000).

Table 2: A comparison of the results from this study's questionnaires/interviews findings, with the results from other studies on ELT materials analysis and on materials writers' considerations

<i>Aspects which SLA theories and research suggest are conducive to language learning</i>	<i>Findings from this study's writer participants' considerations</i>	<i>Findings from empirical studies in materials analysis</i>	<i>Findings from other studies on the considerations of materials writers</i>
Both implicit and explicit knowledge of grammar	Some participants had concerns about designing explicit grammar activities but others did not. Participants were roughly split on whether learners should also be aware of form in meaning-focused grammar activities.	There was a prevalence of explicit grammar activities.	Uncertainty and opposing viewpoints were expressed on whether to design activities for explicit or implicit grammar knowledge.

Input: Consciousness-raising	Highlighting and multiple examples of target structures were provided by nearly all participants. Most preferred inductive learning, but most also said they used both inductive and deductive learning. No one commented on judging grammaticality.	Inductive learning was more common in one study, but deductive learning was more common in two other studies.	This aspect was not a focus of these two studies (except in the previously discussed context of the implicit/explicit grammar distinction).
Input: Meaningful contextualisation	A meaningful context was considered more important when introducing a new target structure than when producing it, mainly because of opportunities for practice in discrete items.	There was a prevalence of input with discrete items (typically single sentences) rather than meaningful contexts.	This aspect was not a focus of these two studies.
Input: Feedback	Most participants favoured providing opportunities for feedback from the teacher, materials or peers, with half choosing all three.	This aspect was not focused on specifically (although communicative activities could provide opportunities for feedback from peers).	This aspect was not focused on specifically (although communicative activities could provide opportunities for feedback from peers).
Output: Freer communicative activities	All participants said they provided both controlled practice and communicative activities, and most considered both kinds important. Some thought links between the two were through sequencing and themes.	There was more controlled practice than communicative production in three of the studies.	Ellis (2002a) noted that contrary to the evidence of the 'teachability hypothesis', writers believed practice was a means of acquiring <i>implicit</i> grammar knowledge. In Johnson (2000), the language-oriented group expressed concerns on how to combine task-based teaching with structural practice.

Output: Different kinds of tasks (focused tasks such as consciousness-raising tasks, interpretation tasks and structure-based production tasks; collaborative output tasks such as dictogloss and jigsaw tasks)	Focused tasks and collaborative tasks were not specifically mentioned by participants. But freer communicative activities requiring the target structure could be structure-based production tasks, and the inductive approach could be used in consciousness-raising tasks.	Four studies noted a lack of focused tasks, but many practice and production grammar activities. Nitta and Gardner (2005) found consciousness-raising tasks and interpretation tasks in the presentation stage; Ellis (2002a) commented on some consciousness-raising.	Johnson (2000) did not comment on focused or collaborative tasks. Ellis (2002a) reported a lack of input processing tasks (interpretation tasks), but did not mention other kinds of focused tasks.
Output: Off-line strategic planning	Most participants said they gave instructions for off-line planning before oral grammar activities.	This aspect was not a focus of the studies.	This aspect was not a focus of the studies.

Some of the findings in this study were the same or similar to the other studies in Table 2; for example, the concerns about teaching explicit grammar; the mixed considerations on inductive and deductive learning; the common use of discrete items despite some SLA support for meaningful contextualisation; and the lack of focused tasks and collaborative tasks (except for structure-based production tasks and consciousness-raising tasks). However, the results of this study sometimes differed from the other findings. For instance, the empirical studies in materials analysis revealed a greater prevalence of explicit grammar activities, discrete items and controlled practice than this study's results. Some of the aspects examined in this study were not a specific focus of the other studies: the empirical studies in materials analysis did not consider feedback and off-line strategic planning, and the other studies on materials writers' considerations did not especially attend to consciousness-raising, contextualisation, feedback and off-line planning.

Non-SLA considerations

The results from the interviews and questionnaires also revealed the participants' views on non-SLA factors. These included affect and issues of practicality, which could reduce the extent to which participants considered SLA aspects when designing grammar activities.

As noted earlier, affect includes motivation, personalisation of materials, anxiety reduction and the cultural appropriacy of materials. The majority of participants took into account all these aspects of affect, especially motivation and cultural appropriacy.

With regard to issues of practicality, all of the participants said they considered others' expectations regarding grammar instruction materials, especially the expectations of teachers, learners and publishers, and over half the participants felt constrained by financial considerations concerning profitability. Roughly equal numbers of participants expressed either negative feelings about the constraints of others' expectations and financial profitability, or were positive or philosophical about these constraints. A minority of the participants felt constrained by these practicality issues when considering SLA theories and research, but half did not. Half the participants either considered certain non-SLA factors more important than SLA ones or had concerns about the importance of SLA, but a minority thought SLA considerations were important. Therefore the writers' considerations on these non-SLA factors varied and were often split.

These apparently conflicting results could be explained by some overlapping of the various SLA aspects and non-SLA factors. For example, an area such as consciousness-raising could be considered important by a writer because of his/her knowledge of the SLA theories and research on it. Or there could be other reasons such as language teaching traditions on making learners aware of new grammar, or others' expectations that these traditions will be followed, or even intuition, common sense or what 'works' according to the writer's own teaching experience and belief system.

It is unclear why certain aspects from SLA were more common than others. One could speculate that the frequently occurring SLA aspects were also more in accord with non-SLA factors such as conventions and expectations (e.g. highlighting and feedback), or the affective factor of motivation (e.g. freer communication and inductive learning may be more motivating for learners). However, the aspects *less* reflective of SLA, such as using discrete items and controlled practice, could have been more common than, for example, collaborative tasks because of non-SLA factors such as conventions, expectations, the time lag before new ideas are implemented by the majority, and the writers' own experience and beliefs.

Some limitations

The study acknowledges the limitations of focusing on links between SLA research-based theories on fostering language learning and grammar instruction activities. As previously discussed, the influence of non-SLA factors on coursebook design can constrain materials writers. Considerations related more to the conditions of learning (e.g. affective issues) than the SLA learning process itself, are also likely to influence materials writers. Additionally, there are certain difficulties in making links between SLA and practical pedagogical issues concerning course materials: SLA research has produced some inconclusive, at times contradictory findings, and future developments could invalidate present theories (Cook, 1996; Tomlinson, 1998). While such non-SLA factors and uncertainties regarding SLA findings are acknowledged as significant, this study nevertheless argues that a link between theory and practice – SLA and pedagogy – has been made by other researchers (e.g. Ellis, 1997b, 2005; Kanda and Beglar, 2004; Waters, 2009) and can be made in this study.

Conclusion

SLA theories and research often reveal opposing positions or dichotomies on aspects which are applicable to language learning materials. The writer participants in this study sometimes chose positions supported by SLA theories and research for teaching grammar. For instance, they said they provided meaningful contextualised texts as input, and activities requiring freer communication as output. But sometimes they chose positions *less* reflective of SLA theories and research, such as including discrete items as input, and mechanical controlled practice as output. Therefore the SLA aspects which foster language learning (according to SLA theories and research) were reflected in the participants' considerations to *varying* extents.

One might ask why the writer participants in this study still included (or reported that they included) some grammar activities which were *less* reflective of SLA theories and research. Waters (2009) notes the same apparent contradiction when he writes:

...there has been a tendency in academic circles to view advances in textbook design as a function of the extent to which materials reflect succeeding developments in applied linguistics. However, in addition to its "applied science" orientation, such a stance assumes that writers and publishers, in taking the *opposite tack*, would willingly pursue a course that is against their best interests.... (Waters, 2009, p. 323, italics added).

Several explanations for this 'opposite tack' have already been suggested in this study, especially the non-SLA factors of practicality issues and affect. The participants' own beliefs, their stated views on 'common sense', and their experience from teaching and writing materials were also taken into consideration when they designed grammar activities. It is less likely that they lacked awareness of SLA theories and research, since professional writers would want to keep abreast of developments which might be applicable to their work.

Another explanation could be the lag between new research (including the lead-in time before its publication) and uptake by practitioners such as coursebook writers and teachers whose expectations obviously influence writers and publishers. This explanation is offered as a possible reason for the relative lack of focused tasks such as comprehension (interpretation) tasks. Such a delay in uptake has a parallel in management theory, which has identified the sequential steps people take before adopting innovations (Markee, 1997).

Most (perhaps all) of the writer participants would have been aware of the controversial issues in SLA theories and research when they considered the extent to which SLA-related aspects were reflected in their coursebook materials on grammar instruction. This study acknowledges issues such as whether SLA theories and research can be applied to language teaching (thus bridging the gap between theory and practice), and whether materials writers should be influenced by research-based SLA theories, given the

inconclusive, sometimes contradictory results from SLA research. One participant noted: “Linguistics, sociolinguistics, the study of L1 and L2 acquisition are all relatively new...” and another observed: “Although I like trying to take SLA theory into account, I don’t think that there is any one theory that should be slavishly adhered to.”

The participants often considered non-SLA factors as well as SLA-related ones to varying degrees, despite some researchers’ claims (Aski 2003; Ellis 2002a; Millard 2000; Nitta and Gardner 2005; Smith 1998) that theories and research from SLA should predominate more in language teaching materials. One solution to this situation can be found in Waters’ “...notion of a *compromise* between what might be theoretically desirable and what is practicable and appropriate in audience terms” (Waters, 2009, p. 324). Ideas from academia can be viewed as contributing to a better understanding and appraisal of course design, rather than being its foremost influence (Waters, 2009).

More balance may also be needed because of the tensions created by the opposing positions discussed in SLA theory and research (e.g. inductive versus deductive learning, meaningful context versus discrete items, and focused tasks versus practice activities). For example, Nitta and Gardner (2005) noted that coursebook writers combined consciousness-raising with more traditional practice exercises, which could perhaps lead to more effective learning:

Accordingly, although researchers insist on the effectiveness of C-R [*consciousness-raising*] rather than practice in theory – and rationally their arguments are convincing – ELT practitioners may not be prepared to abandon the familiar, tried and true ‘practice’ exercises....One issue this raises is whether this hybrid is more effective than either of the two approaches used more consistently (Nitta and Gardner, 2005, p. 10, bracketed italics added).

Some researchers consider that SLA should provide principles rather than prescriptions for materials writers and teachers. Ellis (1997a) describes the relationship between SLA and language pedagogy as problematic. He suggests that practitioners’ theories can be shaped by information from SLA theories and research which serves as a cognitive or interpretation model and which offers only “provisional specifications” (Ellis, 1997a, p. 69). Richards (2005) also argues that many SLA researchers would now take the more cautious position of perhaps extrapolating principles from research, rather than giving advice. Kanda and Beglar observe that because SLA is still developing, and a single detailed theory of language learning has not (yet) been accepted (the same points which were made by some of the writer participants in this study), “..... we believe that one fruitful alternative is for researchers and teachers [*and materials writers*] to utilize instructional principles to guide their work” (Kanda and Beglar, 2004, p. 107, bracketed italics added).

Therefore, some degree of guidance from the insights of SLA theories and research could be helpful for materials writers. However, other non-SLA factors also have a place in the considerations of materials writers, and a balance between the opposing positions of certain SLA aspects may be more appropriate.

References

- Aski, J. (2003). Foreign language textbook activities: Keeping pace with second language acquisition research. In *Foreign Language Annals*, 36 (1), 57-65.
- Bell, J. & Gower, R. (1998). Writing course materials for the world: a great compromise. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Materials development in language teaching* (pp. 116-129). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chaudron, C. (2001). Progress in language classroom research: Evidence from *The Modern Language Journal*, 1916-2000. *The Modern Language Journal* 85 (1), 57-76.
- Cook, V. (1996). *Second language learning and language teaching*. London: Arnold, Hodder Headline Group.
- DeKeyser, R. (1998). Beyond focus on form: Cognitive perspectives on learning and practicing second language grammar. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 42-63). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ellis, R. (1997a). SLA and language pedagogy: An educational perspective. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 20 (1), 69-92.
- Ellis, R. (1997b). *SLA research and language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2002a). Methodological options in grammar teaching materials. In E. Hinkel & S. Fotos (Eds.), *New perspectives on grammar teaching in second language classrooms* (pp. 155-179). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Ellis, R. (2002b). Grammar teaching – practice or consciousness-raising? In J. Richards & W. Renandya (Eds.), *Methodology in language teaching* (pp. 167– 174). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2005). *Instructed Second Language Acquisition: A literature review*. Auckland: Auckland Uniservices Ltd.
- Ellis, R. (2006). Current issues in the teaching of grammar: An SLA perspective. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40 (1), 83-107.
- Ellis (2008). *The Study of Second Language Acquisition (Second Edition)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fotos, S. (2002). Structure-based interactive tasks for the EFL grammar learner. In E. Hinkel & S. Fotos (Eds.), *New perspectives on grammar teaching in second language classrooms* (pp. 135-155). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Haight, C., Herron, C., & Cole, S. (2007). The effects of deductive and guided inductive instructional approaches on the learning of grammar in the elementary foreign language college classroom. *Foreign Language Annals*, 40 (2), 288-310.
- 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). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Johnson, K. (2000). What task designers do. *Language Teaching Research*. 4 (3), 301-321.
- Kanda, M. & Beglar, D. (2004). Applying pedagogical principles to grammar instruction. *RELC Journal*, 35 (1), 105-119.
- Long, M. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. Ritchie & T. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413-468). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Long, M. H. & Robinson, P. (1998). Focus on form: theory, research and practice. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 15-41). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Macaro, E. (2003). *Teaching and learning a second language*. London: Continuum.
- Markee, N. (1997). *Managing curricular innovation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mehnert, U. (1998). The effects of different lengths of time for planning on second language performance. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*. 20 (1), 83-108.

- Millard, D. (2000). Form-focused instruction in communicative language teaching: Implications for grammar textbooks. *TESL Canada Journal*, 18 (1), 47-59.
- Nassaji, H. & Fotos, S. (2004). Current developments in research on the teaching of grammar. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 24, 126-145.
- Nitta, R. and Gardner, S. (2005). Consciousness-raising and practice in ELT coursebooks. *ELT Journal* 59 (1), 3-13.
- Norris, J. & Ortega, L. (2000). Effectiveness of L2 instruction: A research synthesis and quantitative meta-analysis. *Language Learning*, 50 (3), 417-528.
- Pienemann, M. (1985). Learnability and syllabus construction. In K. Hyldenstam & M. Pienemann (Eds.), *Modelling and assessing second language acquisition* (pp. 23-75). Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters.
- Qin, J. (2008). The effect of processing instruction and dictogloss tasks on the acquisition of the English passive voice. *Language Teaching Research*, 12 (1), 61-82.
- Richards, J. (2005). Materials development and research – making the connection. Paper presented at a colloquium on research and materials development, at the TESOL Convention, San Antonio, March 2005. Retrieved August 1, 2006 from <http://rel.sagepub.com.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz>
- Sheen, Y. (2004). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in communicative classrooms across instructional settings. *Language Teaching Research*, 8 (3), 263-300.
- Skehan, P. (2007). Task research and language teaching: reciprocal relationships. In S. Fotos & H. Nassaji (Eds.), *Form-focused instruction and teacher education: Studies in honour of Rod Ellis*, (pp. 55-69). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Smith, G. (1998). *Towards an analysis of form-focused instruction materials*: Unpublished M.A. dissertation: University of Auckland, Auckland.
- Spada, N., & Lightbown, P. (1999). Instruction, first language influence and developmental readiness in second language acquisition. *The Modern Language Journal*, 83 (1), 1-22.
- Swain, M. (2001). Integrating language and content teaching through collaborative tasks. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 58 (1), 44-63.
- Swain, M. (2005). The output hypothesis: Theory and research. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning* (pp. 471-483). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2001). Focus on form through collaborative dialogue: Exploring task effects. In M. Bygate, P. Skehan & M. Swain (Eds.), *Researching pedagogic tasks: Second language learning, teaching and testing* (pp. 99-118). Harlow, UK: Pearson Education.
- Takashima, H. & Ellis, R. (1999). Output enhancement and the acquisition of the past tense. In R. Ellis (Ed.), *Learning a second language through acquisition* (pp. 173-188). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Tomlinson, B. (1998). Introduction. In Tomlinson, B. (Ed.), *Materials development in language teaching* (pp. 1-24). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tomlinson, B. (Ed.), (2003). *Developing materials for language teaching*. London: Continuum.
- VanPatten, B. (2004). Input processing in SLA. In B. VanPatten, (Ed.), *Processing instruction: Theory, research and commentary* (pp. 5-32). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in Society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wajnryb, R. (1990). *Grammar dictation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Waters, A. (2009). Advances in materials design. In Long, M. & Doughty, C. J. (Eds.), *The handbook of language teaching*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- White, J. (1998). Getting the learners' attention. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 85-113). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Williams, J. (2005). Form-focused instruction. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 671-691). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Yuan, F. & Ellis, R. (2003). The effects of pre-task planning and on-line planning on fluency, complexity and accuracy in L2 oral production. *Applied Linguistics*, 24 (1), 1-27.

Appendix

Questionnaire/interview-prompt on considerations of writers of ELT coursebooks

Section A: Second Language Acquisition (SLA) Considerations

This section is concerned with finding out what aspects of second language acquisition (if any) you consider may have influenced you when designing activities for *grammar instruction* materials.

1. Do you design grammar activities that are *explicitly* focused on the grammar point (e.g. gap-fill, changing verb tenses etc), in order to make learners very aware that they are learning grammar?
2. If you answered ‘yes’ to the first question, how do you help learners notice and focus on a grammar point? For example, do you:
 - provide many examples of the grammar point?
 - highlight the grammar point in bold or italics?
 - es around explanations or examples of the grammar?
 - use other ways? (If so, please explain.)use box
3. Do you also design grammar learning activities that are *meaning* focused and therefore learners may be *unaware* that they are learning grammar? Please explain why or why not.
4. How do you prefer to introduce new grammar points?
 - through *inductive* (discovery) learning in which students are given examples and invited to discover the rule
 - through *deductive* (didactic) learning for new grammar points in which students are given the rule first, and then study examples of its use
 - through *both* inductive and deductive learning at different times

Please comment on reasons for your preferences.

5. Do you *introduce* a grammar point
 - in a meaningful context (e.g. in a dialogue, narrative or description)?
 - in discrete sentences (i.e. in sentences that are not meaningfully related to each other)?
 - sometimes in a meaningful context and sometimes in discrete sentences?
6. How do you ask learners to *use* a grammar point?
 - in a meaningful context (e.g. in a dialogue, narrative or description)?
 - in discrete sentences (i.e. in sentences that are not meaningfully related to each other)?
 - sometimes in a meaningful context and sometimes in discrete sentences?

7. How important is it to have both *controlled* language practice (i.e. drills and exercises) and *communicative* language practice (i.e. meaningful, contextualised communication that generates the target grammar feature)? How do you connect controlled and communicative language practice (if you do connect them)?
8. Do you sometimes suggest in your instructions that learners should spend a few minutes preparing what to say before starting the grammar activity? Please explain why or why not.
9. What opportunities do you provide for students to receive *feedback* on the grammar activity? Please comment on the following possibilities for feedback:
 - from the teacher (e.g. providing activities requiring correction/marking)
 - from the materials (e.g. including an answer section for self-correction)
 - from other learners (e.g. providing opportunities for peer feedback during pair and group work on grammar activities).
10. How important is providing opportunities for *social interaction* such as pair work and group work in the grammar activities that you design? Please explain your answer.
11. Are there any other ways in which you take into consideration Second Language Acquisition theories in your work as a materials designer that have not been covered?

Section B: Other Considerations (not related to SLA)

This section is concerned with what *other* considerations influenced you when writing grammar instruction materials.

1. In what ways were you influenced by the importance of *affect* (emotional factors), such as motivating learners, reducing their anxiety, personalizing materials for learners, making materials culturally appropriate etc.?
2. What issues of practicality did you need to take into consideration in the grammar activities? You may wish to comment on the following possibilities: the perceived expectations of teachers and students, your publishers' expectations, constraints on the format and content of the materials, financial constraints, profitability etc.
3. Do any of the factors mentioned in the previous question prevent you from taking more account of Second Language Acquisition theories of teaching/learning in your materials design?

TAKING PRIDE IN TE REO MĀORI: HOW REGULAR SPELLING PROMOTES LITERACY ACQUISITION

Christian U. Krägeloh and Tia N. Neha

Auckland University of Technology¹
University of Otago²

Abstract

Previous literature on the beneficial effects of Māori-medium education on revitalisation of Te Reo Māori has focused almost exclusively on the importance of cultural contextualisation. The present article wishes to draw attention to an additional potential contributing factor to the success of these programmes. Based on a wealth of evidence from cross-language comparisons, it is argued that the orthographic consistency of the language, its regular spelling, is likely to result in rapid reading acquisition due to the ease in which letter-sound relationships can be learned. Additionally, learning to read in an orthographically consistent language optimises the development of phonological processing skills and successful reading strategies, which can later be transferred to literacy acquisition in English. A strong foundation in phonological processing skills protects particularly at-risk students from reading failure. Since Māori students in mainstream schools are particularly vulnerable to experiencing reading difficulties, the prospect that the linguistic properties of Te Reo Māori, the language of their ancestors, could contribute to the alleviation of such deficits, substantially enhances the appeal of Māori-medium education.

Since the British colonisation of Aotearoa/New Zealand and the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840, Te Reo Māori, the language of the indigenous Māori, has experienced continuous decline. An influx of European settlers, who rapidly outnumbered Māori, soon resulted in the dominance of the English language in the country (King, 2004). Although early missionary schools in the 1830s and 1840s taught literacy to Māori in their native language, the assimilationist policies of the New Zealand government in the 1860s started a trend towards education exclusively conducted in the English language (Simon, 1998). The Native Schools Amendment Act of 1871 directed that instruction in schools was to be conducted only in English, and eventually there was an outright ban of the use of Te Reo Māori in schools, which in some cases extended to the use of the language not only within classrooms, but also on the school grounds in general (Spolsky, 2003).

These laws and policies, combined with marginalisation, socio-economic disadvantage, and substantial population drifts from rural to urban living after World War II, contributed to the decline of Te Reo Māori and resulted in a whole generation of Māori where the vast majority was only able to speak English (Simon & Smith, 2001). Surveys

in 1968 (Clay, 1982) and the 1970s (Benton, 1979) confirmed that the language was moving towards extinction. English had increasingly become the language spoken at home, and even when Te Reo Māori became an official language of New Zealand with the introduction of the Māori Language Act of 1987, the language was still in decline (Reedy, 2000). In 1996, census data revealed that only 25% of Māori were able to have a conversation in Te Reo Māori, although evidence emerged that younger generations were becoming increasingly fluent in the language (Spolsky, 2003).

The reason for the resurgence in Te Reo Māori in the young generation was attributable to grass-root initiatives to revitalise the use of the language. In 1982, groups of parents started educational initiatives called *kōhanga reo*, literally *language nests*, as a *whānau* (extended family) focused pre-school co-operative programme exclusively conducted in Te Reo Māori (Hohepa, Smith, Smith, & McNaughton, 1992). Fuelled by the success of the *kōhanga reo*, parents of students who graduated from the immersion pre-school organised the next step, *kura kaupapa*, a Māori-medium primary school (Appleby, 2002). Despite struggles to obtain funding, the *kura kaupapa* grew rapidly to 66 schools in 2005 (Ministry of Education, 2006), although still only the minority of Māori children (3%) attended these immersion-based primary schools (Appleby, 2002).

Parents of the children attending *kōhanga reo* and *kura kaupapa* have generally been motivated and supportive, but the success of Māori-medium was also largely due to its cultural contextualisation and appropriateness (Glynn, Berryman, Loader, & Cavanagh, 2005). This includes integration of learning with culturally relevant experiences, such as *kapa haka* (Māori action songs and performance), as well as close links with the extended *whānau* (Bishop, Berryman, & Richardson, 2002). Teaching in the *kura kaupapa* is based on holistic principles, where the student and teacher both learn from each other (Bishop, 2003), which runs consistent with the Māori form of knowledge transmission as opposed to the methods employed in mainstream schooling.

Cultural factors undoubtedly play a central role in Māori-medium education, but for the purposes of the present article will not be further elaborated. Instead, we attempt to highlight the effects that the linguistic properties of Te Reo Māori might have on students learning to read in that language first, as opposed to learning to read in English. We will argue that the orthographic properties of the Te Reo Māori, its regular spelling, have beneficial effects on speed of reading acquisition and development of phonological awareness, and that these benefits might transfer to the learning of English at a later age. The arguments presented here will be based on a large body of evidence from international cross-language comparisons and will be related directly to theories of literacy acquisition.

The effects of orthography on reading acquisition

Numerous studies have reported that reading acquisition proceeds faster in languages with a transparent orthography than in languages where the spelling is irregular (Landerl, 2000; Paulesu et al., 2000; Aro & Wimmer, 2003; Seymour et al., 2003;

also, for a review, see Joshi & Aaron, 2006). Seymour et al., for example, compared reading performance of primary school children in 14 different countries in Europe. There was a clear relationship between consistency in orthography and speed of reading acquisition, with languages such as English requiring the longest time, and languages such as Finnish the shortest. Even though children in English-speaking countries are generally taught to read at a much earlier age than in other European countries (Seymour et al., 2003; Ziegler & Goswami, 2006), they are generally considered to be up to 2 ½ years delayed in their reading acquisition compared to children learning to read in languages with regular orthographies (Seymour et al.).

One alternative explanation in such cross-language comparisons is that not the orthography, but other aspects of the language, such as length of words or differences in the words used in the reading assessment tools, could be responsible for the observed differences. A number of studies have therefore taken the approach of comparing reading acquisition of English with that of German, two Germanic languages with a large word stock from the same origin and often with similar spelling (Ziegler, Perry, Jacobs, & Braun, 2001; Frith, Wimmer, & Landerl, 1998). German, however, has a much more transparent orthography than English. As Landerl (2006) illustrates, the vowel expressed by the letter *a* is pronounced the same in the following set of German words: *Hand, Ball, Garten, Hass*. In the equivalent set of English words, on the other hand, the letter *a* is pronounced differently each time: *hand, ball, garden, hate*. Frith et al. (1998) compared reading performance of English-speaking and German-speaking children using common words that happen to have the same or similar spelling in both languages and that children are likely to encounter round about the same age. English-speaking children had lower overall reading accuracy and were slower at reading nonwords. Vowels, in particular, are a problem in English, which means that children appear to be processing the consonant skeleton of the word first and determine the accompanying vowels according to analogies (Frith et al., 1998). Such analogies might work in some cases (e.g. *mother-brother*), but are frequently met with exceptions (e.g. *tough-dough*), and these strategies therefore tend to be unreliable and error-prone.

The delays in reading acquisition of English-speaking children do not appear to be the result of their failure to acquire knowledge of letter-sound relationships (Seymour et al. 2003). In fact, English-speaking children are often taught the alphabet at pre-school level, which does not appear to provide any advantage in later reading acquisition compared to German children, for example, who are often only introduced to the alphabet at first year of school (Mann & Wimmer, 2002). Instead, the reading delays in English are clearly related to deficits in phonological recoding. Cross-language comparisons repeatedly find English-speaking children performing worse at spelling, word recognition or pseudoword reading, such as compared to children learning to read in German (Goswami, Ziegler, Dalton, & Schneider, 2001, 2003), Czech (Caravolas & Bruck, 1993), Turkish (Oney & Goldman, 1984) or Albanian (Hoxhallari, van Daal, & Ellis, 2004), to mention a few examples.

Models of reading acquisition have postulated the progression of different stages in learning an alphabetic script. In the early stages of reading acquisition, words are processed using two parallel types of processing strategies, alphabetic and logographic processing (Duncan & Seymour, 2000). Sometimes, especially at pre-school level, words are taught visually, such as by showing flashcards. Although this strategy might work to memorise a limited number of words as visual stimuli, it is an ineffective strategy to teach a larger stock of words (Share, 1995). A more efficient strategy is alphabetic or sub-lexical processing, where words are sequentially decoded according to letter-sound correspondence, which also enables the reader to decode novel words. The second process, the logographic processing involves the storage of word-specific aspects and enables rapid word recognition (Duncan & Seymour, 2000). After the reader has been exposed to a new word for even only a small number of times, he or she already starts to store specific information about the word, and phonological processing is said to become increasingly lexicalised (Share, 1995). Phonological processing thus becomes modified by the orthographic constraints of the language and, when relevant, can inhibit sub-lexical processing, such as when reading the word *pint* not as the rhyme of *mint* (Fiez, 2000). Although this lexical processing is more important in languages with inconsistent orthographies, it occurs in readers of all languages, and allows the reader to recognise familiar words instantly, without having to sound them out.

According to the *orthographic depth hypothesis* (Katz & Frost, 1992), reading acquisition proceeds rapidly in languages with a transparent orthography because readers can easily decode words by blending the individual phonemes that are represented by the graphemes. Even though, with increased reading experience, high-frequency words are increasingly lexicalised and thus quickly recognised, phonological decoding continues to be very important throughout literacy acquisition. Orthographic information about less frequently occurring words can be self-taught via successful phonological recoding, thus providing valuable opportunities to expand the reader's vocabulary (Share, 1995). This is confirmed by experimental findings that good decoders tend to have better vocabulary knowledge (Meschyan & Hernandez, 2002). Even though self-teaching is much easier in consistent orthographies, this is also a crucial strategy in orthographically opaque languages, such as English. Even rudimentary and simplistic knowledge of grapheme-phoneme relationships can function as a scaffold onto which increasingly more complex orthographic patterns can be mapped (Caravolas, Hulme, & Snowling, 2001; Share, 1995).

The finding that English children require more time to acquire fluent reading (Joshi & Aaron, 2006) may therefore be attributable to the fact that the opaque orthography of English delays them to take advantage of self-teaching. This may be further exacerbated by the fact that English is generally taught using whole-language methods, which does not place sufficient emphasis on phonological recoding skills (Nicholson, 2004; Tunmer, Chapman, Greaney, & Prochnow, 2002), which are a pre-requisite for self-teaching. Although, by age 12, English children have generally caught up with the reading abilities of children who learned to read in a language with a transparent orthography (Frith et al., 1998; Landerl, 2000), about 25% of

students do not develop adequate phonological recoding skills if not explicitly taught (Liberman & Liberman, 1992). Children may learn to read successfully via the whole-language method provided they have access to sufficient *cultural capital* (Tunmer, Chapman, & Prochnow, 2004), such as support at home, but children from lower socio-economic backgrounds are at a much higher risk to struggle with reading acquisition (Seymour et al., 2003; Riccio et al., 2001). Struggling readers can benefit greatly from an intervention that emphasises alphabetic decoding skills (Ryder, Tunmer, & Greaney, 2008), which is consistent with the view that lack of phonemic awareness is a matter of a lack of skill, rather than a deficiency (Share, 1995).

The potential advantages of learning to read in Te Reo Māori

In New Zealand, Māori overall continue to be socio-economically disadvantaged (Darrity & Nembhard, 2000), and it is therefore not surprising that Māori children in mainstream schools are more likely than non-Māori to underachieve on various measures of English literacy (Rau, 2005). During the beginning stages of reading acquisition, reading delays in at-risk students may be less noticeable, but failure to develop phonological recoding skills early on may have severely negative consequences (Tunmer et al., 2002). Lack of the necessary skills for self-teaching means the rate of reading acquisition will likely be low. Combined with the fact that struggling readers will be less likely to practice reading independently for lack of enjoyment to read, this is likely to amplify the problem progressively. Stanovich (1986) referred to this as the *Matthew Effect*, based on the biblical saying that the rich get richer and the poor get poorer.

While a lot of the academic literature has highlighted the benefits of cultural factors in Māori-medium education, such as the need to create culturally safe learning environments (Hohepa et al., 1992; Bishop et al., 2002; MacFarlane, Glynn, Cavanagh, & Bateman, 2007), less attention has been devoted to the aspects and properties of Te Reo Māori. Although, due to a general lack of literacy assessment tools for Te Reo Māori (Rau, 2005, 2007; May & Hill, 2005), not much data is available on the reading performance of students in Māori-medium education, cross-language studies from Europe on the benefits of learning to read in a language with a consistent orthography (Joshi & Aaron, 2006) suggest similar potential advantages from learning to read in Te Reo Māori. Unlike English, which is classified as a deep or inconsistent orthography (Katz & Frost, 1992), Māori spelling is very regular and transparent. The five vowels are pronounced consistently and unambiguously, independent of the context in which they appear (Harlow, 2007). Additionally, with a large proportion of syllables ending on a vowel and little consonant clustering, the syllabic structure is not as complex as that of English, for example, which should be an additional advantage in reading acquisition (Seymour et al., 2003; Aro, 2006).

Due to the consistency of the spelling of Te Reo Māori, students are likely to develop phonological recoding skills very rapidly. Studies on reading acquisition in languages with regular orthographies generally report phonological recoding to reach ceiling levels by the end of the first year of instruction (Aro, 2006). Unlike in English, where

the inconsistency of its orthography delays opportunities for self-teaching, readers of Te Reo Māori will be able to take advantage of the consistent letter-sound correspondence early on to decode unfamiliar words. Especially in New Zealand, where the emphasis on whole-language methods is particularly strong (Soler & Openshaw, 2007), at-risk students, and therefore Māori students in particular, are even more vulnerable, since they will be even less likely to develop the vital phonological recoding skills (Stein, Johnson, & Gutlohn, 1999; Ryder et al., 2008; Tunmer et al., 2002). Since the goal of Māori-medium schools is not only to revitalise the use of Te Reo Māori, but also to work towards alleviating general Māori literacy underachievement, the prospect that the properties of Te Reo Māori could improve reading acquisition would undoubtedly increase the appeal of early literacy instruction in Te Reo Māori.

The hypothesis presented in the present article that the linguistic properties of Te Reo Māori are beneficial to reading acquisition raise the question whether these benefits might also be generalisable to the student's subsequent acquisition of literacy in English. Transition programmes that prepared Māori-medium students for mainstream schooling in English have generally reported very good results. In some instances, Māori students even acquired higher levels of English literacy than Māori students who were in mainstream schools from the beginning (Glynn et al., 1996). Of course, apart from the quality and value of the programmes themselves, there could be a number of other contributing factors, such as the extra tuition students received, or the support these children might have received from the reportedly highly motivated parents (Glynn et al., 2005). The arguments presented above, that learning to read in the orthographically transparent language Te Reo Māori optimises the acquisition of crucial phonological recoding skills, leaves open the possibility of an additional contributing factor. The present discussion will therefore finish with a final hypothesis, again directly based on findings from previous research, that the benefits of learning to read in the orthographically transparent language Te Reo Māori are not only confined to reading in Te Reo Māori, but that skills acquired through this process are positively transferred to literacy acquisition in English.

It is well documented that the orthography of one's first language directly influences the way in which one learns to read a second language. A number of studies on cross-linguistic orthographic influences investigated interferences between very different types of script (Hamada & Koda, 2008; Holm & Dodd, 1996), i.e. logographic (e.g. Chinese), syllabic (e.g. Japanese) or alphabetic (e.g. languages using the Roman alphabet). It is generally found that the orthography of the first language of instruction has direct and permanent effects on phonological processing strategies (Koda, 1989), and these differences are also visible at the level of brain functioning (Nakada, Fujii, & Kwee, 2001). Transfer of phonological recoding skills also occurs across two alphabetic languages (Comeau, Cormier, Grandmaison, & Lacroix, 1999; Durgunoğlu, Nagy, & Hancin-Bhatt, 1993; Cisero & Royer, 1995), and since the consistent orthography of Te Reo Māori is likely to foster strong decoding skills, it is likely that these skills will be applied when learning subsequent languages. Phonological abilities are particularly important during the beginning of L2

acquisition (Meschyan & Hernandez, 2002), and are even reported to be a better predictor of success than intelligence (Durgunoğlu et al., 1993). The value of a strong L1 foundation in phonological recoding skills is nicely illustrated in a study by Holm and Dodd (1996), which compared the transfer of reading skills from Hong Kong Chinese, Mainland Chinese, and Vietnamese to English. Readers from Hong Kong were least able to spell new English words, thus demonstrating poor phonological awareness. They had learned Chinese characters as logographic symbols and therefore could not transfer any decoding skills to the learning of English. Mainland Chinese readers, in contrast, had learned Mandarin via the romanised *hànyǔ pīnyīn*, which are taught before and while learning Chinese characters. This group even outperformed a comparison group of Australian native English speakers, and Holm and Dodd (1996) concluded that this was due to the fact that the Mainland Chinese readers had acquired strong phonological skills from learning to read in the highly consistent *hànyǔ pīnyīn*.

Although studies on cross-language transfers have generally reported positive effects, there are also instances of negative influences. Some mistakes can occur as the result of generalisations of orthographic rules from one alphabetic script to another. L1 readers of Spanish, for example, were found to make mistakes in consonant doubling when learning to read English, as Spanish does not have this orthographic feature (Bebout, 1985). When fluent readers of Te Reo Māori start to learn to read in English, it is conceivable that similar mistakes are made during the early phases. Such cross-languages differences in orthographic rules are cognitively challenging, but they are also thought to promote increased metalinguistic awareness in bilingual children (D'Angiulli & Siegel, 2001; Lasabagaster, 2001).

Conclusions and implications for revitalisation Te Reo Māori

Failure to learn to read has been linked to lack in phonological skills (Snowling, 1996; D'Angiulli & Siegel, 2001), thus highlighting the importance of this skill in reading acquisition. We argued in the present article that the orthographic consistency of Te Reo Māori likely results in efficient reading acquisition, and also optimises the development of phonological recoding skills. These skills are likely generalised to the subsequent learning of English, leading to a higher rate of success than without previous exposure to Te Reo Māori, and protect particularly at-risk students from reading failure. Presently, only very limited data is available on the outcomes of *kura kaupapa* (Tocker, 2007). Future research on literacy acquisition of Te Reo Māori in Māori-immersion contexts will require suitable assessment tools. Some of the tools that have been developed specifically for Te Reo Māori, such as the *Ngā Kete Kōrero*, appear suitable and culturally appropriate, but they are not widely available, and teachers often do not have access to them (Rau, 2005).

Since method of reading instruction has direct effects on reading acquisition and development of phonological processing ability (Nicholson, 2004), future research will also need to document in detail how literacy in Te Reo Māori is taught in Māori-medium education, about which currently no systematic information is available.

Hohepa et al. (1992) described how the *kōhanga reo* emphasise learning through observation and imitation in culturally relevant contexts. Teaching in Māori-medium environments is highly oral based and matched to the individual needs, learning strategies and experiences of each child, as children generally enter Māori-medium education from diverse backgrounds and with varying knowledge of Māori culture and language (Bishop et al., 2002). The background of the teachers is often equally varied, with most teachers being L2 speakers of Te Reo Māori themselves (May & Hill, 2005). Teaching in bilingual settings requires special training, and demand for suitably qualified teachers continually outstrips supply (May & Hill, 2005). Combined with the high rate of mobility of teachers (Rau, 2005), it can thus be expected that methods of literacy instruction in Te Reo Māori vary substantially from school to school and even from teacher to teacher. Without doubt, the practice of teaching Māori songs and poems builds awareness of syllables and rhymes, an important aspect of phonological awareness (Tunmer et al., 2002), but it is unknown to what extent teaching places explicit emphasis on phonological recoding. To some extent, the orthographic consistency of Te Reo Māori may be beneficial to the development of phonological recoding skills, regardless of the specific teaching methods used. Māori educators, for example, have noted that Māori children generally master letter-sound rules of Te Reo Māori relatively easily (McDowall et al., 2005; Rau, McNaughton, Hōhepa, & Doherty, 1998). This would certainly be consistent with similar observations about other transparent orthographies. Turkish, for example, is generally taught using rote memorisation techniques. Even though this approach does not take advantage of the highly regular orthography of the language, Turkish children nevertheless develop good decoding skills by the end of the first year of instruction (Durgunoğlu & Öney, 2002). Similarly, Finnish children do not need much explicit instruction to develop high levels of phonological ability in their orthographically transparent native language (Aro, 2006).

The purpose of the present article was by no means to downplay the role of cultural factors in efforts of revitalisation of Te Reo Māori. Language and culture are intertwined (Bishop et al., 2002), and culturally safe learning environments undoubtedly play a crucial role in the success of *kōhanga reo* and *kura kaupapa*. The present discussion aimed to draw attention to a potential additional contributing factor to the success of Maori-medium education programmes, which may be of interest to language planners and policy makers. Compared to literacy acquisition in English, learning to read in Te Reo Māori is likely to optimise the development of phonological recoding skills, which is important for reading acquisition and protects especially at-risk students from failing to develop successful reading strategies. Given that Māori students have regularly been statistically over-represented in the proportion of students considered at-risk of failing to develop adequate reading levels (Bishop & Glynn, 1998), the prospect that the linguistic properties of Te Reo Māori, the language of their ancestors, could be part of the process of alleviation of such deficits, is particularly positive. As Bender (1971) recommended, an important step in revitalisation is to create a sense of pride in the language. Awareness of the beauty of the regularity of Te Reo Māori could definitely help instil this pride.

References

- Appleby, P. (2002). Kura Kaupapa Maori: *Tomorrow's Schools* and beyond. *New Zealand Annual Review of Education*, 11, 105-121.
- Aro, M. (2006). Learning to read: The effect of orthography. In R. M. Joshi & P. G. Aaron (Eds.), *Handbook of orthography and literacy* (pp. 531-550). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Aro, M., & Wimmer, H. (2003). Learning to read: English in comparison to six more regular orthographies. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 24, 621-635.
- Bebout, L. (1985). An error analysis of misspellings made by learners of English as a first and as a second language. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 14, 569-593.
- Bender, B. W. (1971). Linguistic factors in Maori education – a report. Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.
- Benton, R. A. (1979). *Who speaks Maori?* Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.
- Bishop, R. (2003). Changing power relations in education: *Kaupapa Māori* messages for 'mainstream' education in Aotearoa/New Zealand [1]. *Comparative Education*, 39, 221-238.
- Bishop, R., & Glynn, T. (1998). Achieving cultural integrity in education in Aotearoa/New Zealand. In K. Cushner (Ed.), *International perspectives on intercultural education*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Bishop, R., Berryman, M., & Richardson, C. (2002). Te toi huarewa: Effective teaching and learning in total immersion Māori language educational settings. *Canadian Journal of Native Education*, 26, 44-61.
- Caravolas, M., & Bruck, M. (1993). The effect of oral and written language input on children's phonological awareness: A cross-linguistic study. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 55, 1-30.
- Caravolas, M., Hulme, C., & Snowling, M. J. (2001). The foundations of spelling ability: Evidence from a 3-year longitudinal study. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 45, 751-774.
- Cisero, C. A., & Royer, J. M. (1995). The development and cross-language transfer of phonological awareness. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 20, 275-303.
- Clay, M. M. (1982). *Observing young readers: Selected papers*. Auckland: Heinemann Educational Books.
- Comeau, L., Cormier, P., Grandmaison, E., & Lacroix, D. (1999). A longitudinal study of phonological processing skills in children learning to read in a second language. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 91, 29-43.
- D'Anguilli, A., & Siegel, L. S. (2001). The development of reading in English and Italian in bilingual children. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 22, 479-507.
- Darity, W., & Nemhard, J. (2000). Racial and ethnic economic inequality: The international record. *American Economic Review, Papers and Proceedings*, 90, 63-90.
- Duncan, L. G., & Seymour, P. H. K. (2000). Socio-economic differences in foundation-level literacy. *British Journal of Psychology*, 91, 145-166.
- Durgunoğlu, A. Y., Nagy, W. E., & Hancin-Bhatt, B. J. (1993). Cross-language transfer of phonological awareness. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 85, 453-465.
- Durgunoğlu, A. Y., & Öney, B. (2002). Phonological awareness in literacy acquisition: It's not only for children. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 6, 245-266.
- Fiez, J. A. (2000). Sound and meaning: How native language affects reading strategies. *Nature Neuroscience*, 3, 3-5.
- Frith, U., Wimmer, H., & Landerl, K. (1998). Differences in phonological recoding in German- and English-speaking children. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 2, 31-54.
- Glynn, T., Berryman, M., Bidois, P., Furlong, M., Thatcher, J., Walker, R., & Atvars, K. (1996). Bilingual gains for tutors and tutees in a Māori reading programme. In *He paepae kōrero: Research perspectives in Māori education*. Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.
- Glynn, T., Berryman, M., Loader, K., & Cavanagh, T. (2005). From literacy in Māori to biliteracy in Māori and English: A community and school transition programme. *The International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 8, 433-454.

- Goswami, U., Ziegler, J. C., Dalton, L., & Schneider, W. (2001). Pseudohomophone effects and phonological recoding procedures in reading development in English and German. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 45, 648-664.
- Goswami, U., Ziegler, J. C., Dalton, L., & Schneider, W. (2003). Nonword reading across orthographies: How flexible is the choice of reading units? *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 24, 235-247.
- Hamada, M., & Koda, K. (2008). Influence of first language orthographic experience on second language decoding and word learning. *Language Learning*, 58, 1-31.
- Harlow, R. (2007). *Māori: A linguistic introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hohepa, M., Smith, G. H., Smith, L. T., & McNaughton, S. (1992). Te Kohanga Reo hei tikanga ako i Te Reo Maori: Te Kohanga Reo as a context for language learning. *Educational Psychology*, 12, 333-346.
- Holm, A., & Dodd, B. (1996). The effect of first written language on the acquisition of English literacy. *Cognition*, 59, 119-147.
- Hoxhallari, L., van Daal, V. H. P., & Ellis, N. C. (2004). Learning to read words in Albanian: A skill easily acquired. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 8, 153-166.
- Joshi, R. M., & Aaron, P. G. (eds.) (2006). *Handbook of orthography and literacy*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Katz, L., & Frost, R. (1992). The reading process is different for different orthographies: The orthographic depth hypothesis. In R. Frost & L. Katz (Eds.), *Orthography, phonology, morphology, and meaning* (pp. 67-85). Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- King, M. (2004). *The Penguin history of New Zealand illustrated*. North Shore, New Zealand: Penguin Books.
- Koda, K. (1989). Effects of L1 orthographic representation on L2 phonological coding strategies. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 18, 201-222.
- Landerl, K. (2000). Influences of orthographic consistency and reading instruction on the development of nonword reading skills. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 15, 239-257.
- Landerl, K. (2006). Reading acquisition in different orthographies: Evidence from direct comparisons. In R. M. Joshi & P. G. Aaron (Eds.), *Handbook of orthography and literacy* (pp. 513-530). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Lasabagaster, D. (2001). The effect of knowledge about the L1 on foreign language skills and grammar. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 4, 310-331.
- Liberman, I. Y., & Liberman, A. M. (1992). Whole language versus code emphasis: Underlying assumptions and their implications for reading instruction. In P. Gough, L. Ehri & R. Treiman (Eds.), *Reading acquisition* (pp. 343-366). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- MacFarlane, A., Glynn, T., Cavanagh, T., & Bateman, S. (2007). Creating culturally-safe schools for Māori students. *The Australian Journal of Indigenous Education*, 36, 65-76.
- Mann, V., & Wimmer, H. (2002). Phoneme awareness and pathways to literacy: A comparison of German and American children. *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 15, 653-682.
- May, S., & Hill, R. (2005). Māori-medium education: Current issues and challenges. *The International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 8, 377-403.
- McDowall, S., Boyd, S., Hodgen, E., & van Vliet, T. (2005). Reading Recovery in New Zealand: Uptake, implementation, and outcomes, especially in relation to Māori and Pasifika students. Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.
- Meschyan, G., & Hernandez, A. (2002). Is native-language decoding skill related to second-language learning? *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 94, 14-22.
- Ministry of Education (2006). *Ngā Haeata Mātauranga: Annual report of Māori Education*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.
- Nakada, T., Fujii, Y., & Kwee, I.L. (2001). Brain strategies for reading in the second language are determined by the first language. *Neuroscience Research*, 40, 351-358.
- Nicolson, T. (2004). How to avoid reading failure: The teaching of phonemic awareness. In A. McKeough, & V. Timmons (Eds.), *International perspectives on literacy*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

- Oney, B., & Goldman, S. R. (1984). Decoding and comprehension skills in Turkish and English: Effects of the regularity of grapheme-phoneme correspondences. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76, 557-568.
- Paulesu, E., McCrory, E., Fazio, F., Menoncello, L., Brunswick, N., Cappa, S. F., Cotelli, M., Cossu, G., Corte, F., Pesenti, S., Gallagher, A., Perani, D., Price, C., Frith, C. D., & Frith, U. (2000). A cultural effect on brain function. *Nature Neuroscience*, 3, 91-96.
- Rau, C., McNaughton, S., Hōhepa, M., & Doherty, L. (1998). The development of the Māori reconstruction. In C. Rau (compiler), *He mātai āta titiro ki te tūtukitanga māātupu pānui, tuhi*. Ngāruawahia, New Zealand: Kia Ata Mai Educational Trust.
- Rau, C. (2005). Literacy acquisition, assessment and achievement of Year Two students in total immersion Maori programmes. *The International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 8, 404-432.
- Rau, C. (2007). Assessment in indigenous language programmes. In E. Shohamy & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education (2nd ed.)*, Vol. 7: *Language testing and assessment* (pp. 319-330). New York: Springer Science and Business Media.
- Reedy, T. (2000). Te Reo Māori: The past 20 years and looking forward. *Oceanic Linguistics*, 39, 157-169.
- Riccio, C. A., Amado, A., Jiménez, S., Hasbrouck, J. E., & Imhoff, B. (2001). Cross-linguistic transfer of phonological processing: Development of a measure of phonological processing in Spanish. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 25, 417-436.
- Ryder, J. F., Tunmer, W. E., & Greaney, K. T. (2008). Explicit instruction in phonemic awareness and phonemically based decoding skills as an intervention strategy for struggling readers in whole language classrooms. *Reading and Writing*, 21, 349-369.
- Seymour, P. H. K., Aro, M., & Erskine, J. M. (2003). Foundation literacy in European orthographies. *British Journal of Psychology*, 94, 143-174.
- Share, D. L. (1995). Phonological recoding and self-teaching: *Sine qua non* of reading. *Cognition*, 55, 151-218.
- Simon, J. (1998) (ed.). *Ngā Kura Māori: The Native Schools System 1867-1969*. Auckland: Auckland University Press.
- Simon, L. S., & Smith, L. T. (2001). *A civilising mission? Perceptions and representations of the New Zealand Native Schools systems*. Auckland: Auckland University Press.
- Snowling, M. J. (1996). Annotation: Contemporary approaches to the teaching of reading. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 37, 139-148.
- Soler, J., & Openshaw, R. (2007). 'To be or not to be?': The politics of teaching phonics in England and New Zealand. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*, 7, 333-352.
- Spolsky, B. (2003). Reassessing Māori regeneration. *Language in Society*, 32, 553-578.
- Stanovich, K. E. (1986). Matthew effects in reading: Some consequences of individual differences in the acquisition of literacy. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 21, 340-406.
- Stein, M., Johnson, B., & Gutlohn, L. (1999). Analyzing beginning reading programs. *Remedial and Special Education*, 20, 275-287.
- Tocker, K. (2007). Kura Kaupapa Māori experiences. *New Zealand Journal of Education Studies*, 42, 65-76.
- Tunmer, W. E., Chapman, J. W., & Prochnow, J. E. (2004). Why the reading achievement gap in New Zealand won't go away: Evidence from the Pirls 2001 International Study of Reading Achievement. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 39, 127-146.
- Tunmer, W. E., Chapman, J. W., Greaney, K. T., & Prochnow, J. E. (2002). The contribution of educational psychology to intervention research and practice. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, 49, 11-29.
- Ziegler, J. C., Perry, C., Jacobs, A. M., & Braun, M. (2001). Identical words are read differently in different languages. *Psychological Science*, 12, 379-384.
- Ziegler, J. C., & Goswami, U. (2006). Becoming literate in different languages: Similar problems, different solutions. *Developmental Science*, 9, 429-453.

REVIEWS

Burns, A., & Richards, J.C. (Eds.) (2009). *The Cambridge guide to second language teacher education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. ISBN 978 0 521 75684 6. 325 pp.

This is an excellent collection of specially-written articles on a 'hot' topic in applied linguistics: second language teacher education (SLTE). Anne Burns and Jack Richards invited international experts to write short, approximately 10-page, updates on a wide range of area of SLTE, all of which provide reviews of both recent studies and older, standard works, as well valuable and authoritative insights from the authors. It would be tedious here to list the contributors, all of whom have published extensively and recently on their chosen topic. It would, I think, have been useful to devote a few pages at the front of this book to notes on the contributors, especially to introduce new practitioners to some of the leading lights of our profession. Such information would also help to highlight the very diverse contexts in which these experts are based—from Canada and the USA to Hungary and Singapore, from Hong Kong to New Zealand.

The thirty individual chapters are grouped into seven themes, each briefly introduced by the editors: 1) The landscape of SLTE, 2) Professionalism and the language teaching profession, 3) Pedagogical knowledge in SLTE, 4) Identity, cognition, and experience in teacher learning, 5) Contexts for SLTE, 6) SLTE through collaboration, and 7) SLT development through research and practice. Here is a flavour of the issues discussed in two of the sections: Section 1 comprises four chapters on the scope of SLTE (Donald Freeman), trends in SLTE (Karen E Johnson), critical LTE (Margaret Hawkins & Bonny Norton) and social and cultural perspectives (Charlotte Franson & Adrian Holliday). The final section has three articles on classroom research (Sandra Lee McKay), action research (Anne Burns) and reflective practice (Jill Burton).

Given the broad range of issues in this book, it is impossible to effectively appraise each the chapters. So I have decided to pick on three areas which I am particularly interested in, although the choice was not easy because every chapter is clearly written and each contains much useful information and thought-provoking suggestions for further reading and action. Anyway, I have chosen Simon Borg's discussion of language teacher cognition, then Rod Ellis's chapter on Second Language Acquisition (SLA) and teacher education, and finally Kathleen Bailey's consideration of language teacher supervision.

In Chapter 16, Borg firstly defines the construct of language teacher cognition, and then focuses on six themes that are of special interest to teacher educators: prior language learning and pre-service education; pre-service cognition during the practicum; the impact of pre-service education; the cognition and practices of in-service teachers; comparison of language teachers' cognitions and practices; and research methods in studying language teacher cognition. Each of these sections provides a very reasonable digest of the issues considered much more fully in

Borg (2006). In addition to pointing to specific empirical studies, some of which have been published since his 2006 book, Borg adds valuable comments based on his considerable experience in the area; for example, the need to complement quantitative approaches (such as questionnaires) with qualitative data such as may be elicited from reflective journals (p.166). He also adds a cautionary note (p.168) about journals completed by teachers undergoing professional development courses: while this may be a neat way to collect data, he questions whether entries in these journals may not be influenced by what researchers tells participants about the purposes of their investigation. Borg concludes the chapter, as do the other contributors, with suggestions for further research. The points he makes here are, like those in his 2006 review, very sensible and include the need for investigation in more contexts (both geographically and in different educational sectors) and into more pedagogic areas than grammar, reading and writing, which have received most attention. One caveat is that, while he calls for collaboration between researchers from acquisition and cognition traditions, he does not seem to think it important to see teachers themselves as knowledge-makers, and theory-creators; in other words, as full research collaborators, rather than as mere informants or participants.

This issue is in fact discussed very fully in the final three chapters in this book, and also in Ellis's earlier consideration (Chapter 13) of how SLA can best be incorporated into a teacher education programme. After a concise tabulation and description of the key topics studied by SLA researchers (L1 transfer, sequential development, systematicity and variability, learner strategies, etc), Ellis presents three possible models for incorporating insights from SLA into SLTE programmes: a discrete course of SLA, integrating SLA into other courses (e.g., a general methods or grammar course), or using SLA as a basis for practitioner research. With regard to the latter, he cites Allwright's (2003) argument for 'exploratory research' in which practitioners (learners as well as teachers) adapt their normal pedagogic practices for use as investigative tools. While Ellis has reservations about precisely how to apply SLA to practitioner research, he does acknowledge that "doubts have crept in about the value of SLA for teachers" (p.141) because of its until relatively recent narrow focus on the acquisition of grammar, and—quoting Borg (1998, p. 10)—“the inconclusive nature of L2 acquisition studies of the best way to teach grammar.” Ellis considers that research into teacher cognition, such as Borg endorses, is important, but stresses the ultimate importance of the technical contribution that is provided by SLA research. He concludes his chapter by stating that it is undeniable that SLA must be included in second language teacher education programmes, but it is far less obvious how this is best done, and suggests that in itself this is an obvious direction for future research.

In her introduction to Chapter 27, Kathleen Bailey points out that “language teacher supervisors seldom receive specific training in how to be effective supervisors” (p.269), and then summarises three interesting approaches and practices that are currently applied. The first is a discussion of how an analysis of

discourse can illuminate effective—and ineffective—supervision, when she refers to the work of Wajnryb (for example, 1998) in the challenging problem of how supervisors can deliver criticism gently but clearly, and then Williams and Watson's (2004) exploration of student teachers' discourse in post lesson discussions with supervisors. Secondly, Bailey considers how teacher supervision could be informed by sociocultural theory. After a brief reference to Van Lier's (1995) discussion of the Zone of Proximal Development, there is a useful summary of five principles derived from sociocultural theory (Rueda, 1998) which supervisors could apply to promote teacher development. The third section reviews several studies conducted in North America and Australia into how supervisor-teacher interaction can be mediated at a distance by technology, such as websites, emails and handheld personal digital assistants, and videoconferencing, the latter perhaps also involving teachers' videotaped lessons. Bailey concludes this section by saying that the majority of published reports of such distance supervision are about first language teacher education, and that "this trend does not seem to have influenced language teacher education yet" (p. 275). In fact, there are some interesting developments currently taking place in this area of distance supervision in some applied linguistics programmes in New Zealand, which suggests the need for systematic local research into its effectiveness and subsequent public dissemination and discussion of findings and appropriate data collection and analysis procedures.

In their short preface, the editors envisage this book as a companion to the *Cambridge guide to TESOL* (Nunan & Carter, 2001) and anticipate that the readership would include, among others, pre-service and in-service teachers, teacher educators, administrators and academics. Indeed, I strongly suggest that there is something here for everybody engaged in professional or academic activity in the field.

This book would be very useful for any practising teacher who wishes to enhance their professional knowledge, either when undertaking a programme of study, or for private reflection. Here they would find a wide-ranging update on issues of contemporary concern and/or interest. It would help prospective research students who want a bird's eye view of what the current state of research is and what empirical spaces there might be to occupy. It might also serve as a follow-up reading to any introductory course, such as the Cambridge CELTA or Trinity College's Cert. TESOL to indicate to beginner teachers the complexity of the professional community they are about to enter. In my opinion, this book would be entirely suitable as the prescribed textbook for an MA course on the subject of SLTE, a full understanding of which, as the editors point out in their ten-page introduction, is vital if the profession is to meet the ever-growing worldwide demand for effective English language education at all levels, and in many occupations.

References

- Allwright, D. (2003). Exploratory practice: Rethinking practitioner research in language teaching. *Language Teaching Research*, 7, 113-141.
- Borg, S. (1998). Teachers' pedagogical systems and grammar teaching: A qualitative study. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32, 9-38.
- Borg, S. (2006). *Teacher cognition and language education*. London: Continuum.
- Nunan D., & Carter. R. (2001). *Cambridge guide to TESOL*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Rueda, R. (1998). *Standards for professional development: A sociocultural perspective*. (Research Brief No.2). Santa Cruz, CA: University of California, Centre for Research on Education, Diversity and Excellence.
- Van Lier, L. (1995). *Introducing language awareness*. London: Penguin Books.
- Wajryb, R. (1998). Telling it like it isn't – exploring an instance of pragmatic ambivalence in supervisory discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 29, 531-544.
- Williams, M., & Watson, A (2004), Post-lesson debriefing: Delayed or immediate? An investigation of student teacher talk. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 30(2), 85-96.

ROGER BARNARD, University of Waikato

Crookes, G. (2009). *Values, philosophies and beliefs in TESOL: Making a statement*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. ISBN 978-0-521-74127-9. \$65.00. 277 pp.

This recent book reflects on a topic not often addressed in teacher education books. The message is viewed from a number of perspectives, historical and international, and is presented in a highly scholarly and methodical way.

The first chapter makes a link between fashions and values in TESOL in comparatively recent times. Crookes wonders, for instance, whether a present-day proponent of the grammar translation method actually believes (as once was the case) that studying a country's literature leads to an understanding of the best of its values, or whether teaching that way is simply "convenient, expected by the students, and consistent with the teacher's own training" (p.5). This suggests a topic for discussion in a teacher education programme, with its questions about how philosophies of teaching develop and the difficulties teachers experience in articulating them. The chapter concludes with an overview of the remaining content of the book. I found myself wanting that to have been dealt with in a separate introduction, rather than interrupting the train of thought.

Chapter 2 traces the beginnings of schooling in Mesopotamia, Egypt and China in the sixth century B.C. The sweep includes sources likely to be new to many readers, and goes beyond Confucius for the Chinese discussion. In Chapter 3 the survey returns to the present with a quotation that compares the past teaching of Latin with the teaching of English today, each being "an international 'auxiliary' language of power, spreading beyond any one nation-state" (p.47). Crookes concludes with his belief that the long view of history shows "repeated cycles of innovation, institutionalization, erasure, and return" (p.71). It would be interesting to ask a group of teachers using this as a course text, where on this cycle they saw their own national educational system.

The title of Chapter 4, *Isms and systems*, captures the content, which is major belief systems and their applicability to teaching. Fortunately Crookes does not assume that everyone will be familiar with such terms as metaphysics, epistemology and axiology; all are defined before being elaborated. On a personal note it was fascinating to be offered a link between long-forgotten educational theories and current practice in TESOL. Chapter 5's long title is: *Two recent philosophical movements, language teaching, and the way the world is going (perhaps)*. That final word mirrors Crookes' stance throughout the book, where rhetorical questions and the use of hedging invite the reader to accept, reject or modify his comments. Will anyone, for instance, defend The Silent Way from his comment that, while it is usually grouped under the 'humanistic' approaches, "from personal experience [it] seems pretty inhuman" (p.110).

Chapter 6 brings together epistemology, “the domain of philosophy that investigates knowing”, (p.112) and the S/FL teacher. Crookes uses the first person plural as a way of including himself amongst his intended readers. For instance we are reminded that we are not “at the mercy of the expert or researcher” but rather have our own “locally developed knowledge” (p.123). We are invited to consider what we know in various areas and to make that knowledge explicit, particularly in the light of what he sees as a failure to acknowledge the professionalism of language teachers.

For chapter 7, I paused at the title, *Ethics and morals*, and tried to predict the content on the basis of what I had read in the first six chapters. It turned out to be one of the shorter sections, which might seem odd in view of the book’s title, were it not for the fact that explorations of ethics and morals are already spread throughout the book. One source he referred to here (Haferník et al.) was new to me but seemed to deserve further investigation, particularly for people interested in the post-compulsory level of education. Amongst some more familiar problems (plagiarism, gift-giving) are included ‘faculty responsibilities’ and ‘advising’ (p.145).

Chapter 8 is entitled *Mainstream social and political philosophy and language education*. Here, as elsewhere, I found myself wondering how difficult a task it must have been to categorise the book’s content into chapters. So much of the content flows almost seamlessly from one part to the next. Following the sub-section “Sociopolitical concepts in democracies” (p.152) I found myself waiting in vain for a section on the same concepts in non-democracies. A single book can’t do everything.

The title of Chapter 9 is *Radical alternatives*. Here we meet Rousseau, Freire and others whose ideas were widely developed and expanded, not always in ways that pleased their originators. Chapter 10, *Some continuing tensions for S/FL teachers* includes a personal view that the high fallout rate amongst new teachers is linked with a failure in “teacher preparation or induction programs...to emphasize the difficulties of living up to any of the higher aspirations of teachers” (p.200). At the risk of including my own view, the drop-out problem surely has a less simple causal link than this?

Chapter 11 reviews empirical studies on “aims and other components of a teaching philosophy” (p. 214). Almost every review here left me wanting to read the original article. Crookes’ students at the University of Hawaii must enjoy his lectures, but they must also have very long reading lists. Still, he is probably the kind of teacher who inspires them to do more than read the minimum required. Finally, there is a chapter that lasts less than two pages and which finishes with a plea for everyone to keep developing their teaching philosophy: “Can we really know what we should be doing without one?” (p.239).

Comparisons with two other books come to mind. Johnston’s (2003) *Values in English language teaching* is less academic and shorter, although it draws on many of the same sources; closer to home Snook’s (2003) *The ethical teacher* offers a local perspective for teachers in general. To refer to Crookes’ book as highly academic is

to tell only part of the story, since the many footnotes that follow each chapter offer more subjective glimpses into his thinking. As an example, on page 25 there is a brief autobiographical note of the ‘apology’ genre in which he illustrates the point that no book on a topic such as this can come in a vacuum by ‘confessing’ to his ethnicity, gender, family situation, and three decades of professional life.

Like others in this longstanding series, *Values, philosophies and beliefs in TESOL* offers plenty of material to the serious reader, including almost 30 pages of references. Crookes has certainly achieved the book’s subtitle “Making a statement”, being unafraid to offer counterarguments to established viewpoints. The challenge for the wider readership will be to decide how this statement might inform their own teaching.

References

- Hafernik, J.J., Messerschmitt, D.S., & Vandrick, S. 2002. *Ethical issues for ESL faculty: Social justice in practice*. Mahwah, NJ, Erlbaum.
- Johnston, B. (2003). *Values in English language teaching*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Snook, I. (2003). *The ethical teacher*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.

MARILYN LEWIS, Honorary Research Fellow, University of Auckland.

East, M. (2008). *Dictionary use in foreign language writing exams: Impact and implications*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. ISBN 978-9-027-21983-1. 228 pp.

What use do proficient users of a foreign language make of a bilingual dictionary in the context of a writing examination? Martin East's *Dictionary use in foreign language writing exams: Impact and implications* offers a complete description and analysis of three qualitative studies undertaken to investigate this key question. The study is a further contribution to language educators' understandings of assessing writing, offering stakeholders information to help them decide whether bilingual dictionaries are students' friends or foes in assessment contexts. It also offers fascinating insights into the dictionary user's thinking, and, to put all of this study to practical application, offers language learners tips on how to make maximal pedagogical use of their bilingual dictionaries both within examinations and in the freer world of internally assessed coursework.

Martin East, of course, was the winner of the 2005 *ALANZ* best PhD thesis prize, and this book both represents his doctoral study and incorporates a number of subsequent studies on dictionary use and assessing writing. *NZSAL* is, then, specially placed to showcase Dr. East's book, Volume 22 in the John Benjamins Language Learning & Language Teaching series.

The idea for the study stems from a range of topical incidents, such as the *volte-face* withdrawal of bilingual dictionaries from use in the UK's GCSE examinations in 2003, five years after a policy allowing them was established in 1998. The first chapter of Dr. East's book backgrounds this controversy, surveys literature both supporting and opposing dictionary use, and reports interview data from 12 interested parties: three language professionals and nine students. The context is complicated by being situated within opposing paradigms of testing and assessment: assessment *for* or *of* learning. The results are interesting. To summarise, in the 'majority corner', we have those who value the dictionary's authenticity, potential for multi-componential communication and real-life applicability, while in the other are those who see dictionaries as time-wasters that lead to inaccurate and decontextualised lexical choices and even howlers. They encourage the belief that there is a one-to-one correspondence between a word in one language and its translation into another, and they discourage thinking in the foreign language.

The second chapter is a solid survey of the value of bilingual dictionaries *vis-à-vis* monolingual ones in assessing foreign language learning by tests that are construct-valid. It begins the presentation of evidence for or against bilingual dictionaries having a useful place within fair, valid, reliable timed foreign language tests and coursework assessments, particularly those framed within communicative competence. The chapter, and the book, move on to promise evidence from what the test-takers themselves think. Test-takers are, after all, only the most significant stakeholders of all (p. 35).

Issues about whether bilingual dictionary use affects test performance and what test-takers think about how they use dictionaries occupy much of the book. Chapter 6 gives voice to the test-takers, classifying comments in terms of benefits and drawbacks, and Chapter 7 provides a range of perspectives over and above plusses and minuses before bringing it all together. Chapter 3 surveys the kinds of studies—particularly comparative (with and without dictionary) and repeated measures studies—that can (and do) answer these key questions effectively. The chapter emphasises the importance of evidence from test scores in determining a test’s construct validity. The remainder of the book presents its methodologies, data and findings for its three studies over 200 pages of readable scholarly discourse and debate. The data from East’s studies come mainly from the contexts of teaching intermediate students of German, but the intention is that the findings are applicable to any foreign language teaching context.

The readability of the text comes in part from the author’s prodigious knowledge of national education systems and the principles of assessing foreign language learning, and part from such editorial choices as the frequent use of subheadings—chunking for linguists—and summary paragraphs at the end of each section to aid navigation. Another strategy lies in the compelling chapter headings. There are questions: *How do test takers use dictionaries?* (Chapter 4) and controversies: *When the dictionary becomes a liability* (Chapter 5). I won’t go into the minutiae of the three studies here, but the evidence presented compels, and the voices of the students humanise the findings. I also won’t provide a spoiler to answer the key question with which I opened this review.

Academic studies need a ‘so what?’ section, and East’s Chapters 8 and 9 focus on strategies to maximise the usefulness, fairness and effectiveness of dictionary use in examinations. Language teachers will find the section “What does this mean for the classroom?” (p.194) and its many practical applications useful. Whether dictionary use poses a problem of fairness or whether it empowers learners is the question readers take away from East’s *Dictionary use in foreign language writing exams: Impact and implications*.

MARTIN ANDREW, Swinburne University, Melbourne

Nation, I. S. P. & Newton, J. (2009). *Teaching ESL/EFL listening and speaking*. New York: Routledge. ISBN 978-0-415-9870-1. \$59.95. 204 pp.

Nation, I. S. P. (2009). *Teaching ESL/EFL reading and writing*. New York: Routledge. ISBN 978-0-415-98968-8. \$59.95. 172 pp.

In 1985, Patsy M. Lightbown made ten generalizations about second language acquisition research, but concluded that although these might be an important source of information, they could not be the basis for making teaching decisions. In 2000, Lightbown re-assessed those generalizations, largely finding them even more strongly supported, but again reached the same conclusion. Recently, however, a number of articles have taken up the challenge of cautiously bringing second language acquisition research into the classroom, often in the form of principles (for example, see Ellis, 2005). This approach has also been taken in books, ranging from Kumaravadivelu's (2003) book-length development of macrostrategies (based on his 1994 article) that treat language teaching holistically, to Nunan's (2004) edited collection offering different principles for different areas of language teaching.

The companion volumes *Teaching ESL/EFL speaking and listening* and *Teaching ESL/EFL reading and writing* are additions to this trend. The two volumes under review offer a framework of principles in which to address language teaching practices. This framework is the 'four strands' (previously presented in an article; see Nation, 2007). The four strands are meaning-focused input, meaning-focused output, language-focused learning, and becoming fluent. Anyone who has read any of the previously mentioned articles or books will recognize these, suggesting the maturity of SLA in that widespread agreement appears to exist concerning the foundations of ESL/EFL learning. Indeed, one of the hallmarks of these volumes under review is that many early classics are ranged alongside more recent work, and that an effort has been made to include time-honored practices that are supported by research findings.

Each volume has ten chapters, a preface, conclusion, appendices, references, and index. Chapters begin with general principles and then move on to practical advice, both as a few rules of thumb and many practical activities.

Listening and speaking begins with rather oddly titled chapter "Parts and goals of a language teaching course." It is oddly titled because this chapter is not focused specifically on listening and speaking, but on the four strands and their role in planning and teaching a course that covers all skill areas. (It should be noted that grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation are also addressed in these volumes.) There are chapters devoted specifically to beginners (Chapter 2), listening (Chapter 3), pronunciation (Chapter 5), fluency (Chapter 9), and monitoring and testing progress (Chapter 10). Four chapters are devoted to specifically exemplifying how the four strands are related to practical activities. Language-focused learning is linked to dictation and related activities (Chapter 4) and to deliberate teaching (Chapter 8). Learning through task-focused interaction (Chapter 6) and pushed output (Chapter 7)

address the remaining strands. Appendices include a survival syllabus for travel, topic types, and topics. Activities are usefully listed by chapter and also alphabetically in the index.

The lack of an opening chapter on the four strands in the *Reading and writing* book is noticeable, since references to it make it clear that it can be found in *Listening and speaking*. In *Reading and writing* the first six chapters are devoted to reading and the last four to writing. The first chapter, “Learning to read in another language” includes principles grouped under the four strands. It also groups early reading into three types: shared, guided, and independent. The second chapter covers the oft-ignored topics of word recognition and spelling. Other chapter topics are intensive and extensive reading, reading faster, and assessing reading. The writing chapters begin with one on helping learners write that also groups principles under the four strands, and writing tasks into four types: experience, shared, guided, and independent. One chapter discusses process writing. A chapter on topic types is more or less aimed at academic writing. The final chapter, “Responding to written work,” covers motivating students, improving writing through feedback, and measuring writing proficiency. There are also two rather cryptic appendices, one on spelling and pronunciation correspondences and one on conjunction relationships.

These are straightforward and readable books that should appeal to novice language teachers in particular by giving them a sense of how theory and practice fit together, as well as lots of authoritatively presented practical advice about what to do. They are not without flaws, however. Each index is quite selective, focusing mostly on the names of activities and some other topics, without any authors. Like the index, the literature cited is also selective, which of course is necessarily the case. However, there is much more pedagogically relevant research that could have been usefully discussed, particularly given the authoritative tone. Perhaps suggestions for further reading at the ends of chapters would address this concern and facilitate readers in finding out more. Reminders that good teaching considers individual learners, teacher skill and knowledge, and local context would also be wise, given that this appears to be the message (see p. 13 in *Listening and speaking*) the authors wished to convey.

In the end, the four strands are what make the two volumes unique, by distilling SLA research into four easy-to-remember phrases that offer a rubric for planning a course, a unit, or even a single lesson. These two volumes are a sound basis for novices to develop knowledge, and a principled means for experienced teachers and teacher educators to consolidate their understanding.

References

- Ellis, R. (2005). Principles of instructed language learning. *System*, 33, 209-224.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (1994). The postmethod condition: (E)merging strategies for second/foreign language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28, 27-48.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2003). *Beyond methods: Macrostrategies for language teaching*. Yale: Yale University Press.

- Lightbown, P. M. (1985). Great expectations: Second language acquisition research and classroom teaching. *Applied Linguistics*, 6, 173-189.
- Lightbown, P. M. (2000). Classroom SLA research and second language teaching. *Applied Linguistics*, 21, 431-462.
- Nation, P. (2007). The four strands. *Innovation in language teaching and learning*, 1, 1-12.
- Nunan, D. (Ed.) (2004). *Practical English language teaching*. New York: McGraw Hill.

ANNE FERYOK, University of Otago

Samuda, V. & Bygate, M. (2008). *Tasks in second language learning*. Palgrave. ISBN 978-1-4039-1187-2. \$71.95. 299 pp.

Tasks have inspired a number of book-length accounts across a range of perspectives in recent years. One wonders if yet another is needed, and so it was with some skepticism that I approached Samuda and Bygate's offering despite my genuine appreciation of both authors' previous work. *Tasks in second language learning* is part of Palgrave Macmillan's Research and Practice in Applied Linguistics series, edited by Christopher Candlin and David Hall, who also edit Pearson Education's Applied Linguistics in Action, which perhaps accounts for their resemblance. In both series there are chapters devoted to research directions and resources, and boxed inserts highlight quotes and concepts; these are appropriately placed and frequently referred to in this book, making it visually and textually cohesive at first glance.

Tasks in second language learning is divided into four sections, the first two being the core of the book, which will be discussed in detail first, followed by the remaining two sections.

Part One has seven chapters, each approaching tasks from a different perspective. The first chapter sets out the basic premise of the book by conceptualizing second language learning as a holistic activity, and tasks as one way of engaging language use. It draws on Breen's (1987) distinction of task-as-workplan and task-as-process. As with other books on tasks (e.g. Ellis, 2003), examples are provided very early; this book stands out, however, first for focusing on a single task in depth (including an extended sample of learner language generated by it), and second for referring to it throughout the book. Other chapters cover issues in holistic tasks in education and research (2 and 3); tasks in second language pedagogy (4); issues in defining tasks (5); implications of using tasks for engaging learning processes (6); and researching second language pedagogic tasks (7). Part Two focuses on task research from a pedagogical perspective (8) and pedagogic perspectives on tasks (9).

Repeated references to pedagogy and research in this and the previous section do not make it is easy to determine chapter content from the titles, although their introductory paragraphs help distinguish between, for example, the thematically organized overview of research approaches and findings in Chapter 7, the in-depth 'cases' of seven studies in Chapter 8, and the practitioner focus of Chapter 9. I found these three chapters to be the most interesting in the book, because they distinguish it from both research-oriented and pedagogically-oriented books on tasks of recent years (e.g., Ellis, 2003; Nunan, 2005; Van den Branden, 2006; Willis & Willis, 2007).

Chapter 7 is particularly interesting for its analysis of pedagogic task research into three dimensions: systemic vs. process, macro vs. micro, and quantitative vs. qualitative. The dimensions are explained, and followed by discussion of sample studies within each dimension. This approach performs two functions: it allows individual studies to be positioned within a dimension, thereby highlighting the

theoretical framework and assumptions undergirding it. It also allows several studies to be positioned with respect to each other, thereby enabling comparisons to be drawn. The approach culminates in an assessment of the systemic vs. process and macro vs. micro dimensions that provides a critical background to the subsequent overview of research findings.

Chapter 8 focuses on eight studies in order to explore the methods used in researching tasks. It begins with a table summarizing the studies with regard to problem, context, research purpose, and theoretical base. The table shows that the selected studies range over 15 years as well as different topics. The basis for grouping the studies is presented, as well as their connections to the themes of Chapter 7 (which is also tabulated).

Chapter 9 is another rewarding chapter: it reviews curriculum options for tasks, and the case it makes for tasks as pedagogic tools in particular contexts (including different places in an instructional sequence) is persuasive. The pre-service and in-service teachers who read it for a methods and materials course I teach not only agreed, but also made effective use of its ideas in a materials design assessment, which suggests its aptness for that audience.

Part Three provides concrete advice on planning and implementing 32 research projects which is a handy resource for students doing initial one or two semester research projects. The projects are organized by the same themes used in Chapter 7. Part Four provides a list of 'essential' readings, including a list of key influences such as Dewey, whose presence is felt throughout the book. Other categories of resources (associations, conferences, journals, websites and guides) are also listed.

My skepticism, therefore, has been overcome. Samuda and Bygate's *Tasks in second language learning* provides a clearly theorized pedagogically-oriented approach to tasks that not only covers but also challenges much of the received thinking on tasks, making it of interest not only to the students, teachers, and teacher educators mentioned, but also researchers.

References

- Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Nunan, D. (2005). *Task-based language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Van den Branden, K. *Task-based language education: From theory to practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Willis, D. & Willis, J. (2007). *Doing task-based teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

ANNE FERYOK, University of Otago

GUIDELINES FOR CONTRIBUTORS

NZSAL is a refereed journal that is published twice a year. It welcomes manuscripts from those actively involved in Applied Linguistics/Applied Language Studies including second and foreign language educators, researchers, teacher educators, language planners, policy makers and other language practitioners. The journal is a forum for reporting and critical discussion of language research and practice across a wide range of languages and international contexts. A broad range of research types is represented (qualitative and quantitative, established and innovative), including cross-disciplinary approaches.

1. Submission of Manuscripts

- 1.1 Articles should be double-spaced in A4 format with generous margins at head, foot and both sides. Pages should be numbered consecutively. Submission of a manuscript implies that it has not been published previously and that it is not under consideration for publication elsewhere.
- 1.2 Articles should normally be between 3000 and 5000 words in length.
- 1.3 Each article should include, on a separate page, an abstract of between 150 and 200 words, which is capable of standing alone as a descriptor of the article. Include the title on the abstract page.
- 1.4 A separate title page should include the following
 - the title of the article
 - author's name, and in the case of more than one author, an indication of which author will receive the correspondence
 - the affiliation of all authors
 - full postal address and telephone, e-mail and fax numbers of all authors
- 1.5 Authors should include a brief autobiographical sketch (50-80 words) on a separate page.
- 1.6 Copies should be submitted as an attachment to John Bitchener, co-editor:

john.bitchener@aut.ac.nz
- 1.7 All relevant articles submitted for publication will be reviewed by members of the Editorial Board or other referees.

2. Presentation of Manuscripts

- 2.1 Sections of the article should be headed but not numbered.
- 2.2 All Figures and Tables should be provided in camera-ready form, suitable for reproduction (which may include reduction) and should require no change. Figures (e.g. charts and diagrams) and Tables should be numbered consecutively in the order to which they are referred. They should not be included within the text, but submitted each on a separate page. All Figures and Tables should have a number and a caption.
- 2.3 Do not use Footnotes. Endnotes should be avoided, but if essential, they should be numbered in the text by means of a superscript and grouped together at the end of the article before the References under the heading Notes.
- 2.4 References within the text should contain the name of the author, the year of publication, and, if necessary, the relevant page number(s), as in these examples:

It is stated by McCloud and Henry (1993, p. 238) that “students never ...” This, however, has not been the case (Baker & Thomas, 2001; Frank, 1996; Smithers, 1985).
- 2.5 The list of References at the end of the article should be arranged alphabetically by authors’ names. References should be given in the following form:

References

Books

Lillis, T. M. (2001). *Student writing: Access, regulation, desire*. London: Routledge.
Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning and identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Article in book

Clark, R. (1992). Principles and practice of CLA in the classroom. In N. Fairclough (Ed.), *Critical language awareness* (pp. 117-140). Harlow: Longman.

Journal articles

- Lea, M. R., & Street, B. V. (1998). Student writing in higher education: An academic literacies approach. *Studies in Higher Education*, 23(2), 157-172.
- Turner, J. (2004). Language as academic purpose. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 3(2), 95-109.

Unpublished manuscript

- Park-Oh, Y.Y. (1994). *Self-regulated strategy training in second language reading*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Alabama, USA.
- Stein, F. & G.R. Johnson. (2001). *Language policy at work*. Unpublished manuscript.

Conference presentation

- King, J., & M. Maclagan. 2001, August. *Maori pronunciation over time*. Paper presented at the 14th Annual New Zealand Linguistics Society Conference, Christchurch, New Zealand

Work sourced from the internet

- Sanders, R. (2006). The imponderable bloom: Reconsidering the role of technology in education. *Innovate Journal of Online Education*, 2(6). Retrieved July 31, 2006, from <http://www.innovateonline.info/index.php?view=article&id=232>

For other sources use APA (American Psychological Association) conventions.

3. Short reports and summaries

NZSAL invites short reports on any aspect of theory and practice in Applied Linguistics. Manuscripts could also present preliminary research findings or focus on some aspect of a larger study. Submissions to this section should be no longer than 2000 words, and should follow the submission guidelines for full-length articles (no abstract is required, however).

4. Reviews

NZSAL welcomes reviews of professional books, classroom texts, and other instructional materials. Reviews should provide a descriptive and evaluative summary and a brief discussion of the work in the context of current theory and practice. Submissions should generally be no longer than 1000 words.